AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

PUBLIC PAPERS OF THE PRESIDENTS
OF THE
UNITED STATES

Published by the
Office of the Federal Register
National Archives and Records Administration

For sale by the
Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

Foreword

Nineteen hundred and ninety-seven was a year of great and growing confidence for our Nation. America moved forward, forging a new vision of how Government can best equip our people for a time of great change. After years of partisan division and decades of deficits, the two political parties worked together to enact a balanced budget that reflected our values and protected our priorities—the first balanced budget in a generation.

This achievement meant much more than numbers on a ledger. Our balanced budget heralded a new era of fiscal discipline. It accelerated a virtuous cycle of rising economic growth and falling interest rates. It did nothing less than save Government from its own excesses, making it again a progressive force—one that lives within its means while making historic investments in our people. The budget contained the biggest increase in aid to higher education since the passage of the GI Bill 50 years ago and will open the doors of college to every person willing to work for it. The budget also made the largest single investment in health care since the creation of Medicaid in 1965 and will help provide health coverage for up to 5 million uninsured children.

As I said in September at American University, after years in which the two parties seemed capable of little more than conflict, we finally found a way for Democrats and Republicans to work together for the national interest. America is working again; and now, at long last, Washington proved that it could, too.

I also sought to find common ground and lead our Nation to higher ground on another challenge we face at the end of the 20th century, the dilemma of race. My *Initiative on Race* sought to promote a dialogue in every community about this issue and develop concrete solutions to enduring problems of prejudice and discrimination. For me, the most powerful reminder of the distance we can travel together as a Nation came on a sunny morning in Little Rock, Arkansas, when we celebrated the achievement of the Little Rock Nine. Four decades earlier, on September 4, 1957, when they tried to enter the doors of Central High, the Little Rock Nine were turned away by jeers, threats, and the implacable resistance of institutional racism. But on this day, 40 years later, when those same individuals walked up the steps of that imposing brick building, a President of the United States was there to welcome them and hold the door open. We have many steps to climb as we approach the new century. But as the Little Rock Nine reminded us, our Nation moves forward and upward when we move together, as one America.

William J. Clinton

Preface

This book contains the papers and speeches of the 42d President of the United States that were issued by the Office of the Press Secretary during the period July 1–December 31, 1997. The material has been compiled and published by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration.

The material is presented in chronological order, and the dates shown in the headings are the dates of the documents or events. In instances when the release date differs from the date of the document itself, that fact is shown in the textnote. Every effort has been made to ensure accuracy: Remarks are checked against a tape recording, and signed documents are checked against the original. Textnotes and cross references have been provided by the editors for purposes of identification or clarity. Speeches were delivered in Washington, DC, unless indicated. The times noted are local times. All materials that are printed full-text in the book have been indexed in the subject and name indexes, and listed in the document categories list.

The Public Papers of the Presidents series was begun in 1957 in response to a recommendation of the National Historical Publications Commission. An extensive compilation of messages and papers of the Presidents covering the period 1789 to 1897 was assembled by James D. Richardson and published under congressional authority between 1896 and 1899. Since then, various private compilations have been issued, but there was no uniform publication comparable to the Congressional Record or the United States Supreme Court Reports. Many Presidential papers could be found only in the form of mimeographed White House releases or as reported in the press. The Commission therefore recommended the establishment of an official series in which Presidential writings, addresses, and remarks of a public nature could be made available.

The Commission's recommendation was incorporated in regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, issued under section 6 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 1506), which may be found in title 1, part 10, of the Code of Federal Regulations.

A companion publication to the Public Papers series, the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, was begun in 1965 to provide a broader range of Presidential materials on a more timely basis to meet the needs of the contemporary reader. Beginning with the administration of Jimmy Carter, the Public Papers series expanded its coverage to include additional material as printed in the Weekly Compilation. That coverage provides a listing of the President's daily schedule and meetings, when announced, and other items of general interest issued by the Office of the Press Secretary. Also included are lists of the President's nominations submitted to the Senate, materials released by the Office of the Press Secretary that are not printed full-text in the book, and proclamations, Executive orders, and other Presidential documents released by the Office of the Press Secretary and published in the *Federal Register*. This information appears in the appendixes at the end of the book.

Volumes covering the administrations of Presidents Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, and Bush are also included in the Public Papers series.

The Public Papers of the Presidents publication program is under the direction of Frances D. McDonald, Managing Editor, Office of the Federal Register. The series is produced by the Presidential and Legislative Publications Unit, Gwen H. Estep, Chief. The Chief Editor of this book was Karen Howard Ashlin, assisted by Scott Andreae, Brad Brooks, Anna Glover, Margaret A. Hemmig, Maxine Hill, Michael Hoover, Alfred Jones, Jennifer S. Mangum, Michael J. Sullivan, and Karen A. Thornton.

The frontispiece and photographs used in the portfolio were supplied by the White House Photo Office. The typography and design of the book were developed by the Government Printing Office under the direction of Michael F. DiMario, Public Printer.

Raymond A. Mosley
Director of the Federal Register

John W. Carlin
Archivist of the United States

Contents

Foreword . . . v

Preface . . . vii

Cabinet . . . xi

Public Papers of William J. Clinton,
July 1–December 31, 1997 . . . 895

Appendix A
Digest of Other White House Announcements . . . 1829

Appendix B
Nominations Submitted to the Senate . . . 1845

Appendix C
Checklist of White House Press Releases . . . 1857

Appendix D
Presidential Documents Published in the Federal Register . . . 1869

Subject Index . . . A–1

Name Index . . . B–1

Document Categories List . . . C–1

Cabinet

Secretary of State	Madeleine K. Albright
Secretary of the Treasury	Robert E. Rubin
Secretary of Defense	William S. Cohen
Attorney General	Janet Reno
Secretary of the Interior	Bruce Babbitt
Secretary of Agriculture	Dan Glickman
Secretary of Commerce	William M. Daley
Secretary of Labor	Alexis M. Herman
Secretary of Health and Human Services	Donna E. Shalala
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development	Andrew M. Cuomo
Secretary of Transportation	Rodney E. Slater
Secretary of Energy	Federico Peña
Secretary of Education	Richard W. Riley
Secretary of Veterans Affairs	Hershel Gober, Acting
United States Representative to the United Nations	Bill Richardson
Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency	Carol M. Browner
United States Trade Representative	Charlene Barshefsky
Director of the Office of Management and Budget	Franklin D. Raines

Chief of Staff	Erskine B. Bowles
Counselor to the President	Thomas F. McLarty III
Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers	Janet Yellen
Director of National Drug Control Policy	Barry R. McCaffrey
Administrator of the Small Business Administration	Aida Alvarez
Director of Central Intelligence	George J. Tenet
Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency	James Lee Witt

Administration of William J. Clinton

1997

Remarks Announcing the Electronic Commerce Initiative
July 1, 1997

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. For those of you who did not know what he was talking about, we went to a Broadway show last night, and there were three guys in the show who did the macarena in the show. So after it was over, I thought it only fair when the Vice President spoke they come up and do the macarena while—it was sort of background music, you know. [*Laughter*]

Lou Gerstner, thank you for being here. That was a remarkable statement, and the Vice President gave you a remarkable introduction. I never before thought of you as a gazelle, but I always will now. [*Laughter*]

Thank you, Macdara MacColl, for the work you do and for the fine words you spoke. To the members of the Cabinet and the administration and people here from industry and consumer groups, I thank all of you. I especially want to thank for this remarkable report all the agencies who worked on it and in particular Ira Magaziner, who did a brilliant job in bringing everybody together and working this out over a very long period of time. And we thank you for what you did on that. Thank you all. I thank the Members of Congress for being here, Congressmen Gejdenson, Gordon, Markey, and Flake, and for their interest in these issues.

I had two disparate experiences in the last few days that would convince a person of limited technological proficiency, like myself, that the world is changing rather dramatically. You have to remember now, the Vice President coined the term "information superhighway" 20 years ago, back when I didn't even have an electric typewriter. [*Laughter*] But anyway, I had these two experiences which were very interesting to me. It's sort of a mark of how our world is changing.

As you may have seen in the press, the oldest living member of my family, my great-uncle, passed away a few days ago, and so I went back to this little town in Arkansas where I was born. And when I got there late at night, I drove out in the country for a few miles to my cousin's house where the family was gathering. And she has a son who is in his mid-thirties now who lives in another small town in Arkansas, who, after we talked for 5 minutes, proceeded to tell me that he played golf on the Internet several times a month from his small town in Arkansas with an elderly man in Australia who unfailingly beat him. [*Laughter*] An unheard of experience just a few years ago. He knows this guy. He's explaining to me how he finds this man.

Then he says, "My brother likes to play backgammon on the Internet, and it got so I couldn't talk to him. But now I know how I can go get him out of his game, and he can go find a place to come have a visit with me, and they can hold the game while we have an emergency talk." I mean, these whole conversations, the way people—it was just totally unthinkable a few years ago.

And then Sunday, the New York Times crossword puzzle—I don't know if you saw it, but it was for people like me. It was entitled "Technophobes." [*Laughter*] And I'm really trying to overcome my limitations. I'm technologically challenged, and I'm learning how to do all kinds of things on the computer because Chelsea is going off to school, and I need to be more literate. But you ought to go back and pull this, all of you who are now into cyberspace, and see if you can work your way back to another world because they had high-tech clues with common answers. Like "floppy disk" was a clue; the answer was "frisbee." [*Laughter*] "Hard drive" was a clue; the answer was "Tiger's tee shot." [*Laughter*] "Digital monitor" was the clue; the answer was "manicurist." [*Laughter*]

So, anyway, we've come a long way. And I'd like to give you some sense of history about this, because interestingly enough, this gathering at the White House, which I think is truly historic, is in a line of such developments in this house that has shaped our country's history of communications and networking. One hundred and thirty-nine years ago, here at the White

House, America celebrated our first technological revolution here in communications. That was the year Queen Victoria sent the very first transatlantic telegraph transmission to President Buchanan, right here. And later, the first telephone in Washington, DC, was located in a room upstairs, the same room in which Woodrow Wilson managed the conduct of America's involvement in World War I. So we've seen a lot of interesting technological developments over time in the White House.

Now we celebrate the incredible potential of the Internet and the World Wide Web. When I first became President, which wasn't so long ago, only physicists were using the World Wide Web. Today, as Lou said, there are about 50 million people in 150 countries connected to the information superhighway. There will be 5 times as many by the year 2000, perhaps more, doing everything conceivable. We cannot imagine exactly what the 21st century will look like, but we know that its science and technology and its unprecedented fusions of cultures and economies will be shaped in large measure by the Internet.

We are very fortunate to have with us today, together for the very first time at the White House, the four individuals who gave birth to the Internet: Vincent Cerf and Bob Kahn, who were critical to the development of the Internet in the 1970's; Tim Berners-Lee, who invented the World Wide Web, which brought the Internet into our homes, offices, and schools; and David Duke, who headed the team that invented the fiber optic cable which made high-speed Internet connections possible. Their groundbreaking work has done more to shape and create the world our children will inherit than virtually any invention since the printing press. And I would like to ask all four of them to stand and be recognized now. [*Applause*]

The report which is being released and work that has been done is our effort to meet the challenge to make the Internet work for all of our people. Within a generation, we can make it so that every book ever written, every symphony ever composed, every movie ever made, every painting ever painted, is within reach of all of our children within seconds with the click of a mouse—which was "black eye" in the crossword puzzle yesterday. [*Laughter*]

Now, this potential is nothing short of revolutionary. The Vice President and I are working to connect every classroom and school library to the Internet by the year 2000 so that for the first time, all the children, without regard to their personal circumstances, economic or geographical, can have access to the same knowledge in the same time at the same level of quality. It could revolutionize education in America. And many of you are helping on that, and we are grateful.

We've also included $300 million in our new balanced budget plan to help build the next generation Internet so that leading universities and national labs can communicate in speeds 1,000 times faster than today, to develop new medical treatments, new sources of energy, new ways of working together.

But as has already been said, one of the most revolutionary uses of the Internet is in the world of commerce. Already we can buy books and clothing, obtain business advice, purchase everything from garden tools to hot sauce to high-tech communications equipment over the Internet. But we know it is just the beginning. Trade on the Internet is doubling or tripling every single year. In just a few years, it will generate hundreds of billions of dollars in goods and services.

If we establish an environment in which electronic commerce can grow and flourish, then every computer will be a window open to every business, large and small, everywhere in the world. Not only will industry leaders such as IBM be able to tap into new markets, but the smallest startup company will have an unlimited network of sales and distribution at its fingertips. It will literally be possible to start a company tomorrow and next week do business in Japan and Germany and Chile, all without leaving your home, something that used to take years and years and years to do. In this way, the Internet can be and should be a truly empowering force for large- and small-business people alike.

But today, we know electronic commerce carries also a number of significant risks that could block the extraordinary growth and progress from taking place. There are almost no international agreements or understanding about electronic commerce. Many of the most basic consumer and copyright protections are missing from cyberspace. In many ways, electronic commerce is like the Wild West of the global economy. Our task is to make sure that it's safe and stable terrain for those who wish to trade on it. And we must do so by working with

other nations now, while electronic commerce is still in its infancy.

To meet this challenge, I'm pleased to announce the release of our new "Framework for Global Electronic Commerce," a report that lays out principles we will advocate as we seek to establish basic rules for international electronic commerce with minimal regulations and no new discriminatory taxes. Because the Internet has such explosive potential for prosperity, it should be a global free-trade zone. It should be a place where Government makes every effort first, as the Vice President said, not to stand in the way, to do no harm. We want to encourage the private sector to regulate itself as much as possible. We want to encourage all nations to refrain from imposing discriminatory taxes, tariffs, unnecessary regulations, cumbersome bureaucracies on electronic commerce. Where Government involvement is necessary, its aim should be to support a predictable, consistent, legal environment for trade and commerce to flourish on fair and understandable terms. And we should do our best to revise any existing laws or rules that could inhibit electronic commerce. We want to put these principles into practice by January 1st of the year 2000.

Today I am taking three specific actions toward that goal and asking the Vice President to oversee our progress in meeting it.

First, I'm directing all Federal department and agency heads to review their policies that affect global electronic commerce and to make sure that they are consistent with the five core principles of this report.

Second, I'm directing members of my Cabinet to work to achieve some of our key objectives within the next year. I'm directing the Treasury Secretary, Bob Rubin, to negotiate agreements where necessary to prevent new discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce. I'm directing our Ambassador of Trade, Charlene Barshefsky, to work within the WTO, the World Trade Organization, to turn the Internet into a free-trade zone within the next 12 months, building on the progress of our landmark information technology agreement and our global telecommunications agreement, which eliminated tariffs and reduced trade barriers on more than one trillion dollars in products and services. I'm directing Commerce Secretary Daley to work to establish basic consumer and copyright protections for the Internet, to help to create the predictable legal environment for electronic commerce that we need, and to coordinate our outreach to the private sector on a strategy to achieve this. I'm also directing the relevant agencies to work with Congress, industry, and law enforcement to make sure Americans can conduct their affairs in a secure electronic environment that will maintain their full trust and confidence. Next week, Secretary Daley and Ira Magaziner will lead a delegation to Europe to present our vision for electronic commerce to our European trading partners.

Third, I call on the private sector to help us meet one of the greatest challenges of electronic commerce, ensuring that we develop effective methods of protecting the privacy of every American, especially children who use the Internet. Many of you have already begun working with Chairman Pitofsky and Commissioner Varney at the Federal Trade Commission on this issue. I urge you to continue that work and to find new ways to safeguard our most basic rights and liberties so that we can trade and learn and communicate in safety and security.

Finally, it is especially important, as I said last week, to give parents and teachers the tools they need to make the Internet safe for children. A hands-off approach to electronic commerce must not mean indifference when it comes to raising and protecting children. I ask the industry leaders here today to join with us in developing a solution for the Internet as powerful for the computer as the V-chip will be for television, to protect children in ways that are consistent with the first amendment.

Later this month, I will convene a meeting with industry leaders and groups representing Internet users, teachers, parents, and librarians to help parents protect their children from objectionable content in cyberspace. Today we act to ensure that international trade on the Internet remains free of new discriminatory taxes, free of tariffs, free from burdensome regulations, and safe from piracy.

In the 21st century, we can build much of our prosperity on innovations in cyberspace in ways that most of us cannot even imagine. This vision contemplates an America in which every American, consumers, small-business people, corporate CEO's, will be able to extend our trade to the farthest reaches of the planet. If we do the right things now, in the right way, we can lead our economy into an area where our innovation, our flexibility, and our creativity

yield tremendous benefits for all of our people, in which we can keep opportunity alive, bring our people closer to each other, and bring America closer to the world. I feel very hopeful about this, and I assure you that we will do our part to implement the principles we advocate today.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:08 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Louis Gerstner, chairman and chief executive officer, IBM; Macdara MacColl, managing director, Parent Soup; Vinton G. Cerf, senior vice president for Internet architecture and engineering, MCI; Robert E. Kahn, founder, Corporation for National Research Initiatives; Tim Berners-Lee, director, World Wide Web Consortium; and David A. Duke, retired senior vice president of research/development and engineering, Corning, Inc.

Statement on the Proclamation Implementing the Information Technology Agreement

July 1, 1997

As I unveil our electronic commerce initiative, I am also pleased to announce that I signed a proclamation that today implements the information technology agreement concluded at the World Trade Organization in Geneva in March. This historic trade agreement will cut to zero tariffs on a vast array of computers, semiconductors, and telecommunications technology by the year 2000. Trade in these goods covers more than $500 billion in global trade. These products are the essential building blocks of the information superhighway. Combined with the entrepreneurial spirit of people here and throughout the world, they will drive electronic commerce and communication in the 21st century.

Every year, we sell $100 billion in information technology that supports almost 2 million jobs in the United States. Eliminating tariffs on these goods will amount to a $5 billion cut in tariffs on American products exported to other nations. For example, in India and Thailand tariffs on computers are 8 times higher than in the United States. These tariffs will be eliminated, allowing American products to compete on a more level playing field.

America leads the world in information technology. This agreement will create extraordinary new opportunities for American business and workers, so the American people can reap the rewards of the global economy as we enter the new century.

NOTE: The proclamation of June 30 to implement the World Trade Organization Ministerial Declaration on Trade in Information Technology Products was published in the *Federal Register* on July 2.

Memorandum on Electronic Commerce

July 1, 1997

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Electronic Commerce

The invention of the steam engine two centuries ago and the subsequent harnessing of electricity for communications ushered in an industrial revolution that fundamentally altered the way we work, brought the world's people closer together in time and space, changed the way we organize our economies, and brought us greater prosperity.

Today, we are on the verge of another revolution. Inventions like the integrated circuit, the computer, fiber optic cable, and the Internet

are changing the way we work, learn, and communicate with each other.

Students and teachers can have immediate access to the world's information from their classrooms; doctors can administer diagnoses to patients in remote parts of the globe from their offices; and citizens of many nations are finding additional outlets for personal and political expression.

As the Internet empowers citizens and democratizes societies, it is also changing the way business is conducted: entrepreneurs are able to start new businesses more easily by accessing the Internet's worldwide network of customers; world trade involving computer software, entertainment products, information services, professional consulting, financial services, education businesses, medical diagnostics, advertising, and technical services is increasing rapidly as the Internet dramatically lower costs and facilitates new types of commercial transactions; engineers, product developers, and managers thousands of miles apart can collaborate to design and manufacture new products more efficiently; businesses can work more efficiently with their suppliers and customers; consumers have greater choice and can shop in their homes for a wide variety of products from manufacturers and retailers all over the world, and they will be able to view these products on their computers or televisions, access information about the products, and order and pay for their choices, all from their living rooms.

According to several estimates, commerce on the Internet will total tens of billions of dollars by the turn of the century and could expand rapidly after that, helping fuel economic growth well into the 21st century.

For this potential to be realized, governments must adopt a market-oriented approach to electronic commerce, one that facilitates the emergence of a global, transparent, and predictable environment to support business and commerce.

Government officials must respect the unique nature of the medium and recognize that widespread competition and increased consumer choice should be the defining features of the new digital marketplace.

Many businesses and consumers are still wary of conducting extensive business over the Internet because of the lack of a predictable legal environment governing transactions. This is particularly true for international commercial activity where concerns about enforcement of contracts, liability, intellectual property protection, privacy, security, and other matters have caused businesses and consumers to be cautious.

Many companies and Internet users are also concerned that domestic or foreign governments will impose extensive regulations on the Internet and electronic commerce including taxes and tariffs, restrictions on the type of information transmitted, control over standards development, licensing requirements, and extensive regulation of Internet service providers. Indeed, signs of these types of commerce-inhibiting actions already are appearing in many nations.

Governments can have a profound effect on the growth of electronic commerce. By their actions, they can facilitate electronic trade or inhibit it. Knowing when to act and—at least as important—when not to act, will be crucial to the development of electronic commerce.

Today I have approved and released a report—"A Framework For Global Electronic Commerce"—outlining the principles that will guide my Administration's actions as we move forward into the new electronic age of commerce. This report articulates my Administration's vision for the emerging digital marketplace by declaring a set of principles, presenting a series of policies, and establishing an agenda for international discussions and agreements to facilitate the growth of electronic commerce. I expect all executive departments and agencies to review carefully the principles in this framework and implement appropriate policies.

Accordingly, I am hereby directing that executive department and agency heads should be guided in any future actions they take related to electronic commerce by the following principles:

— For electronic commerce to flourish, the private sector must lead. Therefore, the Federal Government should encourage industry self-regulation wherever appropriate and support private sector efforts to develop technology and practices that facilitate the growth and success of the Internet.

— Parties should be able to enter into legitimate agreements to buy and sell products and services across the Internet with minimal government involvement or intervention. Therefore, the Federal Government

should refrain from imposing new and unnecessary regulations, bureaucratic procedures, or taxes and tariffs on commercial activities that take place on the Internet.

— In some areas, government involvement may prove necessary to facilitate electronic commerce and protect consumers. Where governmental involvement is necessary, its aim should be to support and enforce a predictable, consistent, and simple legal environment for commerce.

— The Federal Government should recognize the unique qualities of the Internet including its decentralized nature and its tradition of bottom-up governance. Existing laws and regulations that may hinder electronic commerce should be revised or eliminated consistent with the unique nature of the Internet.

— The Internet is emerging as a global marketplace. The legal framework supporting commercial transactions on the Internet should be governed by consistent principles across State, national, and international borders that lead to predictable results regardless of the jurisdiction in which a particular buyer or seller resides.

I also direct the relevant agencies as identified in "A Framework For Global Electronic Commerce" to pursue the following policies:

1. I direct the U.S. Trade Representative to work with foreign governments to secure agreement within the next 12 months that all products and services delivered across the Internet will not be subject to tariffs and that all equipment from which the Internet is built will also not be subject to tariffs.
2. I direct the U.S. Trade Representative to work with foreign governments to enforce existing agreements and secure new agreements to make electronic commerce a seamless global marketplace. This will include enforcing provisions of the recently concluded World Trade Organization (WTO) Telecommunications Services Agreement; ensuring that product testing, certification, and approval processes do not unnecessarily restrict trade; ensuring that service providers have nondiscriminatory access to customers worldwide; and other measures that ensure a free flow of commerce.
3. I direct the Secretary of Commerce to seek the protection of copyright in the digital environment by working to achieve ratification in the United States and overseas within the next 12 months of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty.
4. I direct the Secretary of Commerce to update and make more efficient our system for protecting patentable innovations to meet the needs of the fast-moving electronic age and to seek agreements with other governments to protect patentable innovations worldwide.
5. I direct the Secretary of Commerce to support efforts to make the governance of the domain name system private and competitive and to create a contractually based self-regulatory regime that deals with potential conflicts between domain name usage and trademark laws on a global basis.
6. I direct the Secretary of the Treasury to work with State and local governments and with foreign governments to achieve agreements that will ensure that no new taxes are imposed that discriminate against Internet commerce; that existing taxes should be applied in ways that avoid inconsistent national tax jurisdictions and double taxation; and that tax systems treat economically similar transactions equally, regardless of whether such transactions occur through electronic means or through more conventional channels of commerce.
7. I direct the Secretary of Commerce to work with the private sector, State and local governments, and foreign governments to support the development, both domestically and internationally, of a uniform commercial legal framework that recognizes, facilitates, and enforces electronic transactions worldwide. I further direct the Secretary of Commerce within the next 12 months to seek to gain agreement with the private sector, State and local governments, and foreign governments, both domestically and internationally, on common

approaches for authentication of electronic transactions through technologies such as digital signatures.

8. I direct the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to encourage private industry and privacy advocacy groups to develop and adopt within the next 12 months effective codes of conduct, industry developed rules, and technological solutions to protect privacy on the Internet consistent with the Privacy Principles issued by the Information Infrastructure Task Force (IITF) Privacy Working Group. I further direct the Director of the OMB to develop recommendations on the appropriate role of government consistent with "A Framework for Global Electronic Commerce." I further direct the Secretary and the Director to ensure that means are developed to protect the privacy of children.
9. I direct the Secretary of Commerce to encourage the development and adoption within the next 12 months by industry of easy to use and effective rating systems and filtering technologies that empower parents, teachers, and other Internet users to block content that is inappropriate for children.
10. I direct the Secretary of Commerce to support private sector development of technical standards for the Internet and the U.S. Trade Representative to oppose efforts by foreign governments to impose standards or to use standards for electronic commerce as non-tariff trade barriers.
11. I direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cooperate with foreign governments to monitor newly developing experiments in electronic payment systems; to oppose attempts by governments to establish inflexible and highly prescriptive regulations and rules that might inhibit the development of new systems for electronic payment; and as electronic payment systems develop, to work closely with the private sector in order to keep apprised about policy development and ensure that governmental activities flexibly accommodate the needs of the emerging marketplace.
12. I direct all executive departments and agencies to promote efforts domestically and internationally to make the Internet a secure environment for commerce. This includes ensuring secure and reliable telecommunications networks; ensuring an effective means for protecting the information systems attached to those networks; ensuring an effective means for authenticating and guaranteeing confidentiality of electronic information to protect data from unauthorized use; and providing information so that Internet users become well-trained and understand how to protect their systems and their data.
13. I direct the Administrator of General Services to move the Federal Government into the age of electronic commerce by expanding "GSA Advantage," its online shopping service for the Federal community to cover four million items by 12 months from now.

I am asking the Vice President to lead an interagency group coordinating the U.S. Government's electronic commerce strategy. Further, I am directing that executive department and agency heads report back to the Vice President and me through this interagency group every 6 months on their progress in meeting the terms of this directive.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Message to Internet Users on Electronic Commerce
July 1, 1997

I have today approved and released a report—"A Framework for Global Electronic Commerce"—setting out my Administration's vision of the emerging electronic market-place and outlining the principles that will guide the U.S. Government's actions as we move forward into the new electronic age of commerce. The report also suggests an agenda for international discussions and agreements to facilitate the growth of electronic commerce.

The invention of the steam engine two centuries ago and the harnessing of electricity ushered in an industrial revolution that fundamentally altered the way we work, brought the world's people closer together in space and time, and brought us greater prosperity. Today, the invention of the integrated circuit and computer and the harnessing of light for communications have made possible the creation of the global Internet and an electronic revolution that will once again transform our lives.

One of the most significant uses of the Internet is in the world of commerce. Already it is possible to buy books and clothing, to obtain business advice, to purchase everything from gardening tools to high-tech telecommunications equipment over the Internet. This is just the beginning. Trade and commerce on the Internet are doubling or tripling every year—and in just a few years will be generating hundreds of billions of dollars in sales of goods and services. If we establish an environment in which electronic commerce can grow and flourish, then every computer can be a window open to every business, large and small, everywhere in the world.

Governments can have a profound effect on the growth of electronic commerce. By their actions, they can facilitate electronic trade or inhibit it. Government officials should respect the unique nature of the medium and recognize that widespread competition and increased consumer choice should be the defining features of the new digital marketplace. They should adopt a market-oriented approach to electronic commerce that facilitates the emergence of a global, transparent, and predictable legal environment to support business and commerce.

The report I released today raises a number of important issues that must be addressed by governments worldwide as this electronic marketplace emerges. I have had it added to the White House home-page on the World Wide Web (www.whitehouse.gov). I call upon all Internet users—both in government and in the private sector—to join me in seeking global consensus and, where necessary, agreements on the issues raised in our report by December 31, 1999, so that we may enter the new millennium ready to reap the benefits of the emerging electronic age of commerce.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: The President's message appeared on the White House Home Page under What's New: Framework for Electronic Commerce. An original was not available for verification of the content of this message.

Remarks on Behalf of the Public Service Campaign for Educational Excellence in Baltimore, Maryland

July 2, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Bud Selig, Peter Angelos, Jim Hunter. To Norm Augustine, the chairman of Lockheed Martin and our Educational Excellence Partnership, and to Cal Ripken, who is the very embodiment of excellence.

Ladies and gentlemen, excellence in baseball requires teamwork, hard work, and setting high standards of excellence. So does excellence in education. The Educational Excellence Partnership, including all-star athletes, businesses, Governors, and teachers, are pitching in to help our children aim high. The young people here behind me from the Boys and Girls Clubs of America embody the kind of future we're trying to build for them.

I want to thank all of you out there who have worked hard to set high standards, not only for your own children but for the other children in your community. I want to thank Cal and Kelly Ripken for the outstanding contribution they are making to literacy here in Baltimore. And I want to urge all of you to rededicate yourselves to the idea that every one of our children can learn, and we will not get into the 21st century with the future we want for them until we expect every one of them to learn and we give them the ability, the tools, and the support they need to learn.

We are very fortunate that outstanding Major League Baseball players, along with business leaders like Norm Augustine, have supported this public service campaign for educational excellence. I want you to watch these ads now, and I hope you will heed them. I hope you will support my call for national standards of excellence in reading and math and go back home and think about what you can do to make sure that every one of our children is as devoted to excellence in education as the baseball players we'll enjoy watching today from the Phillies and the Orioles are to excellence in their sport.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE. The President spoke at 3:01 p.m. at home plate in Oriole Park at Camden Yards. In his remarks, he referred to Bud Selig, acting commissioner of baseball; Peter Angelos, owner, Baltimore Orioles; Jim Hunter, WBAL Radio sportscaster; and Orioles player Cal Ripken, Jr., and his wife, Kelly. Following the President's remarks, those in attendance viewed the public service announcements on educational excellence, featuring prominent baseball players.

Message on the Observance of Independence Day, 1997

July 2, 1997

I am pleased to join my fellow Americans across the nation and around the world in celebrating Independence Day.

Looking back across two centuries, we still marvel at the courage and vision of our nation's founders. With clear eyes and staunch hearts, they fashioned a new form of government for our new country, a government that honors human dignity and protects individual rights. They devised a democracy strong enough to endure through the ages, yet flexible enough to meet new challenges and achieve new dreams. And in doing so, they made America a beacon of hope for generations of people around the world who cherish liberty and justice.

We have much to celebrate on this Independence Day. The journey our nation began more than 220 years ago has brought us to a time of peace and prosperity, a time of unprecedented opportunity to realize the full potential of all our citizens. As heirs to the freedom and equality bequeathed to us in the Declaration of Independence, it is now our responsibility—and our privilege—to build on that legacy and to ensure that America's promise holds true for all our people.

As we join with family and friends to commemorate another Fourth of July, let us resolve to make America a land where prejudice and discrimination have no place; to recognize that the values and ideals we share are more powerful and enduring than any force that would divide us; and to enter the twenty-first century as the "more perfect Union" first envisioned by our founders two centuries ago.

Hillary joins me in extending best wishes for a wonderful Fourth of July celebration.

BILL CLINTON

Statement on the Death of James Stewart

July 2, 1997

America lost a national treasure today. Jimmy Stewart was a great actor, a gentleman, and a patriot. We will always remember his rich career of great performances that spanned several decades and entertained generations of Americans.

Like all Americans, Hillary and I will miss him greatly, but his works live on, and for that we can all be grateful.

Interview With European Television Journalists
July 3, 1997

NATO Expansion

Q. Mr. President, thank you for having us and granting this interview with this group of European television stations. The Summit of Madrid marks the first expansion of the NATO to the Eastern European countries. Mr. President, it is perceived by the public opinion in Europe that the United States limits this expansion. It is perhaps a misperception from Europe?

The President. First of all, let me say that the expansion itself is historic, and we should not minimize it. Of course, Spain was the last new member of NATO, and that was an historic thing as well. But to expand NATO in a way that enables us to move closer to our goal of a united, democratic Europe for the first time in history is very important.

I don't want to limit NATO expansion; I want to leave the door open to all democracies that would like to be a part of it. But keep in mind, NATO is not simply a political alliance. It is primarily a military alliance, and we've done a lot of work to try to adapt NATO to the security challenges of the 21st century, to the Bosnias, if you will, rather than to the cold war.

So it seems to us, after having consulted with all of our allies and after having looked at the capacity of those that would like to become members, that the three members from Central Europe, Poland and Hungary and the Czech Republic, are clearly ready to assume the responsibilities of NATO membership and ready to integrate militarily with NATO. That does not mean that the door should not remain wide open to others and that we shouldn't make every effort over the next couple of years to do what it takes to help others qualify for NATO membership.

I don't want to exclude anyone, but I think it quite important on principle that we not admit anyone until we're absolutely sure that their democracy is stable and that they are militarily capable. And this is just a difference of opinion. Some of the NATO members agree with us; some would prefer four; some would prefer five.

Q. But, Mr. President, does that mean that when you go to Madrid, in effect your mind is made up, and those who disagree in the alliance will have to join your view?

The President. NATO has always made decisions by consensus. For example, suppose we were for five and the British were for three—alone. In order to achieve a consensus, since that's the only way we can proceed, three would still prevail. In other words, it's not because it's America; it's because we have to reach a consensus.

But we have spent a lot of time with this. I've personally visited with President Chirac about it. I've personally talked with Chancellor Kohl about it. I've personally talked with President Aznar and with Tony Blair about it and many other European leaders. I had a long talk with Prime Minister Prodi about it. Then Madeleine Albright went to Sintra in Portugal and talked to all of the people about it before we announced a public position, and I have spent a long time with our military leaders talking about it. And others had announced their position before ours, so I don't foresee any circumstances under which I would change my position that today we ought to have three.

But keep in mind, my position also is—and some of the members don't agree with this—that we should leave the door open, that we should have a review, we should take another look at it in 1999, and even at 1999 we should keep the door open. That is, I see NATO as a way of continuing the process of European integration, which I have supported. I have supported the European Union; I have supported the independent security unit, the ESDI within NATO, which is something that's been important to France and others. I want to see Europe integrated and strong and secure. So I'm looking forward to other meetings like Madrid. I don't think this will be the last one by a long shot.

France

Q. Mr. President, NATO is a bone of contention between you, President Chirac, and his Socialist Prime Minister Jospin. Concretely, why do you refuse the French, but any other European countries, to have the command of the South NATO flank? And I would like to add, is the communist presence inside the French Government a problem in the NATO context?

The President. Oh, no. First of all, I hope that France will become integrated into the military structure of NATO, and I hope that Spain will be as well, and I think we're quite close with Spain. And I hope that both will be.

Secondly, I believe that more command positions should be open to Europeans, and I have supported that. That is—so, in the adaptation of NATO internally, the United States has favored the integration of France and Spain into the military command structure, has favored an independent European security defense initiative within NATO, and has favored more command positions going to French and to European officers.

The particular command, the AFSOUTH Command, is—the real problem there for us right now is that right now, the AFSOUTH Command is essentially command of the 6th Fleet of the United States Navy. And except for, and maybe even including—I'd have to check the numbers—our presence in South Korea, it's the biggest single deployment of United States military assets anywhere. So if we were to divide the AFSOUTH Command, it wouldn't, from our point of view, be a sensible thing to do militarily because that's essentially the central asset of AFSOUTH.

We have offered to revisit this—even that position with the French in a few years, because it may be that we decide to change the composition of what makes up AFSOUTH. But in terms of the command structure, we believe the Europeans should have more command positions. We believe the French should if they come in. And we hope that we can resume these discussions and work this out.

Q. And the communists, no problem?

The President. No. Look, France is a democracy, and they elected a new leadership for the Parliament, and that's up to the government. As long as the Government of France is a great democracy, standing for freedom and participating, I don't have a problem. The French people should make their own decisions over that; the United States shouldn't make a judgment about that.

Germany

Q. Mr. President, one could say that the main beneficiary of the new security structure in Europe is Germany. Our country is not a front line state anymore; the Bundeswehr, which has been trained and equipped to fight a war on its own territory, defining the Eastern flank of NATO, won't have to do that anymore. So when the new, the next Gulf crisis, Somalia crisis, Bosnia crisis come about, what would America expect from Germany to take over in terms of burden from the Americans?

The President. I don't know that I would expect them to take over anything from the Americans, but I would make two points. One and most importantly is that the Germans are in a position to be partners with us now because of decisions which have been made by your supreme judicial body, and because of the vision of Chancellor Kohl—we are in a position to be partners in Bosnia, for example—that the Germans can participate and are not only trusted but relied upon to participate in cooperative security challenges beyond the German borders. That's the first thing.

The second thing I would say is that the Germans have supported the French and others in being for a European security defense capacity where Europe can act alone without the United States and Canada in appropriate circumstances within NATO as part of our adaptation.

So that's what I would expect, if you will. I think that there will be continuing partnership, and now we'll be able to worry not about the eastern border of Germany but about the stability of all of Europe, and we'll be able to do that together now.

Q. But it will also mean an increased military role, probably.

The President. It could, but it may not require an increased military budget. That is, all of our militaries are doing different things. On the budget, let me say—this is one other point I should make—there are costs for Europeans and costs for Americans in expanding NATO, and it's important, therefore, to make a good military decision because you have to justify the costs to the public. That's why it can't simply be about politics, because we have to—we're all obliged to do certain things to keep the military able to work with one another; the term of art is "interoperability." So that's another thing we have to consider.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, I think it would be interesting to know how you did convince President Yeltsin three instead of five. Is it the price that you paid to get yes from Mr. Yeltsin?

The President. I wouldn't say that, but I think that it's important to note that we made an agreement with President Yeltsin to have an agreement between NATO and Russia that would make it crystal clear that NATO is no longer an organization designed to contain Russia; NATO is an organization designed to work with all free countries to respect the territorial integrity of its members, to protect the security of its members, and to work with its members and their allies, Russia, soon to be Ukraine, and those in the Partnership For Peace, on common security problems like the problem in Bosnia.

I think the great contribution Boris Yeltsin has made to the integration of Europe is his willingness to say, Russia is not going to define its greatness in terms of territorial domination, Russia will define its greatness in terms of the achievements of its people and its partnerships with other countries. That was the contribution, that's what he did, and he deserves a lot of credit for that.

Now, should we expand NATO in a way that is at least aware of the nationalist elements in Russia, the people that don't feel the same way? Of course we should. Should we be sensitive to that? Of course we should. But I think as NATO and Russia continue to work in partnership as we have in Bosnia, the continued expansion of NATO will not be seen as a threat to the Russian people but will be seen as something that reinforces our partnership and therefore makes the Russian people more secure.

Q. You decided for a slow start?

The President. No. The main reason I decided this is I really believe that these three countries are the only three countries right now that can start tomorrow and within a reasonable time meet the same standard of membership militarily that the other NATO countries met.

We have to remember, this alliance is the most successful alliance in history because it's had military as well as political integrity. But these other nations, I believe, that are either developing their economies and their military capacity, are stabilizing their democracies, should all be considered for future NATO membership. And the irony of this is, right now a lot of the European countries say five, and I say three, but over the long run we may find the United States in favor of considering more countries than a majority of Europeans would be. If that happens, the Europeans will prevail.

Spain

Q. Mr. President, the government of Madrid wants to remain in the chain of command of NATO. Is Spain's petition to maintain under its control of the Canary Island territory acceptable for the United States?

The President. I think the Spanish position is certainly understandable, and it's my understanding that Spain is at least close to being satisfied with the discussions that have been held. The position the United States has taken on this is that the military experts should resolve this, that only Spain can decide whether its concerns about sovereignty and leadership have been satisfied. But for all of the rest of the countries, what we should do is to make this a military decision and see if we can resolve the issue with Spain in a way that is consistent with the way NATO should operate. And they're working very hard on it, and I hope and believe they will resolve it soon.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. On another security matter, Mr. President, you've nurtured the peace process in Northern Ireland personally, but things are looking very ominous, coming up to this weekend with the scheduled Loyalist march in Drumcree. Are you pessimistic that a collision cannot be avoided?

The President. No, I'm not pessimistic, but frankly, the ball is in the IRA's court right now in terms of declaring a cease-fire, and then there is also a ball in the court of the Protestant Loyalists and whether they will continue to exercise restraint.

But let me say, to me the most hopeful thing is that we've got this meeting, I believe, today between Prime Minister Blair and Mr. Ahern, the new Irish Prime Minister. There has been sort of a reaffirmation of the position of the British and Irish Governments about how decommissioning should operate in a fashion parallel with the peace talks. And so I think that the British and Irish Governments are right on track and doing what should be done, and the Irish people should be heartened by the new leadership in both countries, reaffirming the peace process and trying to invigorate it.

But the truth is that in order to get all the parties involved and do it without bloodshed, the IRA will have to renounce violence and reinstitute the cease-fire. The United States had

been very forward-leaning. We've tried to involve Sinn Fein; we've tried to reach out, as you know. But two young men were brutally murdered in what is clearly an assassination recently in Ireland. That is unacceptable, you know; we can't do that. The Irish people want the peace process, the British and the Irish Governments want the peace process, and the IRA ought to give it a chance to work.

Q. But would you favor the Loyalists calling off their march, postponing things?

The President. I think that is a matter best left to the people of Northern Ireland and to the British and Irish Governments. I have tried to be very disciplined in the role the United States has played in this, and I just don't think that's a matter on which I should express a view at this moment. Let's see what Prime Minister Blair and Prime Minister Ahern say after their meeting today.

What I would favor is that they do nothing to try to provoke violence. I think—you know, these marches are a regular thing. If it happens, there are marches and there are marches; we all know that. So I hope that we can—whatever happens, it won't be an occasion for further violence.

France

Q. Mr. President, going back to the French, President Chirac and the Socialist government are often quoted, and it's true—as criticizing the—what they call, I quote, "the arrogance of the U.S. superpower which wants to rule the world politically and economically," and they add that they criticize the United States for wanting to oust France of Africa. What do you answer to this double accusation from the French authorities when they talk to the French press or that got quoted in the American media, too?

The President. The one on Africa is a new one on me, but the other two—I've heard people say things like that. I've read it in the press with regard to economic issues and with regard to NATO. First of all, let me restate what I said. I don't know whether we would be where we are in Bosnia today if it hadn't been for the leadership of President Chirac and the French. The United States and the French—there have been words in the press for decades now, but the truth is that when the chips are down, we're almost always allies.

Jacques Chirac supported NATO expansion when some European leaders didn't. He was instrumental in getting the agreement with Russia. He was instrumental in forging our common position in Bosnia. All I can say is, I don't want America to dictate to Europe; I want—I have supported European integration. When other Americans were afraid of it, I said—because Europe would be bigger than the United States then—I said, "No, we want a democratic, free, strong, united Europe, and the next 100 years will be different than the last 100. Let it go. We have to work together." So that's the first thing.

On economics, we have been very fortunate in the United States in being able to discipline our spending, invest in our people, and create a lot of jobs. But we have problems here, too. We have—a lot higher percentage of our children are poor than in France or Germany and other countries. We don't have the kind of health care and child care supports that you provide to your working families.

So the challenge that we all face, I think, is more a common challenge: How are we going to create jobs, raise incomes, and hold the social compact together in a global economy? We just happen to be in different places in meeting the challenges.

In Africa, let me say I'm very grateful for what the French and we have done together to help each other's citizens get out of harm's way in African countries in trouble. We have offered an initiative on Africa because we've been repeatedly challenged to do more, and we think there should be aid, and I don't think we've given enough aid to Africa. The French have said that we haven't, and they're right. But we think we can do more to expand trade as well. So I hope we'll be working with France on that.

I do not want to push France out of Africa. I want to lift Africa up. And if we would lift Africa up, the fact that the French were there, caring about Africa all along, will only redound to France's benefit.

Europe-U.S. Relations and NATO Expansion

Q. Mr. President, in line with what the French colleague just said, there is—especially I feel it after Denver—a growing feeling in Europe that America leans toward something like grandstanding or patronizing toward Europe. And then when it comes time to make sacrifices,

like in firm commitments to reduce greenhouse gases or to make compromises like in extending NATO and not risking a rift within NATO over the question of these two countries who will join in addition to the three who are not, America says, this is what our interest is and pushes through. Do you feel that there is a little imbalance in the transatlantic relationship?

The President. First of all—let's deal with the two things separately. I do not think that's a fair characterization of what happened when we had the Summit of the Eight in Denver. Before the other leaders arrived, I gave one speech in Colorado in which I said, 7 years ago when the other countries met in the United States, Europe criticized America, 7 years ago, for dragging down economic growth in the world because our budget deficit was so high, for taking money away from worthy investments in Europe and in other places in the world by having high interest rates in America to finance our deficit. And we have changed that. So now we can't be criticized by our friends in the Summit of the Eight, because we have changed that and we're better off than we were then.

But I said in the same speech, we still have a lot of problems at home and we have no cause for arrogance, and I outlined what those problems were. When I met with the other leaders, I said clearly we've been fortunate; we've created a lot of new jobs. The British also have now created a lot of new jobs. But what happens in this global economy is, as you create more new jobs, the more open the economies are, you have more difficulty in avoiding greater inequality among your people.

So the trick is how to preserve the social compact and create jobs. This is a problem we share together; that's what I said. And anybody who was there in those private meetings will say that. So I simply don't think that's fair.

Now, in NATO, let me say again—I want to say two things. Number one, a lot of the members of NATO have told me they do not favor five, that they understand that politically it's good to say——

Q. Though quietly——

The President. ——that there are five, but quietly they say, "We know that you're right, that this is the right thing to do." Not all of them—I don't want to be—the Italians and the French and others clearly want five. Some would favor four; I think Chancellor Kohl is genuinely open to that. But there is more difference of opinion within Europe than you might think.

But the most important thing is not that. The most important thing is, if we were for five and France was for three, if that were the case, then the French position would prevail because three is a smaller number than five, and we have to do that. This is not an American win; this has nothing to do with me. I am trying to keep NATO's integrity intact from the military point of view, and that's what I want to do.

Do I believe that we should consider expanding to the south when next we meet in '99? I certainly do. I certainly do. Do I think that Romania and Slovenia could be strong candidates? Yes. Do I think that we should exclude the Baltics? No. Would it be a good thing if Austria were interested in coming in? Might Bulgaria be ready in the future? Yes.

So I think that—this is not—this doesn't have to be done in a day. Keep in mind, 3½ years ago when I proposed this, it was a revolutionary idea. Now we're talking about how many and when. So I'm not trying to impose this. I'm just trying to do what I think is best for the military alliance, and it just happened that we strongly believe that if you look at the conditions of membership, that these three clearly meet those conditions, and no one else does now.

But I am for—I am very sympathetic with the French and the Italian position that we have to consider moving to the south, and I'm sympathetic and interested in the new interest in Bulgaria and in Austria, and the Baltics are moving very—forward. We shouldn't tell anyone they can't be part of it. But if you look at it, everyone agrees that at least three should be in, and that's what we ought to do. We always go to what everybody agrees on.

Baltic States

Q. May I ask about the Baltic States because you mentioned them three times? Nobody is as desperate to get in psychologically as the Baltics, and nowhere are the Russians as adamant as in the Baltics not to let them in. Will they come away from Madrid with something more than a vague promise, "We will consider you in the future"?

The President. Well, that's not just a vague promise. Keep in mind, the Baltics are in the Partnership For Peace. Let's not overlook that. That has been—I think one reason we have

so many people wanting to be in NATO now is that the Partnership For Peace has been so successful. It is not an insignificant thing. The Euro-Atlantic alliance that we have with these Partnership For Peace countries will continue to be strengthened.

And I think what we plan to do is to offer to work with the other European countries to try to—to set the stage for what we will do 2 years from now, and also to keep going into the future, to keep integrating these Partnership For Peace countries more and more and more into the military and other operations of NATO. So I think the Baltics should feel reassured by that.

I worked very hard, you know, to work with President Yeltsin to get the Russian troops out of the Baltics, to keep them on the path of reform and democracy, and they've done very well. So I think they should be considered in the future like everyone else, and we should make that clear.

Slovenia and Romania

Q. Mr. President, you said that the Italians definitely want five. Don't you think——

The President. Well, they certainly want Slovenia. I think they would favor five; they would take four.

Q. Romania—isn't the reason of this, isn't that the real threats are there coming from the south, no more from the east?

The President. Absolutely. Well, we certainly hope that, yes.

Q. And, sir, don't you think that Romania and Slovenia will guarantee more stability in the crucial area of the Balkans?

The President. Yes, I do think that. My problem with Romania and Slovenia is I believe, compared to the other three countries, we can't say that they are clearly ready now to assume NATO membership. Let's take Romania. There's a terrific case you can make for Romania—it's the second biggest country in Central Europe. I mean it has—it's very large, and it has a lot of people, strategically located, and the people want to be in NATO. But they've been on this path now for a little less than a year. The countries that are getting in have already been through ups and downs in their economy, in their political systems. They've had elections. They've really been through all the tensions that happen when you move from communism to freedom.

The Romanians have done an amazing job in a few months. They have resolved their differences with Hungary on the border. They've got two Hungarians in the Cabinet. It is an amazing thing. But it has still been less than a year. So my position is, give them a couple of years to stabilize their democracy, to develop their economy, and then let's take a look at it.

Would it be better if, going into the 21st century, we had a NATO that had more membership in the southern flank to deal with those problem areas that are just beyond our borders? Of course, it would. Do we have a good chance to get there? Yes, we do. That doesn't mean that we should do it now because people might feel bad if they don't get in, because I think what we have to do is have a mature relationship with all these countries and keep working with them to get them ready—to get them ready.

I hope that eventually we will have many more countries in NATO and a much closer relationship with the countries beyond our borders that choose not to seek membership, like Russia.

President's Visit to Spain

Q. Mr. President, you will have a brief stay in Palma de Mallorca, together with——

The President. Yes. I'm very excited.

Q. ——the royal family of Spain. What do you expect to discover in the Mediterranean Sea?

The President. Beauty, mystery. [*Laughter*] Rest. [*Laughter*] I'm very much looking forward to it. The King and the Queen have been very kind and gracious to Hillary and to me and to Chelsea for as long as we've been here, and they were kind enough to come down and be there when we're there. And we're looking forward to it. I've never been there, and I'm very excited.

Q. Mr. President, thank you very much. Enjoy Spain.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 11:23 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany; President of the Government Jose Maria Aznar of Spain; Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom; Prime Minister Lionel Jospin of France; Prime Minister

Bertie Ahern of Ireland; and King Juan Carlos I and Queen Sofia of Spain. A portion of this interview could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Interview With David Gollust of the Voice of America
July 3, 1997

NATO Expansion

Q. Mr. President, thanks for giving us your time today as you prepare for the Madrid Summit.

The administration has made it clear that it's prepared to accept only Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in the first round of NATO expansion, but several of our allies, and maybe even a majority in NATO, have said that they would also like to see Romania and Slovenia in that initial round. Since NATO decisions are taken by consensus, we have an effective veto over a broader expansion, but there's been criticism in Europe that we're being a bit heavy-handed, maybe the bigfoot approach to handling NATO affairs. Do you accept that?

The President. No. We consulted extensively with all of our allies. Secretary Albright went to Sintra in Portugal and said what our thoughts were and listened to their thoughts before we announced our position. I personally talked with President Chirac and Chancellor Kohl and Prime Minister Blair and others about this. We would like to see NATO continue to expand. We believe NATO would be well served by having more members on its southern flank. But we believe that these three countries are the only three that are clearly ready now, in terms of the stability of their democracy and their capacity to fulfill the military requirements of membership.

Keep in mind, this is—NATO—there is a political component to this decision, and there should be, but NATO is also, first and foremost, a security alliance. And anybody who gets in as a full member must be able to meet the requirements of membership. Moreover, there are costs to be paid by the NATO members themselves that are significant to integrate new members because we have to operate in more countries. And for all these reasons, on the merits, the United States strongly believes that we should start with three.

Now, let me also back up and just go through a little history here. In January of '94, when we recommended that NATO expand—and I did that in a speech in Belgium—there was some controversy about it among the Europeans. Not all the Europeans thought it was a good idea. But eventually they came around. Interestingly enough, the French were strongly in favor of expansion, and we have been together on that.

Now, what I think is important to do is to see this as an ongoing process so that—let's just take Romania, for example, a very important country, the second largest country in Central and Eastern Europe. Would it be a good thing if Romania were in NATO? Of course, it would be. Is it a good thing that Romania has chosen democracy and has resolved its problems with Hungary and now has two Hungarians in the Romanian Cabinet? Yes, it is. This is a process that's been going on slightly less than a year.

So I think to say—we love what the Romanians are doing; we applaud it. We want them to be a part of our shared future, and the door is still open to them in a very aggressive way. That's the message we want to get out there, it seems to me, and that we will continue to work with them to see whether they can sustain this for another couple of years.

Q. Are you going to be able to offer Romania, Slovenia, some of the other countries that will not be allowed in on the first round anything more than consolation? I mean, will there be any kind of specific information given about a timetable or modalities?

The President. Well, what I would hope is that all the allies would agree that we will take another look at this in 1999. As we complete the integration of the first members into NATO, we will take another look and see if we shouldn't take some more members in then. But in addition to that, let's not forget one thing: There

is something that has already happened to increase their stability. The agreement with Russia increases their security and, even more important, their involvement in the Partnership For Peace, which is now going to be folded into this Euro-Atlantic alliance. That's a big deal for all these countries. That has been the great untold and underappreciated story of NATO, the fact that we put together this Partnership For Peace. There are two dozen countries in it. We do joint military exercises. They're involved with us in Bosnia. This is a huge deal.

So these countries are going to continue to become more secure and more involved with NATO, no matter what happens, if they're getting a clear signal, too, that this is not the last decision on membership and that it is not the last decision for a long time, that within 2 years we're going to take another look at this.

Russia

Q. You've said many times that NATO expansion is not a process that's directed against Russia. But a number of countries that were formerly part of the Soviet Union, for instance, the Baltic States, are very concerned that at some point Russia might return to totalitarianism and empire building at some point. Are the concerns that they have, the Baltic States, for instance, valid on this? And can you or will you do anything to put them at ease?

The President. Well again, we have tried to put them at ease in two ways. One is with their involvement in the Partnership For Peace, and the second is with the clear understanding that the door to membership would remain open on a long-term basis. And let me make a third point. The third is, when we made the agreement with Russia—the partnership with Russia is a clear signal that at least as long as this government is there and that President is there, they are not going to define their greatness in terms of their territorial dominance. Keep in mind, it was President Yeltsin that worked with us to withdraw the troops from the Baltics. So they got their—the Russian troops have left the Baltics in the tenure of my service here.

So I think time is on our side, that we can't resolve all issues today but we are moving in the right direction and we have to let a little time pass on some of these issues. And they'll settle down and resolve themselves, I think, in a positive way. Could something bad happen to change the direction? Of course, it could happen. Is it likely? I don't think so.

Senate Approval of NATO Expansion

Q. After the Madrid Summit is over, of course, I think the focus will shift back here domestically to the Senate, which will have to approve the extension of U.S. defense commitments to new NATO countries. How difficult a process will this be? Are the American people prepared to accept U.S. commitments to defend Warsaw, for instance, as they have done to, say, Paris and London?

The President. Well, I hope they will be. And I think we can prevail on that because it's not just Warsaw; keep in mind you have—I mean, not just Paris and London. We have other smaller countries in NATO right now. Iceland is a member of NATO.

So I think when you point out that no NATO country has ever been attacked, it makes it clear that actually the expansion of NATO reduces the likelihood of Americans having to go to war. It reduces the likelihood of Americans having to fight and die and also broadens the burdens of those who will help us in places like Bosnia. So for all those reasons, I think that we can persuade the American people and the United States Senate to do this.

I also think, frankly, as a practical matter, it will be a little easier to make the case for three rather than five. And if the three work well and the costs are as we expect them to be, modest and affordable, I think it will make it a lot easier to sell in a couple of years if we are in a position where we can come back and argue to expand some more.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, on Bosnia—of course, this was an issue at Denver a couple of weeks ago; it's going to be on the agenda again in Madrid—you have got a few days less than a year now to the planned withdrawal of the NATO-led peacekeepers, and there are reports that within the administration there is disagreement about the ideal of pulling out in the middle of next year. Is it worth keeping the withdrawal date if it means that Bosnia might lurch back to bloodshed?

The President. I think it's important that we keep the date in mind at the end of this mission, because this mission, just like the one before it, can't go on forever. And I think—right now,

I think it's better for us not to speculate about what happens after that. What I'm concerned about is that there is all this rather frenetic looking at what happens next June, to the exclusion of looking at what happens today and tomorrow. That is, we wouldn't even have to worry about this if every day between now and next year everyone involved gave a 100 percent effort to implementing the Dayton peace accords, to doing the economic reconstruction, to setting up the common institutions, to resolving the police and the local election issues, to dealing with the war crimes issues.

And what the United States has tried to do is to get our allies there to focus on implementing Dayton in an aggressive way. And one of the things that came out of the Summit of the Eight was that each of the countries expressed some interest in being given, in effect, almost primary responsibility for each separate element of the Dayton accords.

Then, as we get along toward the end of year, we could take another look and see whether—what's the security situation going to be next June, and how can we best take care of it? But I don't think that this particular mission at this level should continue. We cannot occupy this country forever.

Q. Could we conceivably leave with the very prominent war crimes suspects still at large?

The President. Well, we had a good arrest last week. And I think that the problem, of course, with Dayton was—and this was an inevitable problem, but we were a part of it so we have to take responsibility—is that there was this agreement to set up a tribunal or to support the work of the tribunal with the explicit understanding that the work of then IFOR and its successor, SFOR, would not be used to go and do, in effect, police or military work to get these people, that they would only pick them up if they came in contact with them in the ordinary course of their business, which meant that Dayton left a gap. There was no, in effect, police group charged with the duty to go arrest the war criminals. And so we're trying to figure out how we can accelerate that process consistent with the other obligations the parties assumed at Dayton. That was a big hole in Dayton.

But even with that, that's still not an excuse for why the development aid is taking so long to get out. You know, are we supporting the local elections in every way we can? Have we all done everything we can to set up local police units that can maintain security? Are we doing everything we can to press disarmament instead of having an arms race of equality, which is not in anyone's interest?

We do have an agreement in the parties now to set up common institutions. Are they going to be set up quickly enough so that the benefits of them will be felt by the Serbs and the Croats and the Muslims in time to keep them moving together and going together? I mean, these people butchered each other for 4 years; you've got to work real hard to give them common interest to live together and work together.

And there is a difference in not going back to war, which I don't think any of them really want to do—the ordinary people, I mean—and having a vested interest in continuing to pursue the peace. We've done a good job, I think, of getting them to the point where they don't want to go back to the way it was. We have to do more to get them to try to build a better peace.

Q. Thanks again for your time, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 12:23 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to President Jacques Chirac of France; Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany; Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom; and President Boris Yeltsin of Russia.

Remarks at a NATO Summit Sendoff by American Veterans

July 3, 1997

Thank you very much. I know a good doctor. United States Navy. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Vice President, Commander Frank, Colonel Harmon, Secretary Albright, Secretary Cohen, Ambassador Richardson, Mr. Berger,

General Shalikashvili and General Ralston and members of the Joint Chiefs; to the distinguished veterans and community leaders here, especially to Judge Waters. You know, when he told that horse story, I nearly fell out of my chair. [*Laughter*] But you didn't know what I was thinking. [*Laughter*] I was thinking, there have been several days here in the last 4½ years when I would be grateful just to have been called what that doctor called him. [*Laughter*]

Before I begin, I would like to state what I hope is obvious now, but I've never said it formally, and that is that I intend to nominate Deputy Secretary Gober to be the next Secretary of Veterans Affairs. We have been friends for many years. He did a superb job as the State director of veterans affairs in our home State. He was a good partner and support to Jesse Brown, who fulfilled his promise to me to be a Secretary for as well as a Secretary of Veterans Affairs. And I believe that Hershel will serve in that great tradition, and I thank him for agreeing to do so.

Tomorrow, as the Vice President said, we will commemorate Independence Day and the Declaration of Independence, which I recommend everyone read every Independence Day. The words still ring out of our abiding belief in the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

And we have a lot to celebrate on this July 4th. We are at peace. We are more prosperous than we have been in a generation, our liberty more secure than ever. And for the first time throughout the world—for the first time in our time, there are more people living under governments of their own choosing than are living under dictatorships. That is an astonishing thing, that the dream of our Founding Fathers, articulated so powerfully 221 years ago tomorrow, has now come within the reach of more than half the people on the globe.

Next week we will take a historic step to secure that freedom for more people than ever before, at home and abroad, when we invite new democracies from Central Europe to join our alliance at the NATO Summit in Madrid. I thank those who have spoken before me for their support. Together with our efforts to build NATO's ties to Russia and to Ukraine, and through the Partnership For Peace with so many other of Europe's democracies, we're working to create a continent of Europe that is undivided, democratic, and at peace for the first time since nation-states appeared on that continent.

Our Nation has labored and sacrificed for this goal for more than five decades now, and now it is within reach. So in Europe next week we'll have the chance to strengthen the values we all hold dear: freedom, democracy, security. Our work in Madrid will be a capstone of our Nation's leadership throughout the 20th century and a cornerstone for a new age of possibility in the 21st century.

I saw in one of the papers today a poll that said that only 6 percent of the American people felt that they followed events in NATO closely and thought they knew a lot about it. In a way, that is a stunning tribute to the success of NATO, for no NATO member has ever been attacked. If it had not been so, a lot more people would know about NATO.

Now the time has come for us to make sure more Americans understand the significance of NATO to our security, understand the role it can play in the future, and understand why it is profoundly in the interest of the American people to go forward with this expansion. And all the people on this stage today and all of you in this room today have helped to make a significant contribution to that work. But I hope when you leave here, you will continue to speak about it to your friends and neighbors, to the members of your organizations, to the people with whom you come in contact.

There are four reasons why NATO enlargement is consistent with our values and supports our interests. First, it will make our alliance stronger and better able to address the challenges to Europe's security. As has already been said, if we haven't learned a single, solitary other lesson from the 20th century, surely we have learned that our future and Europe's are inevitably intertwined.

A NATO that embraces Europe's new democracies will be more capable of carrying out its missions, defending the territory of its members, addressing conflicts that threaten our common peace. The Czechs and Poles served beside American soldiers in the Gulf war. Already, the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, Romania, the Baltic States, and many other Central European countries that seek to join NATO are contributing troops to our NATO peacekeeping mission in Bosnia.

Indeed, we could not have deployed our troops to Bosnia as smoothly and swiftly as we did without the critical help of Hungary and our staging ground at Taszar, which I had the privilege to visit shortly after it was established. By bringing new and capable democracies into NATO and deepening our cooperation with others who are not members at this time but are part of our Partnership For Peace, we build a stronger alliance for all future challenges to transatlantic security.

Second, enlarging NATO will plainly help to secure the gains of democracy in Europe. NATO can do for Europe's east what it did for Europe's west after World War II, provide the kind of climate necessary for freedom and prosperity to survive and to grow and flourish.

Third, enlarging NATO clearly will encourage prospective members to resolve their differences peacefully, and that will reduce the chances of further conflicts in Europe. Already, the very prospect of NATO membership has helped to convince countries in Central Europe to improve ties with their neighbors, to settle border and ethnic disputes, any one of which could have led to a conflict in a different time and under different circumstances.

Finally, enlarging NATO will erase the artificial line in Europe drawn by Stalin at the end of World War II. And NATO will now help Europe to come together in security, not be kept apart in instability. NATO's doors will remain open to all those willing to shoulder the responsibilities of membership so that we do not replace an old division in Europe with a new one. And this is also critically important. The decision the NATO allies will make in Madrid must not be a one-time decision.

Today let me again say I thank the American Legion for its support. As the largest American veterans organization, many of your members fought to liberate Europe or to defend freedom there during the cold war. And you know that this makes it less likely that future generations will be called to fight and die in Europe.

I thank the Reserve Officer Association. Your endorsement speaks clearly to the American people because it is you who could be called out of your civilian lives to make good on our commitments. And you have recognized that enlargement will make us safer and stronger.

There are those who say the Central European nations who will be invited to join NATO are not ready to stand shoulder to shoulder with us. But with all respect, they are wrong. The nations we are considering for membership share our values and our aspirations. They have shown that time and again. They also have the capacity to do what is required of NATO members.

As you have heard today, in 1944, in the weeks after D-Day, American and allied troops in Normandy sought to encircle 20 of Hitler's finest divisions, and some of the fiercest fighting of the war resulted. Our forces raced to seal the final gap between them and to prevent the enemy from escaping into the French countryside. Two units got the job done, one an American infantry division, the other a Polish armored division, survivors of the invasion of their land who joined forces with the Allies.

That gap was closed when the Poles finally linked up with the U.S. 90th Infantry at Chambois. The first American they encountered was the man who introduced me today, Captain Laughlin Waters. Now, once the pocket was shut there was another furious battle as the Panzers tried to break out. The Polish First Armored Division held a critical hilltop against a wave of counterattacks. When the Poles ran out of antitank rounds, they moved forward and repelled the enemy with only their rifles and their courage. After the battle of Falaise Gap, 325 Polish soldiers were buried near where they fell. By these graves in the heart of Western Europe, Allied soldiers raised a simple sign of tribute which said in English, "A Polish Battlefield."

Judge Waters, your presence here today, 53 years later, reminds us of the character of those we are about to add to NATO, of the values and interests I talked about before. They remind us of our own freedom, democracy, and security. They, too, have fought and died for freedom and democracy, for ours as well as their own. They have fought and died for the freedom and democracy we celebrate tomorrow. Our ties, therefore, have been forged in blood. And just as they were strong allies in World War II, they will be again.

So, Judge Waters, just as you and your men closed the Falaise Gap at Chambois, we must now close another gap, the gap of hope that has divided Europe since the end of World War II. We must give Europe a chance to live free and undivided for the first time ever. That is what we will do next week and in the months and years ahead, as we continue to work with

Europe's democracies, strengthen NATO, and adapt it to the missions of the 21st century.

Your presence here today has made our success much more likely, and therefore, you will have something else to celebrate tomorrow on our Independence Day.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:29 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Joseph J. Frank, national commander, American Legion; Herb Harmon, president, Reserve Officers Association of the United States; and Laughlin Edward Waters, Senior Judge, U.S. District Court for the Central District of California.

Statement on the Resignation of Ambassador Molly Raiser as Chief of Protocol

July 3, 1997

It is with great sadness that I accepted today Ambassador Molly Raiser's resignation as Chief of Protocol, effective July 24. But it is with even greater thanks and pride that I look back upon her years of service and the extraordinary job she has done to ensure effective American engagement in the world.

No one knows better than Ambassador Raiser the amount of planning and the attention to detail that goes into our Nation's foreign policy. And no one has done more to make the conduct of that policy professional, precise, and smooth. From the war-torn streets of Sarajevo to Denver's gleaming city center, Ambassador Raiser brought elegance and energy to the business of foreign affairs and set a standard for all who worked with her. She made foreign guests feel welcome when they visited the United States and helped me feel at home whenever I traveled abroad. She represented me and the interests of our Nation with insight, judgment, and grace.

I extend Ambassador Raiser my warmest thanks for a job well done, and wish her every possible success in all her future endeavors.

Statement on the Landing of the *Mars Pathfinder* Spacecraft

July 4, 1997

On this important day, the American people celebrate another exciting milestone in our Nation's long heritage of progress, discovery, and exploration: the first landing on the surface of Mars in over 20 years.

Our return to Mars today marks the beginning of a new era in the Nation's space exploration program. The *Mars Pathfinder* is the first of a series of probes we are sending to Mars over the next decade. The information we gather on our neighbor planet will help us better understand our own world and perhaps provide further clues on the origins of our solar system. This mission also underscores our new way of doing business at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). We were able to accomplish this mission in one-third the time and at a fraction of the cost of the first *Viking* mission to Mars.

I congratulate the *Mars Pathfinder* team at NASA and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory for their pioneering vision and spirit in accomplishing this remarkable feat. Their success in developing the *Pathfinder* mission is a testament to the ingenuity and can-do attitude of the American people.

The President's Radio Address
July 5, 1997

Good morning. We come together this weekend to celebrate Independence Day, our 221 years of freedom, and the fundamental values that unite us as one America: All of us should have an equal chance to succeed, and all of us have the same obligation to work hard, to be law-abiding citizens, to give something back to our community, to earn in our generation the freedom our Founders established.

These are the values that have guided our efforts to end welfare as we know it. Today I want to talk to you about the progress we have made over the last 4½ years, the changes now underway, and what we must do—all of us—to make sure that welfare reform honors those values, too.

For 4½ years, my administration has been committed to putting an end to the old welfare system that trapped too many families in a cycle of despair. Working with the States, we first launched welfare reform experiments in 43 States that emphasize work and personal responsibility.

Then last summer, I signed historic legislation that revolutionized welfare into a system that supports families and children but demands work from those who are able to perform it. It was a dramatic step, but we knew the time was right to put an end to a system that was broken beyond repair. As of July 1st, just a few days ago, welfare reform has taken effect in all 50 States. This week the old welfare system came to an end. Now a new system based on work is taking its place. This system demands responsibility, but not only from the people who are now required to work but also from every American.

We knew last August that the new welfare reform law was not a guarantee but a bold experiment. So far, it's working. I'm pleased to announce that today there are 3 million fewer people on welfare than there were the day I took office, a remarkable 1.2 million fewer since I signed welfare reform into law. This is the largest decrease in the welfare rolls in history, giving us the lowest percentage of our population on welfare since 1970.

We have begun to put an end to the culture of dependency and to elevate our values of family, work, and responsibility. But we have only begun. Now we must continue to work together to meet our goal of moving a million more people from welfare to work by the year 2000.

Since I took office, the economy has added 12½ million new jobs, and many economists believe we will continue to produce the jobs we need to meet our challenge. But even so, it won't be easy because many of the people who remain on welfare have never worked before; still others live in poor communities without enough jobs. So if we expect people to work, we need to make sure there's work for them to go to. And we need to make sure that those with no previous work experience, without present connections to mainstream America, get both the preparation and the support they need to succeed.

The National Government will do its part. First, the balanced budget agreement we reached with Congress in May provides $3 billion to create jobs to move people from welfare to work. I secured a commitment from congressional leaders to give private employers tax incentives to hire long-term welfare recipients as well. And I believe that every one of those new workers should earn at least the minimum wage and receive the protections of existing employment laws that other workers enjoy.

Second, we must help welfare recipients get to the new jobs, which often are outside their neighborhoods. That's why I recently proposed legislation providing $600 million to help States and local communities devise transportation strategies to move people from welfare to work.

Third, we must make sure that mothers who must now go to work have good child care and adequate health care for their children. That's why I made sure that the welfare reform bill added $4 billion more in child care assistance and why I fought for the balanced budget agreement to extend health care coverage to millions more uninsured children.

States must also do their part. Many States are already working to reduce caseloads and free resources to put even more people to work. For example, Wisconsin and Florida are significantly increasing their investments in child care. In Oregon, they're providing health care and

transportation support and subsidizing jobs with money that used to pay for welfare checks.

Today I challenge every State to take the money they save from lowering their caseloads and use it—for child care, for transportation, to subsidize the training and wage help that people need to move from welfare to work.

As much as the National and State Governments can do to move people from welfare to work, we know the vast majority of the jobs must be created by the private business. The most lasting way to bring people on welfare into the mainstream of American life is with a solid job in the private sector.

So, to every businessperson who has ever criticized the old system, I say, that system is gone; it's now up to you to help make the new system work. Already, businesses of all sizes have joined in a national welfare-to-work partnership, committed to hiring welfare recipients and to recruiting other employers to join them. I've committed the Federal Government to hire 10,000 welfare recipients over the next 4 years. If you have a business and can hire just one, it will be a great citizen service.

This Independence Day, all Americans should be very happy that 3 million of our fellow citizens are now off welfare rolls. If we can provide another million jobs, then we'll have about 3 million more workers and their children who can celebrate their own independence day by the turn of the century.

So as we celebrate our Nation's past and the values that unite us, let us look forward to the future and let us redouble our determination to give more and more of our fellow citizens their own personal independence day.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 2:25 p.m. on July 3 in the Oval Office at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 5.

Remarks Following a Meeting With Members of Congress and the National Security Team and an Exchange With Reporters in Madrid, Spain

July 7, 1997

NATO Expansion

The President. Let me begin by saying that I and the leaders of my administration team here have just finished a very important meeting with the congressional delegation. We are here in Madrid on an historic mission, to fashion a new NATO for a new Europe that is undivided for the first time in history, for a new century. And that new NATO will include new members, new missions, and new ties to countries, including the very important one we concluded last month with Russia and the one we will solidify here with Ukraine.

For the United States to do its part, the Congress is obviously key for several reasons: First, any attempt to expand NATO to admit new members must be ratified by the Congress; secondly, while we expect the costs to be modest, it is not a free decision because of the costs of integrating new countries into the military planning and operations of NATO; and third, because we believe that the policy itself requires that we keep an open door to the prospect of other democracies coming in, and that is something that clearly would have to be supported by the Congress.

The Members have made it clear to me that while we have representatives here from both Chambers and both parties, indicating that the United States understands that it's important that we be united on the question of Europe, we have a ways to go to convince the American people of the momentous importance of the decisions we're making here and the need for them to support it. And that is a job that I intend to take on when I go home, and I look forward to having the support of as many Members as possible for fulfilling it.

But the fact that this delegation, from both parties and both Chambers of Congress, is here is very important. And the leader of the delegation, Senator Roth, who has been very active in these matters for years, will also address the summit, and I am very grateful for that.

Senator, would you like to say anything?

Senator Roth. Well, thank you, Mr. President. This is indeed a historic moment, and the reason I say it's an historic moment is that here we

are, sitting together, Republicans and Democrats, urging the expansion of NATO.

And why expand NATO now? The reason for doing that is peace and security. We want to fill a vacuum in Eastern Europe. We want to give Eastern, Central Europe the same opportunity we helped give Western Europe, to democratize and reform for freedom. And I think that the fact that we're here together in a bipartisan spirit shows the importance of the matter. And the fact is that a undivided Europe, democratic, is the best chance for peace in our time.

The President. Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, are you convinced that you will take in only three members instead of five, despite the opposition?

The President. I believe that the decision—the consensus decision will be for three, but I hope and believe that there will be a clear message that the door to NATO remains open. I know that there is support for Romania and for Slovenia, and I believe that they could well be strong candidates for future admission. And I think there are other nations that might be as well. I think it's important that we not look at Europe as a three- or a five-nation operation, that this is the beginning of a process that I think will go on.

Let me also emphasize that there are a lot of other nations that have been part of our Partnership For Peace. We are explicitly creating a political arm of that partnership, if you will, in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. That has succeeded beyond anybody's estimation. When the United States first proposed that, frankly, to be candid, even we thought—we never dreamed there would be that much interest in it, that so many countries would participate, and that it would work as well as it has. I think that one of the reasons you have so many people in Bosnia today, so many countries, is because of the way the Partnership For Peace has worked.

So we are moving Europe's democracies closer and closer together, and we'll continue to do it. And I don't think that the difference of opinion we've had over how many to let in now should obscure the overwhelming unanimity of the fact that NATO should expand, should take on new missions, and should maintain new alliances with Russia, with Ukraine, and with the members of the Partnership For Peace.

Q. Mr. President, is there anything you've heard from this congressional delegation that causes you any concern about the U.S. Congress going along with this? Or is there anything that troubles you as far as them giving their approval?

The President. Well, what they've done is they've just reminded me that we've got to sell Congress on two things, and the two things are bound together. One is, Congress would have to agree to ratify an amendment to the NATO treaty putting in new members. And the second is that we would have to agree to pay our portion of the cost of integrating those new members. And they pointed out to me, in no uncertain terms, that we've got a sales job to do, but we think we can do it.

Q. Mr. President, the Russians have said that if former Soviet Republics are admitted to NATO, they will have to reexamine their relationship with the alliance, a clear message that they would oppose the Baltic States being admitted. Will this summit, do you believe, send a clear message that when we say the door is open, it also includes Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia?

The President. My position is that no European democracy should be excluded from ultimate consideration. And I have said that—I believe—my personal position is that should apply to Russia as well, that any democratic country in Europe prepared to make NATO's commitments—which includes recognizing the territorial integrity of every other democracy in Europe and every member of NATO and recognizing our mutual responsibility for one another's security—that anyone should be considered. That's always been the United States position, and that is mine. And I think it's the—I believe that's the position of every Republican and Democrat in this room. I believe it is.

Q. Is there no chance that you will change your mind on three versus five?

The President. My view on three versus five is based on the simple fact that NATO is a military as well as a political organization and we have to be quite disciplined in making judgments about who should come into the membership in terms of the obligations that they have to assume and their capacity to do it. I am very enthusiastic about the developments that have taken place in Romania and Slovenia recently. I think the fact that they've resolved territorial difficulties, that the Romanians have taken two Hungarians into the government and

the Cabinet, these things are extremely laudatory. I'm glad they want to be in NATO, and I think that they should get consideration. I just don't think at this time that they should be admitted. That's what I believe. And I think there are a lot of other countries who feel that. But we have to reach a consensus decision, and that's where I think—I hope and believe that's where we'll come out.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:43 p.m. at the Miguel Angel Hotel.

Remarks Following Discussions With President of the Government Jose Maria Aznar of Spain and an Exchange With Reporters in Madrid
July 7, 1997

President Aznar. President Clinton and his family, at the invitation of Their Majesty, the King and Queen of Spain, have spent a few days in Mallorca. I hope they have been good days in Mallorca, a mini-holiday. I had the opportunity to join them yesterday, again at the invitation of His Majesty, the King. I think I was meant to torture President Clinton's holiday for a few moments, and we discussed at length a number of issues.

It is my pleasure to officially welcome President Clinton and his delegation to Madrid. We have just had a meeting, a continuation of yesterday's conversations, and the meeting was of tremendous interest. We talked about the summit which begins tomorrow in Madrid. I hope that this will represent a decisive contribution to security and peace in the world. We hope that is the case, and it will be if we engage in a constructive spirit, the spirit which presides the Atlantic alliance.

Advances have been made in the negotiations for the internal reform of the alliance, and we have all made efforts to secure the necessary consensus on enlargement of the Atlantic alliance. Sufficient elements are in place so that the summit which begins tomorrow can be the point of departure for improving the security and cooperation in the Atlantic alliance. And we hope that conversations can conclude soon on internal reform for the security and defense of Europe, proceed with enlargement and to sign the historic agreement between the Ukraine and Russia and Atlantic alliance.

I've spoken to President Clinton. I told him that Spain hopes to achieve considerable advances during this summit, bearing in mind Spain's Parliament decision on the referendum on NATO. And we hope to join the military command of NATO once the command is fully defined and our interests are safeguarded. President Clinton knows that Spain is deeply interested in having a positive outcome to this situation.

We discussed bilaterally issues of common interest to us in other parts of the world. Our bilateral relations are excellent, I must say, relations between the United States and Spain. We already had an opportunity to talk a couple of months ago in Washington, and I hope that these conversations and this visit are a good example of how to engage in permanent and fruitful dialog between the United States and Spain.

Thank you very much. And I give the floor to the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton.

President Clinton. Thank you very much. Mr. Prime Minister, it is wonderful to be back in Spain. And let me thank you again, along with the King and the Queen and the people of Spain, for the very warm hospitality that my family and I have experienced in Mallorca. And it is great to be back in Madrid and to be with you again. As you said, we had a very good visit in Washington in the springtime, and then we also saw each other in Paris when the NATO leaders met to forge our compact with Russia.

The NATO Summit that begins tomorrow is a milestone in our work to adapt NATO to a new Europe and a new century, so that it can meet new security challenges, open the door to new members, reach out to new partners. This new mission for NATO is designed to secure a Europe that is undivided, democratic, and at peace for the first time in history. And it is very appropriate that Spain should be the

host of this summit, because, after all, NATO last admitted a new member 15 years ago, and that new member was Spain.

When Spain joined NATO and the European Union, Spain strengthened both institutions and fortified its own newfound freedoms. Now it is one of democracy's staunchest friends and NATO's strongest leaders. And let me say to you, we welcome Spain's intention to take her full place in NATO's integrated military structure as we complete a new command structure.

This will also greatly strengthen the bonds of our alliance. It will greatly strengthen our alliance, and along with the steps that we will take over the next 2 days, I am sure we will promote a greater sharing of responsibility between America and Europe as we try to create an even stronger partnership with richer democracies for a new century.

Finally, Mr. Prime Minister, let me thank you again for hosting this summit and for the strong leadership you have shown in so many areas. I'm looking forward to the work ahead of us in the next couple of days and to the future we are trying to make together.

Thank you very much.

Elections in Mexico

Q. Thank you very much for being here, and welcome here in Spain. I'm a reporter from Televisa. Let me ask you this at least in Spanish, anyway, Mr. President. As you know, elections were held in Mexico yesterday. I'd like to know what your opinion and the Spanish Prime Minister's opinion is with respect to Mr. Cardenas' victory. To what extent do you think those elections might influence the relations between the United States and Mexico?

President Clinton. It's interesting you ask this question because we have just discussed it, and I believe that the Prime Minister is a step ahead of me. He's already called President Zedillo, and they've had a visit. But we support the elections, and we support the expression of popular will by the people of Mexico. The United States wants to be a good partner and a good friend. We share a long border. We share much common heritage. We have many of the same problems with the narcotics and many of the same opportunities with economic growth. And we believe that anything that adds to Mexico's strength as a democracy is good for our common future.

These elections, insofar as they gave the Mexican people an opportunity for the open, free expression of their will, are good for that relationship and good for the future. It doesn't matter how they came out. That was for the Mexican people to decide. And we applaud that.

President Aznar. I have already congratulated President Zedillo's election yesterday. I have already mentioned this to President Clinton. For us, it is a source of satisfaction that the political process in Mexico, in terms of quality, has taken a step forward after yesterday's elections. The elections were held in a very satisfactory way, and human rights were fully respected.

NATO Participation

Q. Mr. President, what do you think of the French deciding not to add to the military structure—their own troops and so forth, as the Spanish have done?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, the Spanish Government—and the leader who is here, he certainly can speak for himself, but Spain has said that they want to be a part of the integrated military structure, but there are certain specifics we have to work out. And Spain should, obviously, take a very aggressive view of its own interest in trying to work through those things. And I have encouraged all of our people to try to cooperate, to work it out in a way that is military defensible. That is, keep in mind, NATO is first and foremost a defense structure, and whatever we do has to make sense from a security point of view. But Spain is working through these issues. And I feel comfortable they will be worked through.

Now, with regard to France, at least in the United States, these issues are quite well known. We believe that there should be a new NATO command structure. We believe that more of the command positions should be given over to Europe and to everybody that is in the command structure, including France, should France decide to do that.

What we have said is that we do not believe that the United States should give up one single command—the command of AFSOUTH it's called—because that's where the United States 6th Fleet is. And except for the position of our troops in Germany and Japan and South Korea, the 6th Fleet is our biggest asset beyond our borders and the major asset of AFSOUTH. But beyond that, we believe the French, if they

join the military structure, should be involved in the command, and we want to support it.

So I hope as soon as the summit is over, NATO can resume negotiations with the French and by the end of the year, both Spain and France will be in the integrated command structure. They are very great countries; they should be in the command structure.

Q. What are the Spanish caveats to joining the military structure?

President Aznar. I am maintaining the Spanish Government's favorable position to conclude the process of integration in the military structure. That is our Government's agreement. It is the majority consensus of Spain's Parliament. We have already taken a number of steps in that direction. I think things are going very well as regards the prior work for concluding the new command structure.

Spain, needless to say, has its own interests that have to be safeguarded, but these have been covered, more or less, by a general framework. There are some technical problems that still have to be ironed out, but I think that with the impetus given by the Madrid Summit, between now and the end of the year, particularly in the month of December, I think we can take the definitive decision to join the full integrated military structure, with all the consequences that entails, as Spain, which wants to shoulder its responsibilities and a country which wants to be present at a very ideal moment in history to contribute with its assets to peace and cooperation in the world, in the Atlantic, and particularly in the areas of interest to Spain.

One last question, please. We are very pushed for time, I'm sorry.

Q. A lot has been made of the United States position accepting just three countries. If a further enlargement took place, does Spain think that Spain's interests have not been fulfilled? The three-country enlargement is—[*inaudible*]—if Spain has been prepared to negotiate further? Has Spain's position been strengthened within the Atlantic alliance?

This is a step forward—a specific question, please—if Spain does not join the full integrated military structure, will a new command structure—if it doesn't achieve a new command structure, will it be disappointed?

President Clinton. That's your question.

President Aznar. I'm convinced things will move along the lines I mentioned just a few moments ago. I think within a few months, Spain will be in the integrated military structure. That is in Spain's interest, in the Atlantic alliance's interest. I did say there were some technical difficulties that have to be ironed out, and they will be ironed out.

As regards enlargement, can I just say that we will make every effort to arrive at a consensus with regard to enlargement, and that consensus will ensure that the summit is a milestone, a success in terms of cooperation and security.

President Clinton. If I could just add to what Prime Minister Aznar said, we believe that the NATO doors should remain open. We do not believe we should close the doors on the aspirations of any democracy in Europe.

As regards Romania and Slovenia, we applaud the work they have done in embracing democracy and in showing a willingness to share the responsibilities of preserving the peace in the future and resolving border disputes and ethnic difficulties. These things are to be applauded. And we do not believe they should be told that they can never be in NATO or that it would be decades upon decades. We believe, however, that each particular decision that should be made should be based on the military as well as the political imperatives of assuming the responsibilities of membership.

But nothing the United States has said should be viewed in any way as a negative for the future prospects of either of these countries or others as well.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, do you expect the NATO Summit to change the rules of engagement for the SFOR troops in Bosnia to permit a more aggressive effort to capture war criminals? And a related question, is there a plan by—or have the CIA and Special Forces put together a plan that would lead to the apprehension of Mr. Karadzic?

President Clinton. I think the—you've asked me two questions, and I will give what I believe is an appropriate answer. The War Crimes Tribunal is a part of the Dayton agreement, and we believe everyone should support the Dayton agreement in all its parts, including that one. We have. And insofar as it's been free to operate, I think it has been a positive force. And I think it should continue to do so, and I believe we should support it in all ways that are appropriate. So that is what I would say about that.

I do not expect there to be a statement here explicitly dealing with the rules of engagement. I think we will have a statement about Bosnia which will make it clear that all of us believe—and we just had a discussion about this, and we discussed it before on Mallorca—we believe that we have to do more to implement every element of Dayton. I think a lot of us are impatient that perhaps even we have not done as much as we should have on all of the elements of Dayton.

Thank you.

NOTE: President Aznar, Spain's Prime Minister, spoke at 8:43 p.m. in the Residence at the Moncloa Palace. In his remarks, President Clinton referred to King Juan Carlos I and Queen Sofia of Spain and President Ernesto Zedillo of Mexico. Reporters referred to Mexico City Mayor-elect Cuauhtemoc Cardenas and Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks Prepared for Delivery to the North Atlantic Council in Madrid
July 8, 1997

Mr. Secretary General; Prime Minister Aznar; fellow leaders. First I would like to thank Prime Minister Aznar for his hospitality in hosting this important meeting. I am also very pleased to be joined in Madrid by leading Members of our Congress, from both Houses and both parties.

Three and a half years ago in Brussels, we began to construct a new NATO for a new Europe, taking on new missions and new partners. Part of that effort included changes in NATO's command structure. I want to confirm my belief that we will make the alliance stronger by continuing to develop the European Security and Defense Identity and giving Europe a greater role within NATO. By working toward a simplified, more efficient military command structure, we will be better able to meet the demands of new missions.

In this regard, I welcome Spain's intention to fully integrate into NATO's military command. And I truly hope that in the very near future France will join a reformed command structure on terms acceptable to France and consistent with the military effectiveness of the alliance.

With respect to enlargement, I believe we should make our alliance broader by inviting Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into NATO, for the following reasons. Over the past 7 years, these are the countries that have proved their readiness to join us at this table. While their work is still in progress, they have met the highest standards of democratic and market reform. They have now pursued those reforms long enough to give us confidence they are irreversible, just as our offer of NATO membership is irreversible. It is important to remember that fact when we make our decision. There is no precedent for removing or disinviting members from the alliance.

Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic have settled outstanding disputes with their neighbors. They have established civilian control of their armed forces and shown that they are prepared to meet the stiff military requirements NATO demands. I believe we can afford the cost to ourselves of adding these three countries to NATO's strength.

I also believe that these three countries' smooth and successful integration will create momentum for others to follow. Today, we must commit to keep the door of this alliance open to all those ready to meet the responsibilities of membership. I believe we should exclude no European democracy. There are other states that are close to being fully qualified to join. When they are ready and the time is right, I believe we should welcome them.

We should not discount the other steps that NATO is taking with its partners. Tomorrow we will hold the first summit-level meeting of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. I am sure that every one of us is happily surprised by just how successful the Partnership For Peace has been in enabling more than two dozen countries to work closely with NATO. The new Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council will

give these countries a forum for deeper consultations with the alliance and greater participation in decisionmaking for operations to which they contribute. The enhancement of the Partnership For Peace will also speed countries along the road to eligibility for NATO membership.

To conclude, Mr. Secretary General, our position is that we should decide today to admit three countries to the alliance. Since this is an irreversible step, we should offer membership to those countries that are irreversibly committed to democratic reforms, while keeping the door firmly open to the admission of other countries in the future.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 11 a.m. at the Juan Carlos Conference Center, but a transcript of his remarks was not available. This item follows the advance text released by the Office of the Press Secretary. In his remarks, the President referred to NATO Secretary General Javier Solana and President of the Government (Prime Minister) Jose Maria Aznar of Spain.

Memorandum on the John D. Dingell Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center

July 8, 1997

Memorandum for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs

Subject: John D. Dingell Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center

A veteran of World War II, a local prosecutor, and since 1955, representing the people of Michigan in the Congress, John D. Dingell has served his country and his State with distinction for over 50 years. Furthermore, throughout his career Congressman Dingell has championed both quality health care and veterans' rights. I therefore take great pleasure in honoring Congressman Dingell by naming the VA Medical Center in Detroit after him.

Thus, in recognition of Congressman Dingell's leadership and exemplary service to our country, I direct that the VA facility located at 4646 John R. in Detroit, Michigan, hereafter be known as the John D. Dingell Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center. You are directed to take such further actions as necessary to effect the naming of this facility for Congressman Dingell.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Remarks to the Community at the United States Embassy in Madrid

July 8, 1997

Thank you. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. I thank all of you for being here, for all the service that you have given either through this Embassy or through our NATO mission. Whether you are an American working for some branch of the United States Government or a foreign national who has contributed to our success here, we're very grateful to you.

And I thank those of you who have brought your children. I thank you for doing that because, after all, what we are celebrating today are actions taken to make the future of these children more secure, more rich, more full of promise, more dependent upon their own abilities and not the whims of some dictator who would seek to advance the cause of his or her power at the expense of their dreams. So I'm very, very glad to see all of you here today.

Let me begin by thanking our delegation. I thank Secretary Albright for bringing her personal life story and her vision into her work every day. I thank Secretary Cohen for his leadership at the Defense Department and for helping us to prove that our politics can still stop at the water's edge and we can work across party lines to do what's right for America.

I thank the members of this distinguished congressional delegation: the chairman of the delegation, Senator Roth, who spoke today on behalf of parliamentarians in all the NATO countries; Senator Biden, who had to leave; Senator Mikulski; Senator Smith; and Congressmen Gilman, Solomon, Gejdenson and Sisisky. I thank them for coming, Members of both parties in both Houses of Congress, proving that we are united on this issue.

Let me also say a special word of thanks to our distinguished Ambassador, Dick Gardner, for the fine job he has done here for the last 4 years. He and Danielle have done very well, and we will always be grateful for their service. I also thank them for their astonishing hospitality to me, to Hillary, to our family, and to many others who have come to Spain in search of peace and beauty—and just being happy tourists. We're very grateful to you for all that you've done.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Ambassador Hunter and the NATO mission for all they have done to make this a success. All of you know what happened today. We bridged a chasm in history and began a journey to a new Europe and a new century by inviting Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary to join NATO and making clear that the door is open for others to follow.

We have taken a giant stride in our efforts to create a Europe that is undivided, democratic, and at peace literally for the first time since the rise of the nation-state on the European Continent. There has never been a time when the entire continent was not divided, was democratic, and was at peace. All three conditions have never prevailed on this continent at the same time. We have a chance to make it so now. It's a result of hard work by all the members of the alliance. This is not an American achievement; this is a NATO achievement. Every country had its say. The statement we released today and the decision we made was a genuine consensus effort. And I am profoundly grateful to all of my fellow world leaders who are part of NATO.

I also would say to the people of Poland and Hungary and the Czech Republic, your heroism made this day possible. Through long years of darkness, you kept alive the hope of freedom. I still remember the Hungarian uprising of 1956, the Prague Spring of 1968, the Gdansk Shipyards in 1981. But we also appreciate the fact that when these three nations threw off the shackles of tyranny, they embraced democracy and tolerance. They devoted themselves to reforming their economies and their societies, to settling age-old disputes with their neighbors. They have done the hard work of freedom now for over 7 years, and they have proved that they are ready to share in the full responsibility of NATO membership.

They have also set an extraordinary example for the other new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe. From the northwest to the southeast corner of Europe, we see other countries now engaged in partnerships with us through the Partnership For Peace, also interested in being considered for NATO membership. These three nations have paved the way for others to follow. They have paved the way by showing that with a long-term commitment to strengthening democracy and reforming an economy, to settling ancient quarrels, a nation can become a full partner in that free, peaceful, undivided Europe. And I am very grateful.

We actually did three things here. First, we made NATO stronger by taking in new members and making clear that others will be allowed to come in the future. And we will continue to work to make sure we can meet the challenges of tomorrow. Second, we're working to adapt NATO internally to meet the new challenges of tomorrow, not the old ones of yesterday. And there will be more responsibility for Europeans in a separate security defense initiative. The third thing we're doing is reaching out to have more partners. You know we signed this historic agreement with Russia. Tomorrow there will be another historic signing with Ukraine. We have over two dozen countries in the Partnership For Peace that are working with us in Bosnia and in other ways, and they will be permitted to have a political arm through a partnership council that will give them a greater say over decisions that they will be expected to participate in.

This is a very great day, not only for Europe and the United States, not simply for NATO but, indeed, for the cause of freedom in the aftermath of the cold war. And every one of you who had anything to do with it, and every one of you who has a child with a big stake in it, should be very happy and very proud.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:05 p.m. at the Embassy. In his remarks, he referred to U.S. Ambassador to Spain Richard N. Gardner and his wife, Danielle; and U.S. Ambassador to NATO Robert E. Hunter.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Cyprus
July 8, 1997

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Chairman:)

In accordance with Public Law 95–384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous submission covered progress through March 31, 1997. The current submission covers the period April 1, 1997, through May 31, 1997.

During this reporting period, I was particularly pleased by the decisions taken by the Governments of Cyprus and Turkey to observe moratoriums on flights over Cyprus. In April, the Government of Cyprus announced that it would not invite Greek aircraft to overfly Cyprus during a joint military exercise in May. It also indicated no other overflights are planned at this time. Turkey, later, decided to refrain from overflying Cyprus as long as Greece does not. As I noted in my last letter to you, these actions should help lessen regional tensions and contribute to a proper climate for negotiations.

I was also encouraged by the effective action taken against extremists on both sides of the island when they attempted to disrupt a concert in May. The event proceeded without incident and the two communities mixed freely together in a very positive atmosphere.

Finally, although it did not occur during this reporting period, the appointment June 4 of Richard Holbrooke as my Special Presidential Emissary for Cyprus reflects our strong and continued commitment to promoting Cyprus reconciliation efforts. The Special Presidential Emissary will lead our Cyprus diplomacy and I will inform you of his activities in upcoming reports.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Jesse Helms, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 9.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Luxembourg-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty With Documentation
July 8, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Washington on March 13, 1997, and a related exchange of notes. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty is one of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties that the United States is negotiating in order to counter criminal activity more effectively. The Treaty should be an effective tool to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of modern criminals, including those involved in drug trafficking, terrorism, other violent crime, and money laundering, fiscal fraud, and other "white-collar" crime. The Treaty is self-executing.

The treaty provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance

available under the Treaty includes: taking testimony or statements of persons; providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; locating or identifying persons and items; serving documents; executing requests for searches and seizures; immobilizing assets; assisting in proceedings related to forfeiture and restitution; and rendering any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 8, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 9.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Luxembourg-United States Extradition Treaty With Documentation
July 8, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, signed at Washington on October 1, 1996.

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

The provisions in this Treaty follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States.

This Treaty will, upon entry into force, enhance cooperation between the law enforcement communities of both countries, and thereby make a significant contribution to international law enforcement efforts. It will supersede, with certain noted exceptions, the Extradition Treaty between the United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg signed at Berlin on October 29, 1883, and the Supplementary Extradition Convention between the United States and Luxembourg signed at Luxembourg on April 24, 1935.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 8, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 9.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Poland-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty With Documentation
July 8, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Republic of Poland on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Washington on July 10, 1996. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty is one of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties being negotiated by the United States in order to counter criminal activity more effectively. The Treaty should be

an effective tool to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of crimes, including "white-collar" crime and drug trafficking offenses. The Treaty is self-executing.

The Treaty provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaty includes: taking of testimony or statements of persons; providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; serving documents; locating or identifying persons or items; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; executing requests for searches and seizures; assisting in proceedings related to immobilization and forfeiture of assets, restitution to the victims of crime, and collection of fines; and any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 8, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 9.

Remarks at the Signing Ceremony for the NATO-Ukraine Charter in Madrid

July 9, 1997

Secretary General, fellow leaders, ladies and gentlemen: From the four quarters of our alliance, we have come to Madrid to build a new Europe, where old divides are bridged by new ties of friendship and cooperation, where we recognize no spheres of influence but instead the influence of shared ideals.

Today we take another step toward that new Europe with the signing of this charter between a new NATO and a democratic Ukraine. From the moment we declared this goal last fall, all have worked hard toward this day. I thank President Kuchma for his vision and courage in leading his great nation down the path of reform. I also thank Secretary General Solana for his efforts on behalf of our alliance.

This charter launches a closer relationship between NATO and Ukraine that will benefit both. It lays a foundation for consultation and cooperation. It welcomes Ukraine as our partner in building an undivided Europe.

Over the last 2 months, Ukraine's bold steps have made this continent more stable and more secure through its treaty of friendship and cooperation with Russia, its border agreement with Romania, its declaration of reconciliation with Poland. Now an open dialog and joint activities with NATO will help Ukraine solidify reform and strengthen stability throughout Europe.

This charter reflects and reinforces the way this continent has changed. Ukraine has emerged from a century of struggle to pursue the highest standards of dignity and freedom. It is tackling tough economic reform. It has been a leader in reducing the nuclear danger. It has embarked on a course of peaceful integration with the community of democracies. NATO also has evolved to meet these new times with new missions, new members, a stronger Partnership For Peace, and now new partners, with Russia and, of course, today with Ukraine.

Today, Europe's security is not a matter of competition but of cooperation on behalf of common goals. It is natural for Ukraine to reach out to NATO and for NATO to do the same, helping to secure Ukraine firmly in the heart of a new, undivided, democratic Europe.

May the charter we sign today be just the opening page in a long history of unity, partnership, and peace that NATO and Ukraine will write together.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:35 a.m. at the Palacio Municipal de Congresos. In his remarks, he referred to NATO Secretary General Javier Solana and President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of President of the Government Jose Maria Aznar of Spain, Secretary General Solana, and President Kuchma.

The President's News Conference in Madrid
July 9, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. Good afternoon. Ladies and gentlemen, I will try to abbreviate my opening statement and get right to the questions, because President Aznar has delayed his press conference so we could do this one first.

Let me begin by thanking the President, Mr. Aznar, the Government of Spain, and the people of Spain for a truly remarkable 2 days here in Madrid. I compliment his leadership. And also, since we are in Spain, I think I should especially say that I believe every leader of a NATO country considers the job that Secretary General Solana has done in managing this historic transformation to be truly remarkable. So the people of Spain have a great deal to be proud of in terms of their world leadership over the last 2 days.

This was a unique conference. There have been conferences of great powers in Europe many times before, but today, with our meeting of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, we had 44 nations, big and small, new democracies and established ones, meeting to chart a common future of freedom and security, not large powers riding the destiny of small ones without regard to the impact of their decisions on ordinary citizens but nations dismantling blocs of power, building lines of partnership and bridges to the future.

Many tongues were spoken at our table today, but the language was the same, the language of democracy and the pursuit of a common dream of a Europe undivided, free, and at peace. NATO is at the heart of that vision.

What happened here this week represents a lot of work over the last 3½ years. Yesterday we made NATO stronger and ready to meet challenges of a new century by further streamlining its command structure and giving Europe a greater security role within NATO. Then in an historic turning point, we extended invitations to new members for the first time since Spain joined NATO 15 years ago, and we opened the door to other members in the future. Today we strengthened our ties to NATO's partners for peace and continued to reach out to a new one with the agreement with Ukraine. Together with the historic NATO-Russia Founding Act in Paris this spring, we now see a new and broader and deeper alliance.

Let me say, as an American, I was very pleased to be joined by a bipartisan delegation of our Congress from both Houses and very pleased that Senator Roth was the spokesperson for the parliamentarians from all the NATO countries yesterday, supporting our expansion decisions.

Next year, I will ask the United States Senate to ratify changes to the treaty governing NATO so that we can bring in the new members by the 50th anniversary of NATO in 1999. I hope this week and the publicity it has received back home in America will help to stimulate discussion and debate among the American people about this historic decision. And I hope that when the American people hear the arguments, they, too, will strongly support the enlargement of NATO.

This is going to make all of us stronger and more secure. The new allies will help us to better defend the territory of members and reduce the chances that any of the territory will be violated. Bringing in new members will help to lock in the gains of democracy in those countries and the free-market gains they are already achieving. The example of these new members will help to encourage others to aspire to membership and to continue their democratic reforms and their efforts to settle disputes with their neighbors. Finally, it will help to erase the artificial line drawn across Europe by Stalin after World War II.

NATO enlargement, however, will not be cost- or risk-free. No important decision ever is. But for the American people, clearly the cost will be far less in lives and money to expand the bounds of democracy and security than it would be if we had to involve our people in another conflict in Europe.

Tomorrow I am going to Poland to talk about the new responsibilities new members must undertake to keep NATO the strongest alliance in the world. Then on Friday, I will go on to Bucharest, Romania, to make clear to the people of that country and of the other emerging democracies that the door to this alliance and to partnership with the West is open, that

we are determined to help them walk through it if they can stay on the path of freedom and reform.

For too much of our century, Europe has been divided by trenches and walls. In two world wars and a cold war, there was a terrible toll in lives and treasure. The work we have done this week will help to build stability and peace in Europe for the coming century. It will make it also far less likely that the sons and daughters of the United States will be called upon again to fight and die for the freedom of the people of Europe because today, and in the years past, we have worked hard to preserve it in peace.

Thank you very much.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, Radovan Karadzic continues to stir up trouble in Bosnia to the point of endangering the new President there and the democratically elected government. Do you think that NATO peacekeepers should aggressively pursue him? Would you favor some kind of paramilitary operation to apprehend him?

The President. First, let me say we support Mrs. Plavsic and what she's trying to do. We oppose the unconstitutional efforts to restrict her authority. We appreciate the fact that even though we don't agree on everything, she has stated her adherence to the Dayton accords and has tried to follow them.

Second, we believe that Mr. Karadzic and all the other indicted people who have been accused of war crimes should be arrested and subject to trial.

Third, in terms of the SFOR members themselves, clearly our mandate is to arrest people who have been accused of war crimes and turn them over for trial, if that can be done in the course of fulfilling our other duties and if the commanders on the ground believe the risk is appropriate. As to whether anything beyond that could or should be done, I think it would be inappropriate for me to comment at this time.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Proposed Tobacco Agreement

Q. Mr. President, your people at the White House have put out the word that the FDA part of the tobacco deal is unacceptable. Are you going to block it?

The President. Let me restate my position, then specifically answer your question. I am concerned about one thing only, the health of the people of the United States and, in particular, our children. Secondly, I want to applaud again the attorneys general, the public health advocates, and the others who negotiated this settlement. There are a lot of really important, good things in it.

I have reached only one conclusion about the settlement in terms of what has to be changed. That portion that restricts the judgment—the jurisdiction of the FDA in terms of limiting tobacco content in cigarettes or banning it outright—nicotine content—or banning it outright because some black market might be created, it seems to me is a totally unreasonable restriction. What is a black market, after all, a one percent penetration of the market, a 3 percent penetration of the market? Would we deny the FDA the right to protect 100 percent of our children because there might be a few black-market cigarettes around? I think that's unreasonable.

I have reached no final judgment about anything else, but I do think that is a change that ought to be made, and I cannot believe that the tobacco companies or others would bring down the entire settlement over that. I have not reached a final decision on anything else.

Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

1996 Campaign Financing

Q. Mr. President, while we we've been over here, there have been reports that you personally intervened with the Democratic National Committee to get John Huang hired as a fundraiser. I wonder what you could tell us about any activities that you had involving John Huang, why you felt so strongly about him, and what, in retrospect, do you think of that?

The President. I can only tell you what I recall about that. I believe that John Huang, at some point when I saw him in 1995, expressed an interest in going to work to try to help raise money for the Democratic Party, and I think I may have said to someone that he wanted to go to work for the DNC. And I think it was—he said that to me, and I relayed that to someone. I don't remember who I said it to, but I do believe I did say that to someone. And I wish I could tell you more; that's all I know about it.

Q. Why were you so—[*inaudible*]?

The President. Well, I had known him for—first of all, most people don't volunteer to help you raise money in this world; it's normally an onerous task. And so if anybody volunteered, I would have referred virtually anybody's name to the party. But I had had some acquaintance with him for several years, going back to my service as Governor, so I knew who he was.

NATO Expansion

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. French President Chirac earlier today suggested that France was not going to spend any money to expand NATO. He said that the new members should pay the bill themselves, which raises two interesting questions. If France isn't going to spend any money to expand NATO, why should the United States taxpayers be forced to spend what probably would be a few billion dollars over the next decade or so to expand NATO?

And the second related question is, these new countries are relatively poor and have limited hard currency. Why should the United States and the other NATO allies be encouraging them now to spend their limited resources for high-tech weaponry, which may be good for U.S. and European defense contractors but probably could be used more effectively to develop their own economic infrastructure, especially at a time when you yourself say there is not serious external threat to these countries?

The President. Well, first of all, the weapons they would have to buy would be conditioned more than anything else on what kinds of missions they believe they will be called upon to undertake. If they, for example, are sending their troops to Bosnia, if there is some future Bosnia or some other peacekeeping role, as NATO troops, we would want them to be as well-armed as possible to protect themselves. That doesn't mean they have to buy the most expensive weapons to do everything in the world, but it does mean that if they're going to undertake the projected missions of NATO, they would need to be appropriately trained and armed.

Secondly, one of the things that I believe that I noted at this meeting was that there had not been a great deal of work done in many countries about what the costs were. I think some people in the United States have grossly overestimated the costs of NATO expansion. I do believe that the nations involved should pay most of the costs themselves. But it's not just a question of that. There will be joint training to be done, just like there is in the Partnership For Peace, but it will be conducted at a higher level. There will be joint planning to be done. So a lot of the costs that would be borne would be extra activities for the armed forces that are already there from these countries.

And then there will be some infrastructure that will have to be built in the countries of members so that we can have what is called interoperability. And I would expect that these costs will be modest for all countries, but I would think that the Europeans and the United States and Canada will have modest costs that we will bear. And I think most of the costs will be borne by the member states. It was up to them to make that judgment.

I think, if you take—let's just take the Czech Republic. President Havel, I think, is widely recognized as an apostle of peace and as someone who's interested in all the kinds of domestic concerns to improve the quality of life in the Czech Republic that you would expect. To have a modest but strong defense is a precondition, I believe, over the long run, for Europe avoiding the kind of instabilities that could undermine the quality of life. So I think as long as—we're not talking about getting into an arms race or bankrupting their budgets, and these were judgments that they were all in a position to make.

I will say this. One of the things that I think animated our decisions on how many countries should come in, and when, is that we want countries to be able to do this and afford to do it without undermining quality of life at home, because the public in those countries has to continue to support both democracy and free market reforms and engagement, constructive engagement with other nations.

1996 Campaign Financing

Q. Mr. President, yesterday when some of your aides were asked about allegations raised at the Thompson committee hearings about China still possibly being engaged in attempts to manipulate U.S. elections, their response was that because this was under investigation, it's inappropriate to comment. While reasonable, this response is also in some ways quite unsatisfying because this is a very serious allegation. It's difficult to believe that the White House does not have concerns and opinions. So I'm taking the question once again to you, to the top. Do you have knowledge of this,

or at the very least, do you have concerns that these allegations have been raised?

The President. Well, as I have said before and I will say again, I have no knowledge of it. I do not know whether it is true or not. Therefore, since I don't know, it can't in any way and shouldn't affect the larger, long-term strategic interests of the American people and our foreign policy.

However, it is a serious charge. If any country—any country—sought to influence policy through illegal means, including illegal campaign contributions to people running for President or people in the Congress, it would be wrong and a matter of serious concern. But I simply don't know. And I think we have to let the investigation play itself out. As you did, all I know is what was said yesterday. I heard the assertion that this was continuing, and I heard others say that they did not believe the evidence supported that conclusion, and I just don't know.

So what I have said and what I expect is the most vigorous possible investigation by the Justice Department. And let's get the facts, and when we have the facts we will act in an appropriate fashion.

Yes? And then I'll take a couple of foreign journalists in a moment.

NATO Expansion

Q. Mr. President, NATO expansion has critics in the United States and not only on the grounds of costs; some say it risks isolating Russia or weakening and diluting the western alliance. Do you feel the need to launch a public relations campaign in the United States on behalf of this initiative, and if so, what will you do?

The President. Well, I think a lot of our campaign has already begun. Because of the widespread awareness at home because all of you are here and telling them at home what we just did, I think that a lot of the work has begun. But I do think, yes, that we all have a job to do, as Senator Roth said yesterday, but I and our administration have a job to do with the American people and with the United States Congress.

I disagree that we are isolating Russia. You can only believe we're isolating Russia if you believe that the great power, territorial politics of the 20th century will dominate the 21st century and if you believe that NATO is inherently antagonistic to Russia's interests and that Russia inherently will have to try to exercise greater territorial domination in the next few years than it has in the last few. I dispute that.

I believe that enlightened self-interest, as well as shared values, will compel countries to define their greatness in more constructive ways. And the threats that we will share that will be genuine threats to our security will compel us to cooperate in more constructive ways. Therefore, I think the fact that we had the NATO-Russia agreement first, that I went to Helsinki to see President Yeltsin before we actually even went—finalized where we were going with this—we got that done first, and we met in Paris and signed the agreement—it shows that NATO wants a constructive partnership with Russia as with all other democratic countries.

Yes, go ahead, Peter [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio].

Nuclear Weapons and the Republics of the Former Soviet Union

Q. Mr. President, the recent arrest in Miami of three Lithuanian nationals accused of offering to smuggle nuclear weapons to U.S. Customs agents, unbeknownst to them at the time, has raised new questions about the security and stability of the nuclear holdings of the former Soviet Union. What is your analysis of it, especially in light of the decisions that have been taken here over the past couple of days? How secure, how stable are the nuclear holdings of the former Soviet Union?

The President. I think on balance, they have made great progress in the last few years. You know this because we've talked about it a lot over the last few years, but we have spent a lot of time working with the Russians both to try to bring all the nuclear weapons and materials into a more concentrated area and get them out of the other Republics of the former Soviet Union and also to try to increase the safety of the materials. And the Russians have been quite constructive in our cooperation, and we've made a lot of progress.

The first thing I asked when I saw that story about the arrest was whether or not they could have delivered the goods they were promising, which we don't know. Keep in mind, we have—our European friends, and Germany especially, a few years ago made a lot of arrests of people who were coming out of Russia with what they thought were nuclear materials, but none of

them, as far as I know, could have been converted into weapons. That is, they were nuclear-related materials from sites that people got away with, but the actual material that could be turned into a weapon was under sufficient security control that it wasn't out.

We may not live in a zero-risk world, but I do believe we're doing well. And we will have to investigate this thoroughly to try to trace it back if there was a breakdown somewhere and, if so, what we have to do about it. But let me say, you just made the case for why I believe that we need to view our national interests in the same way. Obviously, the Russians and we here have the same interest. The Lithuanians have the same interest. Nobody wants this to be done. This is a violation of every nation's self-interest.

Yes, Mara [Mara Liasson, National Public Radio].

Medicare

Q. [*Inaudible*]—said that you would consider means-testing Medicare only in the context of long-term structural reform of the program, and now your advisers say you might be reconsidering to accept it in the context of this budget agreement. Why the shift in your thinking?

The President. Well, I think on the merits, means-testing—as the population ages and as we continue to have an unconscionably high percentage of children living in poverty, you have to have help from society as a whole. We will have to look at means-testing generally. I have never been opposed to means-testing Medicare.

Now, one of the things I have said—let me reiterate here, the Senate committee and then the Senate as a whole deserves a lot of credit for looking to the long-term future of the country and trying to deal early with the impact of the aging of the population on one of our most important systems, Medicare. And I think that we have a responsibility to respond to that, and I intend to. But I'd like to make just two points.

Number one is, if you look at their bill, it adds about now 12 years to the Medicare Trust Fund. Most of the adding to the Medicare Trust Fund comes from the structural reforms, including the greater competition, the greater choice, and the greater preventive elements that are in the plan that I presented. Number two, if we're going to means-test benefits, the means-testing needs to be fair and workable. And the third thing I would say about the things that they offered, we do not want to do anything that will increase the number of people without any health insurance at all. That is one of the biggest problems America has. And as I predicted back in '93 and '94, it's getting worse, not better. And if it weren't for Medicaid, it would be terrible.

And one of the most difficult populations we have in the United States are people who retire early, say, at 55 or 60, or are forced to retire, and then they have to wait for years to qualify for Medicare. I'll never forget the one story Hillary told me about meeting a woman that actually had breast cancer, who was 64 years old, who was waiting until she qualified for Medicare to get adequate treatment. I mean, we don't want to create a new class of people without any health insurance at all.

But the Senate did a good thing by showing its concern for the future. I think I should respond. I intend to, but I want us to—whatever we do, I want it to make sense. And let's not forget, the structural reforms may save more money over the long run.

The gentleman from Ukraine there, and the lady next to him. I'll take both questions.

Russia and Ukraine

Q. Mr. President, what's your attitude—Russia is going up the opposition towards the American-Ukrainian exercises on the Black Sea. And if Russia will go up their opposition, are you going to withdraw your troops from Black Sea—from this exercises—[*inaudible*]—'97? And will the Ukrainian-NATO charter give any guarantees of security for Ukraine?

The President. Well, first of all, you should read the charter because it shows about what we will do together with Ukraine. Secondly, I think it enhances the security of Ukraine, just as I believe the NATO-Russia agreement enhances Russia's security and enhances NATO's because it commits us to cooperation rather than conflict.

In terms of what we would do in the Black Sea, let's note one thing, that Ukraine and Russia have recently agreed to settle their differences, which is a huge, positive thing from our point of view. To us, that was our biggest concern in the Black Sea, was the argument between Ukraine and Russia. And we're gratified that there's been an agreement that will resolve it when it's implemented.

And in terms of what we do with our exercises, that depends upon what we think the appropriate thing is under the circumstances. And I have no evidence at the time which would cause me to change my position.

Yes?

Q. Mr. President, you had a meeting with Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma today. What did you say to him? And what do you think about the state of economic reform in this country which was the point of your concern recently?

The President. Well, first of all, I congratulated him on the agreement—President Kuchma on the agreement between the United States and NATO. Secondly, I reaffirmed our determination, which was stated again at Denver, to help Ukraine deal with the closure of Chernobyl and develop reasonable alternative sources of energy. The third thing I did was to urge him to continue to support economic reform.

This is the most difficult thing of all because when a country goes from a communist economy to a free market economy, almost always there is a period in which things are actually harder for ordinary citizens, and the voters may vote out the reformers. And it's a difficult thing. But in the end, which doesn't take very long, the economy grows much more.

And I told President Kuchma that if he could find a way to support the reforms and enact them in this year, that I would do everything I could to see that the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development supported Ukraine to minimize the problems for the people in Ukraine and to speed up the day when the economy will genuinely be growing again.

Let me take one—is anyone from Spain here? I think I should take a host question. One of the Spanish journalists? Go ahead. Either one of you stand up. Somebody. Go ahead. Since I don't know your name, I have a hard time calling on you.

NATO Expansion

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Because NATO is a military organization, which requires a commitment of security, it is always operated by consensus. That is the only way it ever could have operated. Keep in mind, if we extend membership to another country, it means that we are committing the people who wear the uniform of our Nation to go and fight and die for that nation, should it ever be attacked. Now, I think it's a pretty good gamble because no NATO nation has ever been attacked, ever, not once. But for 50 years, we have always operated by consensus.

Let me give you another example. When we planned the NATO operation in Bosnia, we had to reach consensus among our military planners. They didn't all agree on every detail. Of course, because it was military planning, the differences were not so highly publicized as these were, which were more open and political, if you will. But obviously, you couldn't take a vote on those kinds of decisions. And I think it's the very nature of this sort of alliance; we have to try to work through and do our best to get a unanimous decision and accommodate ourselves to each other.

And let me say, it wasn't just how many countries got in; it was also how we stated what we were doing, making sure the door was open, acknowledging that progress had been made in Europe's northwest and Europe's southeast and that we were going to keep the door open over a protracted period of time. I thought all that was quite important.

I'll take one question from the gentleman from Israel. Then I have to go.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. Amar Adniah from Channel 2 News, Israel, and I wonder whether you've got any new plans, any new initiatives to save the peace process in the Middle East, which seems to be falling apart. And does the Secretary of State plan a visit to the region?

The President. The answer to your question is that I have been working, before I came here, to come up with some ideas about how we can start this again. I am very concerned about what's happening in the peace process. I'm very concerned about the growing tensions between the Palestinians and the Israelis. And it is obvious that we're going to have to see some new specific actions taken in order to get this thing going again. It is equally obvious that we're going to have to have real security cooperation in the area with the Palestinians to keep down the violence.

I think it can be done. It is a question of will and risk, calculated risk; that's what the peace process in the Middle East has always been about. And we are working on it now.

But you know how it works there: The less I say about it, the more likely we are to succeed.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 149th news conference began at 4:43 p.m. at the Centro de Convenciones. In his remarks, he referred to President of the Government Jose Maria Aznar of Spain; NATO Secretary General Javier Solana; President Biljana Plavsic of the Serb Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina (Republika Srpska); Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic; President Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic; and President Boris Yeltsin of Russia.

Statement on the Helicopter Tragedy at Fort Bragg, North Carolina
July 9, 1997

I was saddened to learn today that a U.S. Army *Blackhawk* helicopter had crashed at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, killing all eight soldiers aboard.

Although nothing can ease the pain of this tragic loss, I want to express my deep respect for these patriots who died proudly serving the country they loved. These eight soldiers paid the ultimate price for the peace we all enjoy.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the families of these brave soldiers and ask that all Americans join us in remembering them in our prayers.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Iraq's Compliance With United Nations Security Council Resolutions
July 9, 1997

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

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1) and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). This report covers the period from May 8 to the present. Saddam Hussein remains a threat to his people and the region and the United States remains determined to contain the threat of Saddam's regime. As Secretary of State Albright stated on March 26, the United States looks forward to the day when Iraq joins the family of nations as a responsible and law-abiding member and that, until then, containment must continue. Secretary Albright made clear that Saddam's departure would make a difference and that, should a change in Iraq's government occur, the United States would stand ready to enter rapidly into a dialogue with the successor regime.

In terms of military operations, the United States and its coalition partners continue to enforce the no-fly zones over northern Iraq under Operation Northern Watch, and over southern Iraq with Operation Southern Watch. We have not detected any confirmed, intentional Iraqi violations of either no-fly zone since late April.

In addition to our air operations, we will continue to maintain a strong U.S. presence in the region in order to deter Saddam. United States force levels include land- and carrier-based aircraft, surface warships, a marine amphibious task force, a Patriot missile battalion, and a mechanized battalion task force deployed in support of USCINCCENT operations. To enhance force protection throughout the region, additional military security personnel have been deployed for continuous rotation. USCINCCENT continues to closely monitor the security situation in the region to ensure adequate force protection is provided for all deployed forces.

United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 949, adopted in October 1994, demands that Iraq not utilize its military or any

other forces to threaten its neighbors or U.N. operations in Iraq and that it not redeploy troops or enhance its military capacity in southern Iraq. In view of Saddam's accumulating record of unreliability, it is prudent to retain a significant U.S. force presence in the region in order to maintain the capability to respond rapidly to possible Iraqi aggression or threats against its neighbors.

Since my last report, the Government of Iraq has continued to flout its obligations under UNSC Resolutions. Under the terms of relevant UNSC Resolutions, Iraq must grant the U.N. Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) inspectors immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to any location in Iraq that they wish to examine, and access to any Iraqi official whom they may wish to interview, so that UNSCOM may fully discharge its mandate to ensure that Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) program has been eliminated. Iraq continues, as it has for the past 6 years, to fail to live up to either the letter or the spirit of the commitment. Of particular concern is UNSCOM's June report to the Security Council of serious incidents involving Iraqi escort helicopters flying dangerously close to the Commission's aircraft to force it to change direction and multiple cases of Iraqi personnel aboard UNSCOM helicopters attempting to wrest control of aircraft from their pilots.

In his June report, UNSCOM Chairman Rolf Ekeus also indicated that UNSCOM had found new indications that Iraq has not fulfilled its requirement to destroy its WMD. Chairman Ekeus told the Security Council that on June 10 and 12, Iraqi officials totally blocked UNSCOM inspectors from access to three sites suspected of containing hidden information about its prohibited weapons programs. He reported that UNSCOM inspectors observed Iraqi officials shredding, burning, or hiding documents at the sites, and that senior Iraqi government officials refused to allow UNSCOM inspectors to interview officials involved in Iraq's weapons programs. Chairman Ekeus singled out Iraq's leadership as having hindered several attempts by UNSCOM inspectors to inspect areas that are suspected of being hiding places for chemical or biological weapons or technology used to manufacture those weapons.

In response to Iraqi intransigence, the U.S. sponsored and the Security Council on June 21 passed unanimously, UNSC Resolution 1115, which 1) condemns the repeated refusal of Iraqi authorities to allow access to sites designated by UNSCOM; 2) demands that Iraq cooperate fully with UNSCOM in accordance with relevant UNSC resolutions and allow UNSCOM inspection teams immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to any and all areas, facilities, equipment, records, and means of transportation that they wish to inspect; 3) demands that the Government of Iraq give immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to officials and other persons under the authority of the Iraqi Government whom UNSCOM wishes to interview; 4) provides that the periodic sanctions reviews provided for in UNSC Resolution 687 will not be conducted until after UNSCOM's next consolidated progress report—due October 11, 1997—after which time those reviews will resume; 5) expresses the firm intention to impose additional measures on those categories of Iraqi officials responsible for Iraq's noncompliance, unless advised by UNSCOM that Iraq is in substantial compliance with this resolution; and 6) reaffirms its full support for UNSCOM.

Implementation of UNSCR 1051 continues. It provides for a mechanism to monitor Iraq's effort to reacquire proscribed weapons capabilities by requiring that Iraq notify a joint unit of UNSCOM and the International Atomic Energy Agency in advance of any imports of dual-use items. Similarly, countries must provide timely notification of exports to Iraq of dual-use items.

Regarding northern Iraq, the United States continues to lead efforts to increase security and stability in the north and minimize opportunities for Baghdad or Tehran to threaten Iraqi citizens there. Following a successful trip to northern Iraq in early April, Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs David Welch led a U.S. delegation to Turkey for a fourth round of higher-level talks on May 14 to help resolve differences between the two main Iraqi Kurd groups, Massoud Barzani of the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP) and Jalal Talabani of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK).

During this latest meeting under the "Ankara Process," the U.S., British, and Turkish cosponsors of the talks obtained agreement from KDP and PUK delegations to take several steps designed to strengthen the October 23, 1996, cease-fire between the two Iraqi Kurd groups and encourage their political reconciliation.

Representatives from the Iraqi Turkoman and Iraqi Assyrian organizations participating in the neutral, indigenous Peace Monitoring Force (PMF) also attended the fourth round of talks in Ankara. The PMF participants also continue to help the Iraqi Kurd groups move forward on several other confidence-building measures, the most recent of which included several joint committee meetings on May 29 that addressed a range of civilian services and humanitarian issues affecting all residents of the north. Local representatives of the two Kurd groups, the three countries, and the PMF continue to meet biweekly in Ankara and move forward on other confidence-building measures.

As part of the Ankara process, the United States is providing political, financial, and logistical support for the PMF in northern Iraq that has demarcated the cease-fire line and monitors the cease-fire. Our support is being provided in the form of commodities and services in accordance with a drawdown directed by me on December 11, 1996, and in the form of funds to be used to provide other nonlethal assistance in accordance with a separate determination made by former Secretary of State Christopher on November 10, 1996. The PMF began full deployment in mid-April and continues to investigate and resolve reported cease-fire violations.

These steps, as with all our efforts under the Ankara process and concerning Iraq, maintain support for the unity and territorial integrity of Iraq. Security conditions in northern Iraq nevertheless remain tenuous at best, with the Iranian and PKK (Kurdistan Workers Party) activity adding to the ever-present threat from Baghdad.

The oil for food arrangement under UNSCR 986 was reauthorized under UNSCR 1111 on June 9, 1997. Under UNSCR 1111, Iraq is authorized to sell up to $2 billion of oil during a 180-day period (with the possibility of UNSC renewal for subsequent 180-day periods). Resolution 1111, like its predecessor, requires that the proceeds of this limited oil sale, all of which must be deposited in a U.N. escrow account, will be used to purchase food, medicine, and other material and supplies for essential civilian needs for all Iraqi citizens and to fund vital U.N. activities regarding Iraq. Critical to the success of UNSCR 1111 is Iraq's willingness to follow through on its commitments under the resolution to allow the U.N. to monitor the distribution of humanitarian goods to the Iraqi people. Iraq has suspended any further oil sales until a new distribution plan is approved, which will probably occur sometime in July. The Iraqi Government has prepared a new distribution plan, which is subject to the approval of the U.N. Secretary General.

Iraq continues to stall and obfuscate rather than work in good faith toward accounting for the hundreds of Kuwaitis and third-country nationals who disappeared at the hands of Iraqi authorities during the occupation. It has also failed to return all of the stolen Kuwaiti military equipment and the priceless Kuwaiti cultural and historical artifacts that were looted during the occupation.

The human rights situation throughout Iraq remains unchanged. Iraq's repression of its Shi'a population continues with policies that are destroying the Marsh Arabs' way of life in southern Iraq, as well as the ecology of the southern marshes. The U.N., in its most recent reports on implementation of UNSCR 986, recognized that the Government of Iraq continues to forcibly deport Iraqi citizens from Kirkuk and other areas of northern Iraq still under the Iraqi Government's control. Saddam Hussein shows no signs of complying with UNSCR 688, which demands that Iraq cease the repression of its own people. The effort by various Iraqi opposition groups and nongovernmental organizations to document Iraqi war crimes and other violations of international humanitarian law, known as INDICT, continues.

The Multinational Interception Force (MIF) continues its important mission in the Arabian Gulf. The United States Navy provides the bulk of the forces involved in the maritime sanctions enforcement although we receive much-needed help from a number of close allies. In recent months, ships from the Netherlands, Canada, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom have participated in MIF operations. We continue active pursuit of broad-based international participation in these operations.

Illegal smuggling of Iraqi gasoil from the Shatt Al Arab waterway continues to increase. We estimate that over 81,000 metric tons of gasoil each month is exported from Iraq in violation of UNSCR 661. The smugglers utilize the territorial waters of Iran with the complicity of the Iranian Government, which profits from charging protection fees for these vessels, to avoid interception by the MIF in international waters. Cash raised from these illegal operations

is used to purchase contraband goods, which are then smuggled back into Iraq by the same route. We continue to brief the U.N. Sanctions Committee regarding these operations and have pressed the Committee to compel Iran to give a full accounting of its involvement. We have also worked closely with our MIF partners and the Gulf Cooperation Council states to take measures to curb sanctions-breaking operations. Recent announcements by the government of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) that it intends to crack down on smugglers who operate UAE-flagged vessels is a positive step in this regard.

The United Nations Compensation Commission (UNCC), established pursuant to UNSCR 687, continues to resolve claims against Iraq arising from Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. The UNCC has issued almost 1.1 million awards worth approximately $5.9 billion. Thirty percent of the proceeds from the oil sales permitted by UNSCR 986 have been allocated to the Compensation Fund to pay awards and finance the operations of the UNCC, and these proceeds will continue to be allocated to the Fund under UNSCR 1111. Initial payments out of the Compensation Fund are currently being made on awards in the order in which UNCC has approved them, in installments of $2,500.00.

To conclude, Iraq remains a serious threat to regional peace and stability. I remain determined to see Iraq comply fully with all of its obligations under U.N. Security Council resolutions. My administration will continue to oppose any relaxation of sanctions until Iraq demonstrates its peaceful intentions through such compliance.

I appreciate the support of the Congress for our efforts and shall continue to keep the Congress informed about this important issue.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 10.

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

July 9, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Poland, signed at Washington on July 10, 1996.

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

This Treaty will, upon entry into force, enhance cooperation between the law enforcement communities of both countries. It will thereby make a significant contribution to international law enforcement efforts.

The provisions in this Treaty follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 9, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 10.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the France-United States Extradition Treaty With Documentation
July 9, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaty between the United States of America and France, signed at Paris on April 23, 1996.

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

This Treaty will, upon entry into force, enhance cooperation between the law enforcement communities of both countries. It will thereby make a significant contribution to international law enforcement efforts.

The provisions in this Treaty, which includes an Agreed Minute, follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

July 9, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 10.

Statement on the New Television Rating System
July 10, 1997

Two years ago, Vice President Gore and I challenged Congress and the television industry to give parents new tools to control the television children watch. We were pleased with their response. Last year, Congress passed legislation giving American families the V-chip, and the industry developed a voluntary system of ratings for television programs. Today these tools are being made stronger. The television industry, working with parents, has strengthened its original rating system by agreeing to assign new ratings that will better help families choose appropriate television programming for their children.

When Vice President Gore asked parents to tell us how the original rating system was working—where it was succeeding, and where it could be improved—parents told us that age-based ratings are helpful, but that they needed to know more about the specific programming content. The new system gives parents more information about the images and language contained in programs and more power to screen out violence and objectionable content.

I applaud the industry and parent groups who have worked so hard to reach common ground. As with any new system, we should now give this solution—together with the V-chip—a chance to work.

Statement on the R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company Decision To Stop Using the Joe Camel Character in Tobacco Advertisements
July 10, 1997

I welcome R.J. Reynolds' decision today to stop using Joe Camel in its advertisements. This step is long overdue. As I said last year when we announced the FDA rule to protect youth from tobacco, we must put tobacco ads like Joe Camel out of our children's reach forever. I am glad RJR has finally taken this step today, and I hope other companies will follow suit. In the months ahead, I will keep fighting until the days of marketing tobacco to our children are over.

Remarks to the Citizens of Warsaw, Poland
July 10, 1997

Thank you. Mr. President, Mr. Mayor, Major Kuklelka, Lieutenant Blazeusz, to the people of Warsaw and the people of Poland. I am proud to speak to you and to welcome you, along with the people of Hungary and the Czech Republic, as the next members of NATO and the next allies of the United States of America.

If my interpreter will forgive me, I want to depart from the text to say that our American delegation are all proud to be here. But there are two here for whom this day has special meaning, and I would like to ask them to stand. The first is our Secretary of State, who was born in the Czech Republic and driven out by the troubles that so grieved the Poles in the last 50 years, Madeleine Albright. The second is one of the most distinguished Members of the United States Congress—both of her grandfathers were Polish immigrants—Senator Barbara Mikulski, from Maryland.

We gather to celebrate this moment of promises kept and of promise redeemed. Here, in the twilight of the 20th century, we set our sights on a new century, a century in which finally we fulfill Poland's destiny as a free nation at the heart of a free Europe, a new Europe undivided, democratic, and at peace.

Three years ago this week, I came to this great city and made this pledge: Nothing about you without you. *Nic o was bez was*. Now Poland is joining NATO. Poland is taking its place in the community of democracies. Never again will your fate be decided by others. Never again will the birthright of freedom be denied you. Poland is coming home.

Freedom burned brightly in Poland 200 years ago. Then you gave Europe its first written constitution and the world's second written constitution, after America's own. That solemn pact gave strength and hope to your ancestors, even as Poland fell victim again and again to tyranny. But this week, its words and those who revered them speak to us across the centuries: "We do solemnly establish this constitution, willing to profit by the present circumstances of Europe and by the favorable moment which has restored us to ourselves."

People of Poland, this favorable moment has restored you to yourselves. It is a moment that you have made. Just as freedom was born here 200 years ago, it was reborn here 8 years ago when you changed the course of history. And now, together, we have restored Poland to Europe and to the destiny you deserve. From this day forward, what Poland builds in peace, Poland will keep in security.

To the citizens of my own country I say, this land where I speak has known the worst wars of the 20th century. By expanding NATO, we will help to prevent another war involving Poland, another war in Europe, another war that also claims the lives of Americans.

We come to this moment grateful for its blessings but conscious of the grave responsibility it carries. Through the power of its example and the example of its power, our NATO alliance has kept Western Europe, Canada, and

the United States secure for nearly half a century. Not once has a NATO member been attacked. Not once has NATO ever lashed out in aggression.

Now we must adapt our alliance to a new time. Our common enemy of Communist oppression has vanished, but common dangers have not. Too many people still fear change because they have not yet felt its benefits. They remain vulnerable to the poisoned appeal of extreme nationalism to ethnic, racial, and religious hatreds. Rogue states seek to undermine the community of democracies. Terrorists, international criminals, drug traffickers show no regard for borders. These are our common dangers, and we must defeat them together.

NATO is doing its part, taking in new members, taking on new missions, working with new partners. Like Poland, we have reached out to Ukraine to help forge stability in Europe, and we are working with a new Russia as our partner in building a Europe in which every nation is free and every free nation joins in securing peace and stability for all.

Now, as your President has said, you must continue to do your part. Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic will now become full members of our alliance, with the full responsibilities of membership: the responsibility to nurture and strengthen and defend your democracies because, as we in America know, after more than 200 years the struggle for democracy is never over, it must be fought every day; the responsibility to continue the remarkable transformation of your economies because, having known poverty, you know the true value of the prosperity you have only begun to achieve; the responsibility to reach out to all your neighbors, to the East as well as the West, including the people of Russia—you must continue to build in tolerance what others destroyed in hate; the responsibility to meet NATO's high military standards and to help to bear its cost, because true security requires strength and readiness. We know you are ready to share the burdens of defending freedom because you know the price of losing freedom.

Other nations are counting on you to show the contributions new members can make. You did not walk through NATO's door to see it shut behind you; that door will stay open. Eight years ago you led the way to freedom. Now we ask you to be pathfinders again.

People of Warsaw, people of Poland, the American people know from the hard lessons of this century that your fate and our future are joined. After World War I, America turned away from the world, and freedom's flickering torch was engulfed by Europe's darkened night. After World War II, we and our allies continued to hold liberty's beacon high, but it could only light half the Continent.

Now we come here to celebrate history's most precious gift: a second chance, a second chance to redeem the sacrifice of those who fought for our liberty from the beaches of Normandy to the streets of Warsaw, a second chance finally to unite Europe not by the force of arms but by the power of peace.

One week ago was the Fourth of July, America's Independence Day. More than 200 years ago, you sent your sons to help to secure our future. America has never forgotten. Now, together, we will work to secure the future of an undivided Europe for your freedom and ours.

That is the promise that brings us together today. That is the promise that will keep us together in a new Europe for a new century. That is our promise to all the young people here today and to generations yet to come: security for 100 years. *Sto lat*. Democracy for 100 years. Freedom for 100 years.

God bless America, and God bless Poland. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:30 p.m. at Castle Square in Warsaw. In his remarks, he referred to President Aleksander Kwasniewski of Poland; Mayor Marcin Swiecicki of Warsaw; Maj. Bolesaw Kuklelka, Polish World War II veteran; and 2d Lt. Piotr Blazeusz, Polish Air Force officer who studied in the United States.

Remarks at a Dinner Hosted by President Aleksander Kwasniewski of Poland in Warsaw

July 10, 1997

I and all of our American colleagues are honored to be here in Warsaw today, grateful that you have received us so warmly, proud to share in such an historic occasion for Poland, Europe, and the United States.

This week in Madrid, the old dividing lines of Europe were wiped away forever, and in their place we are building a framework of a Europe whole and free for the first time since nation-states arose on the Continent.

NATO's decision to welcome Poland into the alliance is both a tribute and a challenge: a tribute to the people of this great nation who were the first to unleash the force of freedom from behind the Iron Curtain; who pioneered the difficult transition to an open society and an open market; who took the lead in reaching out to your neighbors in the Baltics, Russia, and the Ukraine; who sent your troops to give the people of Bosnia a chance to rebuild their broken land.

It is a challenge to all of us to ensure that this moment of possibility fulfills its promise by meeting the solemn responsibilities that NATO membership entails, by living up to the shared ideals NATO represents, by continuing to support Europe's new democracies in their quest to be full partners in an undivided Europe, by making the defense of peace and freedom our common goal and commitment. I am confident we will meet these challenges because the love of liberty we share has been forged on the anvil of history.

In the park by the White House is a statue of Kosciusko, beloved son of Poland, adopted son of the United States. Moved by the ideals of our revolution, Kosciusko traveled to Philadelphia to enlist in freedom's cause. He was the first foreign soldier in America's army. He distinguished himself at Saratoga and West Point, where American cadets later built a monument in tribute to his role in forging our freedom. He returned to Poland to help defend his homeland against a foreign invasion. And though he did not succeed, he inspired the world with his courage and the force of his ideals. Thomas Jefferson said of his Polish friend, "He was as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known and of that liberty which is to go to all, not to the few and rich alone."

In the more than 200 years since Kosciusko came to us, Poland has given us many sons and daughters of liberty. I want to say a special word about one—adopted son of the United States and pure son of liberty, the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, the highest ranking American in the United States military, General John Shalikashvili, who is here with us tonight.

He was born here in Poland. He witnessed the destruction of Warsaw. He saw its heroic rise against tyranny. A child born of war, he has given his entire life to the cause of peace. Our ability to be here tonight celebrating NATO's enlargement is due in no small measure to his visionary leadership in helping to create the Partnership For Peace. The American people, and the President in particular, are very proud of the service of this son of Poland, John Shalikashvili. Thank you, sir.

The Poles have a tradition of sending their finest sons to fight for others' freedom. I have been told of the Polish phrase that describes this tradition, a phrase that also represents our new alliance through NATO. It goes, "For your freedom and ours," I believe: *Za wolnosc wasza i nasza.*

Nothing is more precious, nothing more noble, nothing more right. It is the spirit of Poland, the spirit of America, the spirit of NATO, to which this great nation is joining its strength fully, finally, forever.

I now ask you to join me in raising a glass to the President, the distinguished leaders here present, the people of Poland, the enduring friendship between our nations, and the future we will create in the new century.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 8:30 p.m. at the Presidential Palace. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Emil Constantinescu of Romania in Bucharest
July 11, 1997

Romania

Q. Mr. President, are you going to tell the Romanian President when Romania will be taken into NATO? [*Laughter*]

President Constantinescu. It's not a press conference. [*Laughter*]

President Clinton. She's been doing this quite a long while. She's better at it than we are, and we cannot win. [*Laughter*]

Q. What do you think of your reception, Mr. President?

President Clinton. It was wonderful seeing all the people in the streets, and I'm very, very glad to be here. It's quite impressive what they have accomplished here in Romania in such a short time. And I think you see from the spirit of the people in the streets their devotion to freedom. It's a great tribute to the President and to his Government, and I'm looking forward to this.

"Mars Pathfinder" Spacecraft

Q. What do you hear from Mars? [*Laughter*]

President Clinton. We're doing okay on Mars.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, is the situation in Bosnia calm? I mean, have you heard any reports?

President Clinton. So far, yes. We have no reports to the contrary.

Q. Are you sorry they didn't get the big guys?

President Clinton. Well, I think what was done was appropriate and within the SFOR mandate. The people were under sealed indictment, and they came in regular contact with the SFOR forces there—and that's plainly within the mandate—in the British sector. They were prepared to do that, and we helped them to move the people who were arrested to the War Crimes Tribunal in The Hague. And I think it was the right thing to do.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:48 p.m. at the Cotroceni Palace.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Study on the Operation and Effect of the North American Free Trade Agreement
July 11, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Study on the Operation and Effect of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), as required by section 512 of the NAFTA Implementation Act (Public Law 103–182; 107 Stat. 2155; 19 U.S.C. 3462). The Congress and the Administration are right to be proud of this historic agreement. This report provides solid evidence that NAFTA has already proved its worth to the United States during the 3 years it has been in effect. We can look forward to realizing NAFTA's full benefits in the years ahead.

NAFTA has also contributed to the prosperity and stability of our closest neighbors and two of our most important trading partners. NAFTA aided Mexico's rapid recovery from a severe economic recession, even as that country carried forward a democratic transformation of historic proportions.

NAFTA is an integral part of a broader growth strategy that has produced the strongest U.S. economy in a generation. This strategy rests on three mutually supportive pillars: deficit reduction, investing in our people through education and training, and opening foreign markets to allow America to compete in the global economy. The success of that strategy can be seen in the strength of the American economy, which continues to experience strong investment, low unemployment, healthy job creation, and subdued inflation.

Export growth has been central to America's economic expansion. NAFTA, together with the

Uruguay Round Agreement, the Information Technology Agreement, the WTO Telecommunications Agreement, 22 sectoral trade agreements with Japan, and over 170 other trade agreements, has contributed to overall U.S. real export growth of 37 percent since 1993. Exports have contributed nearly one-third of our economic growth—and have grown three times faster than overall income.

Workers, business executives, small business owners, and farmers across America have contributed to the resurgence in American competitiveness. The ability and determination of working people across America to rise to the challenges of rapidly changing technologies and global economic competition is a great source of strength for this Nation.

Cooperation between the Administration and the Congress on a bipartisan basis has been critical in our efforts to reduce the deficit, to conclude trade agreements that level the global playing field for America, to secure peace and prosperity along America's borders, and to help prepare all Americans to benefit from expanded economic opportunities. I hope we can continue working together to advance these vital goals in the years to come.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 11, 1997.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the District of Columbia Fiscal Year 1998 Budget Request

July 11, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 202(c)(5)(C)(ii) of the Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995 ("the FRMA Act"), I am transmitting the Council of the District of Columbia's "Fiscal Year 1998 Budget Request Act of 1997."

The Council's proposed Fiscal Year 1998 Budget was disapproved by the Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (the "Authority") on June 12. Under the FRMA Act, if the Authority disapproves the Council's financial plan and budget, the Mayor must submit that budget to the President to be transmitted to the Congress. My transmittal of the District Council's budget, as required by law, does not represent an endorsement of its contents. The budget also does not reflect the effect of my proposed Fiscal Year 1998 District of Columbia revitalization plan.

The Authority is required to transmit separately to the Mayor, the Council, the President, and the Congress a financial plan and budget. The Authority sent its financial plan and budget to the Congress on June 15.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 11, 1997.

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

July 11, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my pleasure to transmit the Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Arts for 1996.

One measure of a great nation is the vitality of its culture, the dedication of its people to nurturing a climate where creativity can flourish. By supporting our museums and theaters, our dance companies and symphony orchestras, our writers and our artists, the National Endowment for the Arts provides such a climate. Look

through this report and you will find many reasons to be proud of our Nation's cultural life at the end of the 20th century and what it portends for Americans and the world in the years ahead.

Despite cutbacks in its budget, the Endowment was able to fund thousands of projects all across America—a museum in Sitka, Alaska; a dance company in Miami, Florida; a production of a Eugene O'Neill play in New York City; a Whistler exhibition in Chicago; and artists in schools in all 50 States. Millions of Americans were able to see plays, hear concerts, and participate in the arts in their hometowns, thanks to the work of this small agency.

As we set our priorities for the coming years, let's not forget the vital role the National Endowment for the Arts must continue to play in our national life. The Endowment shows the world that we take pride in American culture here and abroad. It is a beacon, not only of creativity, but of freedom. And let us keep that lamp brightly burning now and for all time.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 11, 1997.

Remarks to the Citizens of Bucharest, Romania
July 11, 1997

The President. Thank you. Mr. President, thank you for your wonderful welcome. And to the young student who just spoke, Semida Munteanu, if she is a representative of the youth of Romania, the future of this nation is in good hands.

I am proud to be the first American President to visit a free Romania——

Audience members. U.S.A.! U.S.A.! U.S.A.!

The President. I am proud to stand in University Square, where so many have sacrificed for freedom. Most of all, I am proud to see in this vast crowd the face of a new Romania, moving beyond the past to build a bright future of possibility for all your people. Congratulations.

Audience members. U.S.A.! U.S.A.! U.S.A.!

The President. America knows that Romania's destiny lies in an undivided, democratic, peaceful Europe, where every nation is free and every free nation is the partner of the United States. To all the people of Romania who love freedom so dearly: I come to Romania because of all you have already done; I come because I know what you still can do; I come because of all that we must do together to achieve your destiny in the family of freedom.

No people have suffered more under Communist repression. No people paid a higher price for the simple right to live in freedom. No people faced greater challenges in the struggle to start anew. But though your path has been steep and hard, you are going forward. And for that, we salute you.

In America, we have seen your spirit, your endurance, your determination symbolized by the feat of one of your young Romanian athletes. At the end of the New York marathon last fall, a runner named Anuta Catuna came from behind to close the lead and earn her way to victory in one of America's most prized races. Like her, Romania has set its sights and its heart on the long run. And like her, the Romanian people have won the world's respect for moving so far, so fast, and for believing in yourselves and your future. Like her marathon race, the marathon of freedom is not a sprint; it takes steady and persistent commitment to stay the course. After more than 200 years, America now knows the journey of democracy is never over; it must be traveled every single day.

But what progress you have made. You have launched bold economic reforms to give your people the chance to make the most of their own lives. In the short term, I know there are costs to this market reform. But in the long term, the rewards are far greater, in better jobs, new opportunities, more trade and investment from around the world for your people. And in recent years, we have learned from other nations' experience that those who reform the fastest make the most progress for their people.

Romania has been making up for lost time, and the whole world is taking notice.

You have turned old grievances to new friendships, within your borders and beyond. You have forged landmark treaties with Hungary and Ukraine. You have brought ethnic Hungarians into democratic government for the first time. You are giving minorities a greater stake in your common future. Together you are doing something that people all over the world must do, you are reaching across the lines that divide you to build one Romania. And for that, I salute you.

You have shown the way of responsible leadership here in your own region. In Bosnia, it was Romanian engineers who repaired the first train crossing the Sava River so that critical aid could reach the Bosnian people after years of deprivation. In Albania, Romania's peacekeeping battalion has played a key role in promoting stability and securing free elections. Your nation, at its own initiative and its own expense, has helped your faltering neighbors get their feet back on the ground. And for that, the world salutes you. Of course, there is more work to do. I come here to say that America will do that work with you.

Audience members. U.S.A.! U.S.A.! U.S.A.!

The President. The values that govern Romania today, liberty, openness, tolerance, free markets, these are values shared by the community of democracies Romania is joining. The community includes security cooperation through the Partnership For Peace. It includes strong ties of trade and investment. It includes institutions like the European Union. And of course, it includes NATO.

I welcome Romania's deep desire to contribute even more fully to Europe's security and strength. I welcome your desire to join NATO. I want that, too, for Europe, for America, and for you. And I say to you today, stay the course, and Romania will cross that milestone.

To all nations who embrace democracy and reform and wish to share the responsibilities of membership, I reaffirm from this plaza of freedom: The door to NATO is open. It will stay open, and we will help you to walk through it.

NATO has committed to review aspiring members in 1999. Romania is one of the strongest candidates. And if you stay the course and manifest the love of liberty we all see here today, there can be no stronger candidate. Stay the course. Stay the course. The future is yours.

Audience members. Clinton! Clinton! Clinton!

The President. Thank you.

In the meantime, your President and I have agreed to establish a strategic partnership between our nations, a partnership important to America because Romania is important to America, important in your own right, important as a model in this difficult part of the world. Romania can show the people of this region and, indeed, people throughout the world that there is a better way than fighting and division and repression. It is cooperation and freedom and peace.

Mr. President, citizens of Romania, my visit has been brief, but our friendship will endure the test of time. As long as you proceed down democracy's road, America will walk by your side.

The great Romanian-born playwright Ionesco once said, "There has always been at every living moment of culture a will to renewal." Here in Bucharest, I see that will to renewal all around. I am reminded of the words of your hymn, once forbidden but never forgotten: "Wake up, Romanian." You have shown the world, and you have shown me here today, that Romania has awakened, awakened to democracy, awakened to freedom, awakened to security, awakened to your destiny. And because of you, the world has awakened to Romania. May the light of your freedom shine forever, and may God bless the Romanian people and the future of our two peoples together.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:25 p.m. in University Square. In his remarks, he referred to President Emil Constantinescu of Romania and student Semida Munteanu, who introduced the President. The transcript issued by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of President Constantinescu.

Exchange With Reporters in Bucharest
July 11, 1997

President's Visit

Q. What did you buy at the Peasant's Museum?

The President. I bought just a representative sample of the things that were there.

Q. What did you think of the reception?

The President. It was amazing. It was truly amazing. I can't imagine how many people were there, because there were people, when I drove up, in blocks that had been blocked off by the police, who were way back, weren't even visible from the stage. There were a lot of people there.

Q. Were you surprised by the warmth?

The President. Well, I was surprised by the size and intensity of the crowd. I knew that the Romanian people—my friend Mr. Moses here keeps me updated, and I knew that they were very friendly toward America. And keep in mind, they really did suffer more in the recent past than any other people under any of the other Communist governments—I mean, what they went through here to gain their liberty. You saw behind the stage today—the President and I were before the cross there, and that cross marks the place where people were actually killed when they threw off the previous government. So I think that the price they paid is very fresh in their minds.

Romania and NATO

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*].

The President. They're a very impressive people. And I do believe if they keep going, they'll make it, just like I said. They've just begun in the last year or so, and they have an enormous undertaking with their economy. But if you look at the rich resources and the fact that the people here are very well educated, I'd say they have an excellent chance, a really good chance.

Q. Did they express disappointment? Were they frustrated?

The President. Oh, I think of course they were disappointed. But I think they also—the leaders have managed this very well, and they talked very frankly to the people and said—well, you heard what the President said today. NATO is a part of their larger strategy. And as long as they see that we're all still on the same page with the larger strategy, that we want them integrated into the West, we want their democracy to flourish, we want their economy to do well, and that if they keep going the way they're going, they will certainly be qualified for NATO membership. And everybody—100 percent of us in Madrid agreed that one of the things that we wanted was to have some more membership from the southern flank, because of the problems that are likely to develop in this region in the years ahead.

Q. By NATO's test, where is their area needing greatest improvement, the economy?

The President. Well, I think for one thing, when a country assumes the responsibilities of membership, you want to be—[*inaudible*]—hopefully, would even be helpful because of the extra psychological boost it gives.

So Poland and the Czech Republic and Hungary, they've all been through that roller coaster that the economists call the J-curve, where you undertake the reforms, there's a drop in economic output, people suffer, they go through it, they bottom out, and then they start coming back. And they've been through that. So you don't want to impose on a country big, new external burdens while they're going through that. But on the other hand, you don't want to take away the hope that these people have waited decades for.

Martin Luther King, Jr., Assassination Investigation

Q. Mr. President, what do you think about the King bullets not matching the James Earl Ray rifle?

The President. I'm sorry, I don't know—you're the first person who's asked me that. I haven't been briefed about it.

Q. The test results show that the markings do not match.

The President. I'll review it.

NOTE: The exchange began at 7:06 p.m. at the Village Museum. In his remarks, the President referred to Alfred H. Moses, U.S. Ambassador to Romania. A reporter referred to convicted assassin James Earl Ray. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Excerpts From an Exchange With Reporters Aboard Air Force One
July 11, 1997

Visit to Romania

[*The President's remarks are joined in progress.*]

The President. ——but also, what if anything can be learned.

Q. When you looked down on that crowd, is it the same feeling you had in Ireland? Was it the same feeling you had in Ireland? Is it different?

The President. No, different but wonderful. In Ireland it was—you know, my feeling there was about what was then a very much alive peace process, involving the people from whence I came, and all the hope of peace between two warring factions. You know, what I saw today was different, which is, this was the country which in the end of the Communist era was the most depressed. I mean, they never went through anything like Stalin's purges where he killed millions, but at the end of the Communist era, they were the most depressed. And to see the passion they have for their freedom and the way they honor the people who stood up for it in that square and the feeling they have about America, even though they know quite well that it was our judgment that they shouldn't come into the first tranche of NATO, I mean, it was overwhelming.

And you know, these people, too—keep in mind, it's not like Poland, where Poland was—and I'm not denigrating—but Poland is now the success story of the former Communist countries. And 3 years ago, we didn't do a public event in Poland; I don't know how many people would have been there. I can't say. But the point is, Romania is now where Poland was 3 years ago, maybe even longer, economically. They're still getting—what I said in my speech today—they're still going through the painful transition, the growing pains of going through a market economy where their economy is not growing. And they still came out to say, you know—that was an enormous expression of national conviction and self-confidence. I mean, they were confident. You know, those people, you don't—100,000 people don't show up and stand in the sun unless they believe in what they're doing, unless they believe in themselves and their future and they believe they can keep going and they can weather this storm.

You know, it was an extraordinary thing to see people who are having those kinds of economic difficulties believing they can come out of them, having no doubt that they can be full partners in the Western alliance, showing—they're also—I think Romania deserves a lot of credit. I mean, it is a Balkan country, and they just basically made a deal with the Hungarians and put them in the government to solve their border disputes, their problems with Ukraine and Hungary, which required enormous self-restraint, you know, because a lot of what is now in Moldova—Moldavia—and Ukraine was once a part of Romania. This is a country that has really, in a matter of months, just blossomed and is thinking about itself in terms of the future in ways that, of course, you know, I believe everybody said—so I'm thrilled.

Q. That's policy. But on a personal level, do you ever get used to 100,000 people hearing you?

The President. No. I mean, personally, what I thought there—that this was—the three biggest crowds I believe I've had since I've been President, I believe—we were just talking about it—were this one, Dublin, and Berlin. There were probably 100,000 people when I was the first President to speak on the east side of the Brandenburg Gate. Of course, in Dublin and here, I'm much more involved in the events. There, I was going to ratify what others had done, in effect, what the Germans and others had done. But in each case, to me—on a personal basis, I thought, this is not me, this is the United States. This is what people think of America, and this is a tribute to what we have stood for, what we have worked for. And the other thing I thought was, this is an enormous responsibility. No other country could draw this sort of response at this moment in time.

[*At this point, a portion of the exchange was omitted from the transcript.*]

"Mars Pathfinder" Spacecraft

The President. I just had to keep watching. No, right after the landing and they brought me the first pictures, color pictures of the vehicle there, still in sort of its thing, it was just

exhilarating. And now, you know, everywhere I am I turn on—and last night I was dying to go to sleep, and there was this Polish language—well, I mean the Polish was sort of dubbed over the English and all the pictures, and I couldn't hear the English. I couldn't turn it off. I could not turn it off. I just had to keep watching it.

Q. It's making more headlines than the trip, sir.

The President. It's just thrilling, isn't it?

Q. But it did make history in press relations. It's the first time a President of the United States has been asked, "What do you hear from Mars?" and actually answered the question. [*Laughter*]

The President. I know it.

Q. Well, John Glenn wants to go.

The President. Yes, I think it would be a great thing. And I do think the argument that he could be helpful in analyzing not only the effects of space travel on a normal person but also what, if anything, could be learned about weightlessness and that sustained experience that might help us back home to deal with the increasing health challenges of our aging population, I think all that's really important.

Q. It could be ironic because it was President Kennedy's order——

[*A portion of the exchange was omitted from the transcript.*]

Prime Minister Jean Chretien of Canada

Q. [*Inaudible*]—Mr. Chretien. [*Laughter*]

The President. Yes. You know, look, first of all, he is a superior human being; he is a very fine man. And he's a great leader, and he has been a fabulous ally of ours in Bosnia, in Haiti where they're carrying most of the load now, in many different ways. And we have no more strong ally. You know, this is just not going to bother me. I'm just not going to let this be static on our radar screen. We can't afford to do it. There's too much between our two countries. That's the most important thing. And there's too much between us personally. You've got to blow something like that off.

Q. Is it a basic rule of politics that you should always assume microphones are on?

The President. Yes. But you know, you remember when that happened to President Reagan when he was doing the radio address?

Q. "We start bombing in 10 minutes"?

The President. It's happened to me before. It happened to me in '92, do you remember?

Q. Yes—Jesse Jackson.

The President. I had a particularly embarrassing incident in '92. It happened to other people in the primary in '92 were with me. If you do this business long enough and you operate under enough pressure and you have enough short nights where you don't get enough sleep, you're going to say something to somebody you wish you hadn't said that will wind up being a public statement. If you do it long enough, it's going to happen to everybody. And it's just not a big deal to me. He's a terrific human being and a great leader, and they're our great ally.

Q. But you are going to beat him on the golf course?

The President. Yes, I will try to get even on the golf course. The last time—the last two times I've played with him, I didn't play very well, and I haven't beat him like I should. So I'm going to try to do better next time.

[*A portion of the exchange was omitted from the transcript.*]

Assassination Investigations

Q. [*Inaudible*]—instruct them how we can—[*inaudible*]?

The President. First of all, I'm very interested in this, but I literally know nothing about it. All I know is what you said to me in your question. So I need to get back and really study it because obviously I'm very interested in it, not only from a forensic point of view but just because the assassination of Martin Luther King was one of the most traumatic events of my youth. I remember it like it was yesterday—April 4, 1968.

Q. Do you think Oswald killed Kennedy?

The President. Yes.

Q. You've read the report, and you believe it?

The President. I'm satisfied that they did a pretty good job on that. They did a good job. I think they——

Q. Why do you think Ruby killed Oswald? Why do you think Ruby then killed Oswald? Did they want to shut him up?

The President. I don't know.

[*A portion of the exchange was omitted from the transcript.*]

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, can I ask—[*inaudible*]?

The President. No, no—the statement we put out is the truth. There were sealed indictments; these guys were indicted. And they were within the SFOR mandate; that is, they were in regular contact with SFOR soldiers. And so they almost—in the British sector they felt they had an obligation to try to apprehend them because they were in regular contact with them. And we agreed to help because of the need, because there were—you know, because there could be problems and we had to get them out and get them to The Hague as soon as possible.

Q. Mr. President, I think we're trying to figure out is whether it's that circumstance or a conscious decision to change—[*inaudible*].

The President. Well, if you look at the statement, I don't think that's so much—let me say, if you look at the statement made by the foreign ministers at Sintra and if you look at the statement that came out of the Group of Eight and the NATO meeting itself, the statement we issued, we basically believe that we have to make an effort to save the Dayton process.

And there are lots of elements in the Dayton process. This one obviously is, at the moment, the most compelling, especially since unfortunately the man fired on the troops and therefore was killed. But if you go back over this, there are several elements to Dayton. There's what we now call SFOR and its predecessor. There's local police, train local police. There's municipal elections. There's setting up the shared institutions. There's the arms controls provisions. There's the infrastructure. And then there's the economic development. I think that's all—there are basically eight separate elements. And what we admitted to ourselves—and one of the most interesting things at the Group of Eight was that because SFOR was keeping anything bad from happening, if you will, there was too much focus being given to what happens in June of '88 and too little focus being given to each of these other elements.

So I think it would be a fair conclusion for you to draw that we made a commitment in each of these places—the Sintra meeting, the NATO meeting, the G–8—that every element should be given greater attention.

We also got a new guy in there on the civilian side, Westendorp, and with a very aggressive American aide named Klein we think a lot of; he did a good job in Eastern Slavonia. And we have a very competent NATO Secretary General in Solana. And we're about—and a commander, George Joulwan, who's been great, is about to leave and be replaced by Wes Clark, who was our military man when Dayton was negotiated.

Q. Are you going to talk—[*inaudible*]?

The President. He's doing what he should be doing. He is——

Q. [*Inaudible*]—General Joulwan?

The President. Yes, I know. He wants to retire.

Q. You can't talk him—did you try?

The President. No, I don't discuss that.

Q. I'm sorry. All right.

The President. But he is fabulous.

Press Secretary Mike McCurry. We've got to go.

Q. But wait, he didn't tell us what he thinks of the Berger——

Q. It is not a change in the mission. It is a determination to execute it more forcefully and more——

The President. It would be fair for you to conclude that we have decided we should try to save Dayton, and to save Dayton, all the elements had to be implemented. And that it's too easy for everybody involved to lean on SFOR as a crutch. But it also would be wrong to conclude that there was a decision to basically totally reform the mission. This was clearly within the mission.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. That's right. Properly read, this was plainly within our mission.

Q. Right.

Q. Are they under indictments?

The President. Yes. Yes, they are.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 8:35 p.m. aboard Air Force One en route to Copenhagen, Denmark. In his remarks, he referred to Senator John Glenn, a former astronaut; Bosnian Serb war crimes suspects Milan Kovacevic, who was apprehended, and Simo Drljaca, who was killed after firing on peacekeeping forces; Carlos Westendorp, High Representative, and Jacques Klein, Principal Deputy High Representative, for Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina; NATO Secretary General Javier Solana; and Gen. George A. Joulwan, USA,

and Gen. Wesley K. Clark, USA, outgoing and incoming Supreme Allied Commanders, Europe, respectively. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on the Situation in Cambodia
July 11, 1997

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

Political animosity between Cambodia's Co-Prime Ministers, Prince Ranariddh and Hun Sen, erupted into armed clashes on July 5. Hun Sen, in what he claimed was a preemptive move, acted to disarm forces loyal to Ranariddh in Phnom Penh. Although Hun Sen has outwardly maintained the coalition government, he intends to replace Ranariddh as Co-Prime Minister. After fighting between the rival forces over a wide area of Phnom Penh on the weekend, an uneasy calm has been restored in the capital. No Americans were killed or wounded. Danger remains in Cambodia from increased criminal activity and military mop-up operations (including extralegal arrests) since July 5, and living conditions have deteriorated due to extensive damage sustained during the fighting. The principal area of concern is now the northwest part of the country where elements of the armed forces led by commanders still loyal to Ranariddh are resisting forces loyal to Hun Sen. The potential exists for armed clashes between contending units. U.S. citizens are not the targets of any of the contending forces, but substantial danger exists to the civilian population and any foreign residents or visitors in those regions, principally the northwest, where clashes are likely to occur.

On July 9, 1997, the State Department ordered a drawdown of official American personnel to a minimal staff of 20 persons, and recommended that private American citizens in Cambodia should leave. The departures are being accomplished, safely so far, through commercial air. If the security situation deteriorates, however, that option might quickly become unavailable.

On July 10, 1997, a Joint Task Force of approximately 550 U.S. military personnel from the U.S. Pacific Command and the United States began deploying to establish an intermediate staging base at Utapao Air Base, Thailand. These forces will stage for possible emergency noncombatant evacuation operations in Cambodia, establish communications, and conduct contingency planning. These actions will enhance the ability of the United States to ensure the security of between 1,200 to 1,400 American citizens in Cambodia if an evacuation should become necessary.

The Joint Task Force includes a forward headquarters element, fixed-wing and rotary aircraft, airport control and support equipment, and medical and security personnel and equipment.

The U.S. forces primarily come from elements of the U.S. Pacific Command; other elements are U.S. based units. All the armed services are represented. Although U.S. forces are equipped for combat, this movement is being undertaken solely for the purpose of preparing to protect American citizens and property in the event that such becomes necessary. U.S. forces will redeploy as soon as an evacuation is determined to be unnecessary or, if necessary, is completed.

I have taken this action pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution. I appreciate the support of the Congress in this action to prepare to protect American citizens in Cambodia.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 11, 1997.

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 12.

The President's Radio Address
July 12, 1997

Good morning. I'm speaking to you from Copenhagen, Denmark, on the last day of what has been an historic week in Europe. For nearly 50 years, the NATO alliance has kept America and Western Europe secure in its peace. This week, we made NATO stronger to help keep America and all of Europe secure and at peace for the next 50 years by preparing NATO to take on new security challenges, reaching out to new partners like Russia and Ukraine, and inviting in new members, starting with Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic.

Enlarging NATO will not be cost-free, but it will cost far less in lives and money to broaden our alliance than to fight another war in Europe. These new members will add to NATO's strength. Membership will help them lock in democracy and free markets. Their example will encourage other new democracies in Central Europe to stay on the path of reform and settle the kinds of disputes that have sparked two World Wars. And enlarging NATO will help to erase the artificial line drawn by Stalin that has divided Europe for nearly 50 years.

Next year, I will ask the Senate to ratify changes to the NATO treaty so that we can welcome in the first new members by 1999. This is a serious step. It requires a full discussion I intend to lead with the American people. I firmly believe enlarging NATO is in America's interest. The countries we want to add to NATO are ready to help us defend freedom because they know the price of losing freedom.

My trip to Europe has been about building American security for the 21st century. In the weeks to come, we have an opportunity at home to better prepare our families for that 21st century, to build greater security from the inside out. Our expanding economy and declining deficit provide us the chance both to balance the budget and to give the middle class a responsible tax cut targeted to education, children, and families. Today I want to discuss the right way and the wrong way to cut taxes.

When I became President, our economy was stagnant, with high unemployment, low job growth, and an out-of-control deficit. In 1993 we put in place a new economic strategy—what I call invest-and-grow economics—a strategy to prepare our people for the 21st century. It had three principal elements. First, we reduced the deficit, which led to lower interest rates and greater investment. Second, we invested in education, training, and technology and made special efforts for high unemployment areas so that all our people can reap the rewards of growth. And third, we've worked hard to make the global economy work for us, tearing down foreign barriers and opening new markets to American products.

Four years later, our economic strategy is working. The deficit has fallen by over 77 percent. More than 12 million jobs have been created. And millions of Americans who once were dependent on welfare now have the dignity and security of the paycheck. Exports have surged to a record level. Unemployment is the lowest in 24 years, inflation the lowest in 30 years. We've had the biggest drop in inequality among working families in 27 years.

Our prosperity is real. It's based on investment, not debt. More Americans than ever are living the American dream of a good job, a home of their own, a better life for their children. This progress was not predestined; it was earned with the right strategy and the right choices, including tough budget cuts. And while we can be pleased with our progress, we can do better, and we must, because our work is not finished.

First, we must finish the job of balancing the budget. I'm pleased that our balanced budget agreement, which is in balance with our values as it invests in education, science and technology, research, and health care for our children, is moving through Congress with strong majorities in both parties. The balanced budget plan also sets aside funds for a tax cut. If done properly, the tax cut will increase economic growth, help working families to improve their lives and educate their children, and enable us to keep the budget in balance, unlike the tax cuts of the early 1980's, which increased our deficit by 4 times and crippled our economy.

That kind of good tax cut is the one our balanced budget agreement promised the American people in quite specific terms. Unfortunately, the tax plan recommended by the Congress offers too little relief to the middle class and fails to live up to the budget agreement.

Before I left for Europe I put forward my own tax cut plan, which I believe is the right one for America. It focuses on higher education—the key to opportunity in the new economy—with $35 billion in tax cuts, as called for in the budget agreement, with the biggest increase in college aid since the GI bill 50 years ago. The congressional plan would deny 7 million students tuition tax credits. And Congress' plan gives families little help to pay for the last 2 years of college or graduate school or training throughout a career. My tax cut will keep the budget balanced. But tucked away in the congressional plan are time-bomb tax cuts that risk exploding the deficit in years to come.

My tax cut plan will give families a $500-per-child tax credit. The congressional plan denies the child credit to up to 4.8 million families who make less than $30,000 a year. But these families work hard, pay their taxes, and play by the rules. They're teachers, firefighters, nurses, maybe your neighbors. They deserve a tax cut, too.

I was pleased that the Senate Democratic caucus this week wrote me in support of my tax cut plan. We will stand together to make sure a tax cut reflects the priorities I have set out and the ones agreed to by the leaders of both parties in the balanced budget agreement.

I'm determined that our tax cut, like the rest of the balanced budget, honors our values and values our families. The tax cut must be fair, giving middle class families the help they need to raise their children, send them to college, buy and sell a home. It must not contain provisions which will lead to big budget deficits in years to come.

This is the kind of tax cut I'm coming home to work with Congress to pass. The hard work and hard choices of the American people have given us a chance to enter the new century strong and vibrant and optimistic. If we stand firm for the right principles, if we stick to a strategy that has secured our prosperity—invest and grow—we can prepare our people for the bright new century ahead.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 11 a.m. on July 12 at the U.S. Embassy in Copenhagen, Denmark, for broadcast in the United States at 10:06 a.m. on July 12.

Remarks at a Luncheon Hosted by Queen Margrethe II in Copenhagen, Denmark

July 12, 1997

Your Majesty and members of the royal family, Mr. Prime Minister, members of the Danish Government, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you, Your Majesty, for your kind words and your gracious welcome. You have reminded us that the friendliness of Denmark's people is matched by the warmth of its sovereign. On behalf of our delegation, I thank you for your wonderful hospitality. We feel very much at home.

The United States has had uninterrupted ties with Denmark longer than with any other country. And our nations have never been closer than today. On almost every issue, we stand together. And on some of the most important issues, we stand together almost alone. [*Laughter*] But still, America always knows it is on the right side if Denmark is by our side. [*Laughter*]

Thanks in part to this extraordinary friendship, we have together made history this week. We invited Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary to join NATO. We opened the door to all of Europe's new democracies. We made a great stride toward creating a peaceful, undivided, and democratic Europe for the first time since the emergence of nation-states on this continent.

At this moment, however, I would speak not only about how America and Denmark have enlarged NATO but about how Denmark has enlarged and enriched America. In a literal sense, of course, without Denmark, America would

have been much smaller because it was a Danish explorer, Vitus Bering, who found Alaska for us, although I suppose we would have eventually stumbled on it on our own. [*Laughter*] Peter Larsen, a blacksmith from this city, blazed a trail from Missouri to California in 1839, leading the way for countless settlers who followed. Half a century later, Jacob Riis taught us how the other half lives, enlarging the conscience of a nation and leaving us with a responsibility we have still not entirely fulfilled. President Theodore Roosevelt called Riis the best American he ever knew.

Danish-Americans have contributed in every way to America's greatness. I'm proud that two descendants of Danish immigrants have been members of my Cabinet. Mr. Prime Minister, you'll be interested to know that our Attorney General, Janet Reno, is a Rasmussen on her father's side. [*Laughter*] And Lloyd Bentsen, a truly outstanding United States Senator and my first Secretary of the Treasury, one of the architects of our economic progress, was a son of a Dane who came to the United States as a teenager—as he loves to remind us—as a stowaway on a ship. His father was 16 and starving in the hold of the ship after 3 days, and finally he concluded he had come too far to be thrown overboard, so he emerged and worked his way to our country. [*Laughter*]

Your Majesty, in the sons and daughters who came to our shores, Denmark has given America the most precious gifts. They came seeking new hope and new freedom. And now, through our partnership and our work together for a democratic and prosperous Europe, we can give their grandchildren in America, and all their families here in Denmark, new hope and new freedom in a new century. We are equal to that challenge together, and together, I am certain we will succeed.

So I now raise my glass and ask you to join me in a toast to Her Majesty, the Queen of Denmark, to the people of Denmark, and the extraordinary long and rich friendship between our two peoples.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:43 p.m. in Fredensborg Palace. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen of Denmark.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen of Denmark in Copenhagen

July 12, 1997

NATO and the Baltics

Q. Have you been—[*inaudible*]?

President Clinton. We've made a very clear statement that every democracy in Europe who wishes to join should be eligible to join at the appropriate time and that we will take regular reviews, the first one in 1999. And that applies to the Baltics as well as other countries. I must say that I want to thank the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister for taking the same position. We should remain open for business, if you will, for all, because we're trying to bring Europe together, including Russia and Ukraine and others, and that is our mission.

Q. Are they in a better position today than before the Madrid Summit—the Baltic countries?

President Clinton. I think they are, because it's the first time NATO has taken this public position, with the heads of governments saying we would be open to all. They've said it before, but in a different forum. So this is the first sort of public statement about our long-term plan over the next decade or two.

Denmark-U.S. Relations

Q. Will you—[*inaudible*]?

President Clinton. Sorry, I'm hard of hearing. Well, let me say, we have had a wonderful partnership with Denmark. It's been an unusual one, and I think we will continue our partnership.

President's Visit

Q. How do you like your visit?

President Clinton. I love it. You know, I was last here in 1969 as a poor student, and I had a wonderful time and I have never forgotten it. I've always wanted to come back. I only wish

I could stay longer, especially because it's so warm and the jazz festival is going on.

Prime Minister Rasmussen. We wish that too, President.

Q. How do you like the Danish hospitality?

President Clinton. I love it, don't you?

Q. Is this the first time you've been here?

President Clinton. Since 1969. I was here in December of 1969. I loved it then, and I like it now, a lot.

Q. Mr. President, is this a fitting end to a busy week?

President Clinton. It's a wonderful end to a busy week because we have had no stronger ally and freedom has had no stronger friend than Denmark over the last several years. Denmark has taken a leading role in NATO and is working for expansion and working for the resolution of our agreement with Russia and Ukraine and in Bosnia. Denmark has been with us in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Denmark has been in Albania, where we have not been. It is a remarkable country, and this is a fitting end of the week because this is the week in which together, we with our NATO allies, I believe went a very long way toward creating a Europe which will be free of war, which will have more freedom, and which will be undivided, really for the first time in its history.

Bosnia

Q. You know Congress has voted that you—we cease any operations or any participation in Bosnia after June 1998. Do you go along with that?

President Clinton. I believe the present operation will have run its course by then, and we'll have to discuss what, if any, involvement the United States should have there. I will say this. Our involvement there in the last—the SFOR operation, which is much, much reduced; we have fewer than half the troops we had there when we started. It's been much less expensive and much less hazardous to America than a resumption of full-scale war in Bosnia would be. So I think it's been a very good thing we've done, and I would hope the American people are very proud of it.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:52 p.m. in the Prime Minister's Office at Christianborg Palace. In his remarks, the President referred to Minister of Foreign Affairs Niels Helveg Petersen of Denmark. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks to the Citizens of Copenhagen
July 12, 1997

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Prime Minister and Lone and Madam Vice Prime Minister and Mr. Jelved, Lord Mayor, Madam Chair of the Council. Ladies and gentlemen of Denmark, thank you for the wonderful welcome. I would also like to express my thanks for all of those who entertained you with music before we began. Thank you all very much.

Let me say I am delighted to be the first sitting American President ever to visit Denmark. I had planned to come earlier, as some of you know, but I injured my leg. And I thank you for allowing me to wait until my leg healed, so the first sitting American President could also be a standing American President. [*Laughter*] When I first visited Copenhagen in 1969, I was just one student among many who were traveling here. But in all the years since, I have never forgotten the beauty of this city or the warmth of the Danish people. And it is very good to be back.

We gather today at the end of what will long be remembered as a week in which a new era of promise was launched for all Europe. It is the bond between our two nations and the bond of the alliance of all nations in the North Atlantic alliance that has brought us to this moment of hope and possibility at the dawn of a new century.

This week in Madrid, we adapted NATO to meet the new security challenges of the 21st century. They will face us all: ethnic hatreds, the weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, drug running, things that cross national borders. We invited three new nations from Central Europe to join NATO. We opened the door to all the

region's new democracies. We forged closer ties with our partners throughout the continent. Together we have now moved closer to realizing our 50-year-old dream: a Europe undivided, democratic, and at peace for the very first time since nation-states arose on this continent. And I thank the Government and the people of Denmark for their leadership in realizing this vision.

America's unbroken ties with the Kingdom of Denmark are the oldest we have with any nation in the world. The American people have benefited beyond measure, in the stories of Danish writers like Karen Blixen and Peter Hoeg; in the philosophy of Kierkegaard, who I am told once lived on this very square; in the fables of Hans Christian Andersen who teaches our children that emperors sometimes have no clothes but that ugly ducklings can turn into swans. [*Laughter*] It is said that every Dane has a relative in America. Today I can tell you, all Americans know they have a friend in Denmark.

Above all, I want to thank Denmark for the extraordinary example you have set for being a force for good far beyond your numbers. Denmark may be a small nation, but you are a very large reason why I believe we're on the verge of a great new age of possibility.

First, Denmark has been a pioneer in showing the world how a nation can succeed, both in creating a strong economy and a good society that provides opportunity for all its citizens and supports those in need, a society bound together by shared values and respect for real differences. We can all learn from your efforts to educate your people for a lifetime, to give them the tools necessary to make the most of their own lives in a time of global, economic, and technological change.

Second, you have shown us the power of a nation to act with compassion and humanity. During World War II, Denmark's rescue of its Jewish citizens from deportation and death camps set a standard for moral courage that will stir the hearts of free people forever.

Denmark has always made overcoming barriers a national mission, and that is the third point I want to make. A thousand years ago, your seafaring ancestors pushed back the barriers of the known world. You are still doing that. Just as Tycho Brahe mapped the structure of the heavens and Niels Bohr charted the inner workings of the atom, the Danish people time and time again reach beyond borders and go on.

Over the last half century, you have looked past the borders of this prosperous land and made the freedom and well-being of others your concern: leading the global effort to lift people out of poverty far away from here, standing up for human rights around the world, as the Prime Minister said, sometimes almost alone—standing against those who would practice terror against the innocent. Denmark provides more peacekeepers proportionally than any other nation in the entire world, and I hope you are all very proud of that.

You were among the first to heed Bosnia's call. Despite the loss of brave Danish soldiers while the war raged, you have never wavered. For your unshakable commitment to peace and for all you do, I have come here to say on behalf of the American people, we thank you.

Now we must draw on your example to finish the work of overcoming one of the greatest barriers of our time, the division of Europe. And this past week we have shown we can do it not by force of arms but by the power of peace. This week we have seen the face of the new Europe. In Madrid, during our NATO Summit, we saw 44 countries from all corners of the continent come together to forge a common future. We saw the most successful defensive alliance in history reach out its hand to new members and extend its hand to Ukraine and to Russia, now our partners in building a bright future.

We saw nations large and small, new democracies and old ones, join to clear away the debris of old blocs of nations to build new bonds of partnership. In Poland, one of three nations invited to join the alliance, we saw the joy of a people at last secure in their freedom and sure of their place in Europe, people who seized their moment and changed the course of their history and who now sound ready to guarantee a future of freedom to others. Yesterday in Bucharest, Romania, a nation we believe that will soon be ready to join our alliance, we saw the faces of a people—over 100,000 of them—who freed themselves from yesterday's tyranny and are just as determined to seize the promise of tomorrow.

I thank Denmark for rising to this moment; especially I thank you for reaching out to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, for helping them to

fortify their economies, to strengthen their democracies, to establish their Baltic Battalion, and to take their place in the new Europe. By bridging the expanse of the Baltic Sea, you helped to close a great gap in history.

Throughout the nations of our alliance, there is a Europe of visionary leaders with a profound sense of mission and a unity some said could not be sustained. NATO has succeeded beyond any expectations. Today, America is grateful to our 15 remarkable allies for their perseverance and friendship, for their leadership in turning the bloodiest continent of the 20th century into a continent free, undivided, at peace, and full of hope for the young people in this audience and far beyond these borders in the 21st century.

Today I ask all of you assembled here, throughout this land, across Europe, and in America, let us all keep freedom's bright light and advance the work of the extraordinary Atlantic community. Let us bring down the barriers to a better future for all people on this continent. Let us close history's divide. Let us create a 21st century of opportunity, security, peace, and freedom for the children of Denmark, Europe, and the United States. It can be the greatest time in all human history. We must follow your past example into the future.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4 p.m. in the Ny Torv Square. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Rasmussen's wife, Lone Dybkjaer; Vice Prime Minister and Minister for Economic Affairs Marianne Jelved and her husband, Jan; Jens Kramer Mikkelsen, Lord Mayor of Copenhagen; and Bodil Jensen, chair, Copenhagen City Council.

Statement on Northern Ireland
July 12, 1997

I welcome the decision of the Orange Order and its local lodges to voluntarily call off and reroute the contentious parades scheduled for this weekend. In choosing not to risk confrontation, the members of the Orange Order have taken a significant step. I hope that the people of both communities redouble their efforts to reach accommodation on other contentious parades in a spirit of good will and generosity and reject the inexcusable violence that we saw in Northern Ireland today.

The Orange Order's decision, and the warm welcome that has greeted it, confirm my conviction that the people of Northern Ireland want and deserve an end to violence and confrontation. The people of Northern Ireland have the United States' unwavering support to build on this moment of hope to seek a lasting settlement to the conflict that has divided them for far too long.

Remarks Announcing Proposed Legislation To Ban Discrimination Based on Genetic Screening
July 14, 1997

Thank you very much. You know, very often when I come into this room for an event like this, to stand up for a cause I believe in, by the time it's my turn to speak, there is nothing else to say. [*Laughter*] But that has never been more true than it is at this moment. Mary Jo, you were terrific, and we thank you. Thank you very much.

Secretary Shalala, Congresswoman Slaughter, Dr. Collins, the head of our genome project, Susan Blumenthal, the head of the Women's Health Office at HHS, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for being here.

I want to say a special word of thanks, too, to Congresswoman Louise Slaughter. Both our

families have known losses—and hers very recently—and we appreciate her being here. I love to hear Louise Slaughter talk with her beautiful southern accent. The first time I heard she was a Congresswoman from New York, I thought it was a misstatement. [*Laughter*] And from my point of view, she's the only Member of Congress from New York who speaks without an accent, and I like that. [*Laughter*]

The remarkable strides that we have seen in genetic research and testing are so important to every American family. Chances are, every family represented in this room in our lifetime will have a child, a grandchild, a cousin, a niece, a nephew somehow benefited from the work of the human genome project, which seemed nothing more than an intellectual dream just a few years ago. And one of the things that we have to do is to make sure that every American family has a chance to benefit from it.

Secretary Shalala's report which she has issued—it's a remarkable report; I commend it to all of you—makes it clear that the scope of this era of discovery is truly astonishing. We are literally unlocking the mysteries of the human body, finding new and unprecedented ways of discovering not only the propensity for it to break down in certain ways or lead to certain forms of disease or human behavior but also ways to prevent the worst consequences of our genetic structure.

And as with every kind of decision like this, there is always the possibility that what we learn can not only be used but can be misused. And in all of this era of scientific discovery, there is probably no greater promise for use or for misuse than in the area of genetic testing. Used in the right way, obviously it has the chances to save millions of lives and revolutionize health care. And I am proud of our aggressive support for the human genome project.

But it's also clear that it is wrong for insurance companies to use genetic information to deny coverage. It's happened before. It happened in the 1970's with some African-Americans who carried sickle cell anemia. And it can happen in many other ways. An enormous number—percentage of American women get breast cancer at some time during their lives. An enormous percentage of American men get prostate cancer at some time during their lives. There are other kinds of medical problems that occur with increasing frequency and that we'll see more and more as we grow older as a population.

And now we see the consequences already of this kind of discrimination. It's wrong when someone avoids taking a test that could save a life just because they're so afraid that the genetic information will be used against them. And too many women today fear that that will happen when they decide to test or to not be tested to see if they carry the gene for breast cancer.

Now, this kind of discrimination is—really it's more than wrong; it's a life-threatening abuse of a potentially life-saving discovery. And I can't help commenting that in the United States, it is a direct consequence of the fact that we are the only advanced country in the world that has chosen to finance the health care of our citizens through a private insurance system that is completely optional and does not cover everyone. So that to be fair, the insurance companies themselves face some dilemmas that can only be fixed by the law, by a restatement of the public interest, so that none are treated differently from others if they make the decision to do what is morally right. And I think that's important to point out. I tried to fix it once and took a lot of criticism, but I'm not—[*laughter*]—I'm not ashamed that I did. If I could fix it tomorrow, I would fix it tomorrow, because this is not right.

But we have done what we could to try to, step by step, change this structure. A year ago, we took the first step when Congress passed and I signed the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill, which prohibits group health plans from using genetic information to deny coverage. And today my administration is sending legislation to Congress that will ban all health plans, group and individual, from denying coverage or from raising premiums on the basis of genetic tests. It will prohibit all health plans from disclosing genetic information that could be misused by other insurers. But it will protect researchers' ability to make the best use of this vitally important tool.

It builds on the solid foundation of Congresswoman Slaughter and Senator Olympia Snowe's bill, and I'm pleased to say that Senator Frist from Tennessee and Senator Jeffords from Vermont have announced that they will share our commitment and they will work with us to pass bipartisan legislation to ban discrimination based on genetic tests.

This is an example of the step-by-step approach we are now taking that I will not be satisfied with until we have made sure that every American family has the health care they need to thrive. We've already ensured that a job change or an illness in the family doesn't mean automatically losing your health insurance. We've made it easier for self-employed people to buy health insurance for their families. The balanced budget agreement I have reached with the leaders of Congress, that was voted for in its outline by overwhelming majorities in both parties and both Houses, will extend care to millions and millions of uninsured children. It will ensure, as Secretary Shalala said, that more older women can have mammograms. It will protect Medicare and Medicaid.

But what we're here today to say is something very simple and yet profound. We cannot afford to let our progress either in science or in extending health care to the American people to be undermined by the misuse of what is a miracle of genetic testing. Americans should never have to choose between saving their health insurance and taking tests that could save their lives. With these efforts, we will ensure at least that no American ever has to make that choice again.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:55 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mary Jo Ellis Kahn, breast cancer survivor and member, National Action Plan on Breast Cancer; and Francis S. Collins, director, National Center for Human Genome Research.

Remarks Prior to a Meeting With Congressional Leaders and an Exchange With Reporters

July 15, 1997

The President. First of all, I want to welcome the congressional leadership here. I am glad to be back home. Last week was a truly historic week not only for NATO and Europe but for the United States. And the meeting we had in Madrid, I'm convinced, 50 years from now will be looked back on as a very wise decision to admit new members and take on new missions and establish new partnerships for NATO.

I want to say a special word of thanks to all who were responsible for the bipartisan delegation from both the Senate and House that went to the NATO meeting. And in particular, I'd like to thank Senator Roth, who is here, who was the chair of the delegation and who actually spoke to the North Atlantic Council and did a terrific job. So it was a very, very good thing.

Now that we're back here, I think that clearly the first order of business is to go on with the work of balancing the budget in a way that is consistent with the agreement we made and consistent with our strategy, since 1993,[1] of cutting what can be cut, investing in our people, and trying to grow this economy.

There are some I have heard since I've been gone who have argued that since the deficit has dropped dramatically, it will somehow disappear just if we leave the '93 plan in place and don't do anything else. I have to say that I emphatically disagree with that. It is true that the deficit has dropped more than we predicted it would in '93, and we're proud of that. But I think it is plainly wrong that, number one—Frank Raines told me just this morning that if we did nothing, it wouldn't—the budget would not balance.

Number two, let me be quite specific about the kind of agreement that we have reached here. This agreement has $900 billion in spending reduction over 10 years. It has entitlement reforms that have to be made, and even after that, there will be more to be done to try to save Medicare and the other entitlements over the long run. It pays for the biggest increase in education and children's health in over 30 years, which would not occur, I'm convinced, in the ordinary appropriations process. It pays

[1] White House correction.

for tax cuts, and we still have some disagreement about that, but I think we'll reach agreement on tax cuts that fund the education portion of the budget agreement. And I believe it should also give the children's tax credit to hard-pressed working families.

I think that we should be careful not to let the deficit explode. I think that we should—I hope that I can persuade the Congress to embrace the specific provisions relating to redevelopment of our urban areas and our poorest rural areas, because I think we have to change from the social service model for the poor inner cities to an economic development, growth, and private business model. So I hope we can do that. But the idea that we don't have to do anything, I think, is dead wrong.

The last thing I'd like to say is confidence in this economy keeps it growing and keeps people investing in it, and if we pass another budget agreement and it has credibility, we'll have more confidence, more investment, and we'll keep it going.

So I'm looking forward to this opportunity to work with the Members of Congress. And perhaps they would like to say a word or two, and then we'll answer a question or two.

Mr. Speaker, would you like to go first?

[*At this point, House Speaker Newt Gingrich made brief remarks.*]

The President. Senator?

[*Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott made brief remarks.*]

Q. Mr. President, why do you think—

The President. Just a minute.

Mr. Daschle?

[*Senate Minority Leader Thomas A. Daschle made brief remarks.*]

The President. Mr. Gephardt?

[*House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt made brief remarks.*]

Budget Agreement

Q. Mr. President, what do you think of the Republicans saying that your tax cuts fall short of the budget agreement, $20 billion or so?

The President. Well, as I understand, it has something to do with the calculation of whether someone who's getting the earned-income tax credit, if they got the child credit, would be getting a spending or a tax cut. But we'll work through all that.

I don't want to get into a big negotiation here; I can just say this. I think we ought to give a tax cut to the people making $22,000, $24,000, $25,000 a year who have children. They're still paying taxes quite—all these people—a majority of American taxpayers pay more in payroll taxes than they do in income taxes anyway these days. And I think we've just got to work together in good faith and try to find a way to work through it. I think we will.

Q. Mr. President, do you hope to leave the room today having convinced the Speaker and Leader Gephardt to embrace the Medicare changes that are in the Senate proposal, the age increase and the means testing?

The President. Well, as you know, on principle I support means testing. The House has spoken overwhelmingly on the age increase. The problem I have with the age increase is that one of the biggest difficulties we have today with Americans without health insurance are people who retire early at 55 and lose their employer-based health insurance and then, because they've had—they've been somewhat ill or had problems, can't get other health insurance until they qualify for Medicare. So if we're going to raise the age limit, we need to have some idea of how those people would be insured. And I don't know that we do now. That's been my problem with that.

But I would hope we can agree to some sort of a premium that's enforceable and that's fair and that doesn't drive people out of the Medicare system.

Q. Mr. President, will you explicitly tell the leadership here what might make you veto a tax cut bill, and do you want to tell us? [*Laughter*]

The President. Probably not. [*Laughter*] Look, I think—wait a minute—let me just say, we have lots of negotiating sessions. I have been very ably represented. I don't think I've ever had any better representation in any negotiations than our team has provided this time. And we're going to work through this.

But it does not serve the American people well if we explicitly and publicly turn this into the gunfight at the O.K. Corral. Now what we're trying to do is to find a way to work through our differences so we get a bill that they can all vote for and I can sign and we can celebrate for the country. And that's what we're trying

to do. We all have our bottom lines. They have their bottom lines; I have mine. And we're going to see if we can't reconcile them all and go forward. We're doing the best we can.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, are you worried about a possible Bosnian Serb backlash to the arrests of accused war criminals there, sir?

The President. Well, I'm concerned about it, of course I am. But the representatives of the Serbs signed the Dayton agreement as well. They signed the Dayton agreement, and the Dayton agreement says that if someone is charged with a war crime, they should be turned over and subject to trial. Now, they plainly—it also says that if the SFOR troops come in regular contact with those people that they can be arrested.

Now, they have clearly not complied with that provision of the Dayton agreement in terms they've made no effort to help us get any of these people. And so—but they have no call to take any retaliatory action, and it would be a grave mistake to do so.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:20 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House.

Remarks Announcing Steps To Make the Internet Family-Friendly
July 16, 1997

Thank you very much, Lois Jean, and thank you, Steve Case. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for all the work you've done on this issue. And to Secretary Daley, Commissioner Varney, Deputy Attorney General Waxman, and the Members of Congress who had to go for a vote, I thank all of you for your interest. And thank you, all of you, who come here from the various companies, who were part of the Vice President's meeting this morning, and from other interested groups.

I think it's fair to say that history will evaluate the Internet as having sparked a revolution in information perhaps every bit as profound as the printing press. For today, at the click of a mouse, children can tap into the resources of the Library of Congress, to a great museum, communicate with classrooms around the world. I am particularly proud to point out that the Internet allows us now to journey beyond the Earth. Just since July 4, NASA's *Mars Pathfinder* website has received more than 27 million visits. And we are very proud of that and proud of NASA.

But we all know and we've heard the horror stories about the inappropriate material for children that can be found on the Internet. We know children can be victimized over the Internet. After the Supreme Court struck down the portion of the Communications Decency Act last month affecting this as an abridgement of free speech, we brought together industry leaders and groups representing teachers, parents, librarians to discuss where to go next.

This morning there was a discussion that I believe can fairly be said to have reached a consensus about how to pave the way to a family-friendly Internet without paving over the constitutional guarantees of free speech and free expression. The plan has three components: new technologies, enforcement of existing laws, more active participation of parents.

As you have heard already, with regard to technology, the computer industry is developing a whole toolbox full of technologies that can do for the Internet what the V-chip will do for television. Some of the tools are already widely in use, as Steve said. They give parents the power to unlock and to lock the digital doors to objectionable content. Now we have to make these tools more readily available to all parents and all teachers in America. And as new tools come on-line, we have to distribute them quickly, and we have to make sure that parents are trained to use them.

In an extremely adroit use of language in our meeting earlier, one of the leaders said, "Well, Mr. President, you've talked about how technologically inept you are; perhaps you would be our guinea pig as each new thing comes along, and then we could certainly certify that if you can figure out how to use it, anybody can." [*Laughter*] And so I sort of volunteered. Having been damned with faint praise, I enjoyed that.

[*Laughter*] But I think it is important—it is important to know not only that things exist but that they are being used and that they can be used. So we had a little laugh about what is a very serious element of this whole endeavor.

Today several industry leaders are taking major steps in this direction. I'm pleased to announce first that Netscape Communications has committed to add family-friendly controls to the next release of its popular Internet browser. Parents who use the Netscape browser to explore the Internet will be able to tell the browser precisely what types of materials they do not wish their children to see. Microsoft, which also offers a popular Internet browser, has already incorporated this technology. Therefore, with Netscape's pledge today, we now have assurance that 90 percent of all software used to explore the Internet will have family-friendly controls built right in. It's also important to note that all of the major companies that offer Internet service now provide some form of family-friendly controls. And I commend all of them for that.

For these controls to work to their full potential, we also need to encourage every Internet site, whether or not it has material harmful for young people, to label its own content, as the Vice President described just a few moments ago. To help to speed the labeling process along, several Internet search engines—the Yellow Pages of cyberspace, if you will—will begin to ask that all websites label content when applying for a spot in their directories. I want to thank Yahoo!, Excite, and Lycos for this important commitment. You're helping greatly to assure that self-labeling will become the standard practice. And that must be our objective.

Beyond technology, we must have strict enforcement of existing laws, the antistalking, child pornography, and obscenity laws as they apply to cyberspace. In the past 3 months alone, the FBI has expanded by 50 percent the staff committed to investigating computer-related exploitation of minors and established a task force to target computer child pornography and solicitation. In the past 6 months, the Department of Justice has increased the number of lawyers working in its Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section by 50 percent. We simply must not allow pornographers and pedophiles to exploit a wonderful medium to abuse our children.

And finally, we must recognize that in the end, the responsibility for our children's safety will rest largely with their parents. Cutting-edge technology and criminal prosecutions cannot substitute for responsible mothers and fathers. Parents must make the commitment to sit down with their children and learn together about the benefits and challenges of the Internet. And parents, now that the tools are available, will have to take upon themselves the responsibility of figuring out how to use them. I think it's fair to say that all parents will likely lag behind their children in facility on the Internet, but at least if we understand the tools that are available, it will be possible to do the responsible and correct thing.

Thanks to the talents, to the creativity, to the commitments of so many of you assembled today, we have now, therefore, a roadmap toward constructive steps for a family-friendly Internet. There is still a lot to do. Parent groups and educators must work to help hone our labeling systems so that they will actually screen out materials we don't want our children to see and, as others have said today, with equal energy help to highlight the materials that serve our children best. That is very, very important.

The Internet community must work to make these labels as common as food safety labels are today, to continue to expand access to family-friendly tools, including software to protect children's privacy from unscrupulous vendors. With a combination of technology, law enforcement, and parental responsibilities, we have the best chance to ensure that the Internet will be both safe for our children and the greatest educational resource we have ever known. And that is our common commitment, and for that, I thank you all very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:45 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Lois Jean White, president, National Parent Teacher Association, and Steven Case, president, America Online.

Statement on Action on Title III of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996

July 16, 1997

Today I am notifying the Congress of my decision to suspend for 6 more months the right of U.S. citizens to file suit against foreign firms trafficking in confiscated properties in Cuba. This decision is consistent with my strong commitment to implement the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act (LIBERTAD Act) in a way that best serves our national interest and hastens a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba.

I have invoked this waiver for the past year in order to continue strengthening cooperation with our friends and allies toward our shared goal of ending Cuba's 38 years of oppression. Thanks to the efforts of Stuart Eizenstat—my Special Representative for the Promotion of Democracy in Cuba and now Under Secretary of State—we have made significant progress. We are forging an international consensus on concrete steps to clear the way for a new era of democracy and prosperity for the people of Cuba.

I said in January that I expected to continue suspending this provision of title III of the LIBERTAD Act so long as our partners continued their stepped-up efforts to promote a democratic transition in Cuba. My decision today to renew the suspension reflects the sustained progress that has been made over the past 6 months and my expectation of further advances in the future. Just 2 weeks ago, the European Union (EU) formally renewed its commitment to the historic Common Position it adopted last December. This agreement binds all 15 EU member nations to make any improvement in relations with Cuba dependent on concrete advances in human rights and political freedoms on the island. EU member states have broadened their contacts with human rights activists and independent groups in Cuba. Furthermore, after careful consultation with the Congress, the United States and the EU reached an understanding on April 11 to develop international disciplines to inhibit and deter the acquisition of confiscated properties or any dealings involving them.

Key countries in Europe and, increasingly, Central and South America have made clear that they are no longer conducting "business as usual" with the Castro government. Instead, their leaders are pressing for the release of political prisoners, free elections, economic reform, and other measures that will help the Cuban people achieve the fundamental political and economic freedoms they deserve. Major European political parties met in The Netherlands for the first time to promote freedom and human rights in Cuba and issued a strong declaration urging Castro to democratize Cuba.

Nongovernmental organizations (NGO's) have also risen to the challenge. European NGO's have made pathbreaking strides to increase international support for change in Cuba and provided unprecedented support to prodemocracy activists on the island. Business and labor groups are formulating "best business" practices for firms investing in Cuba. While the United States discourages investment in Cuba, we hope that those who do invest there will foster respect for basic workers' rights and improvements in working conditions.

We have continued to enforce vigorously title IV of the LIBERTAD Act, denying entrance into the U.S to directors of several foreign firms that traffic in confiscated properties in Cuba. As a result, several firms have withdrawn from investments and contracts in Cuba and are reassessing future investments. The United States will continue enforcing title IV during the negotiations of binding international disciplines as called for in the U.S.–EU understanding. The administration will consult further with the Congress concerning authority to waive title IV if the investment guidelines have been agreed upon and implemented.

We are making real progress in strengthening the international effort to bring democracy to Cuba. The Cuban people and the Castro regime hear the message more clearly than ever. The international community is committed to seeing freedom reach Cuba's shores and the Cuban people assume their rightful place in the family of democratic nations.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Title III of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996
July 16, 1997

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Pursuant to subsection 306(c)(2) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–114), (the "Act"), I hereby determine and report to the Congress that suspension for 6 months beyond August 1, 1997, of the right to bring an action under title III of the Act is necessary to the national interests of the United States and will expedite a transition to democracy in Cuba.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

July 16, 1997.

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Jesse Helms, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Ted Stevens, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations; Benjamin A. Gilman, chairman, House Committee on International Relations; and Robert L. Livingston, chairman, House Committee on Appropriations.

Statement on the Resignation of Walter Dellinger as Solicitor General
July 16, 1997

With deep regret, I accept the resignation of Walter Dellinger as Solicitor General. Walter Dellinger has been an outstanding advocate for the American people. He has fought tirelessly and courageously for the rights of all Americans. He has represented this country in some of the most important cases ever decided by the United States Supreme Court, and in each case, worked hard to assure that the Court understood the national interest and not just the particular interests of the selected few. Walter is one of Nation's most brilliant constitutional scholars, and I know his students are delighted that he will return to teaching. But we will miss his talent, his leadership, his energy, and his sense of justice.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the China-United States Fisheries Agreement
July 16, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the People's Republic of China Extending the Agreement of July 23, 1985, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States, with Annexes and Agreed Minutes, as amended and extended. This Agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Beijing on June 6 and July 1, 1996, extends the 1985 Agreement to July 1, 1998.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the People's Republic of China, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this Agreement at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

July 16, 1997.

Remarks Announcing the Nomination of General Henry H. Shelton To Be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and an Exchange With Reporters

July 17, 1997

The President. Good morning. Mr. Vice President, Secretary Cohen, National Security Adviser Berger, General Shalikashvili, members of the Joint Chiefs, General and Mrs. Shelton. Let me begin by saying that it has been my great honor for these last 4 years to work with General John Shalikashvili as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. When he departs at the end of September for his return to civilian life, he will have spent nearly four decades standing up for our interests and our ideals. At a later time I will have more to say about Shali's extraordinary service to our Nation, but today I have to thank him on behalf of the American people and the President. He has done a magnificent job. We thank you, sir.

Gen. John M. Shalikashvili. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. I also want to thank Vice Chairman General Ralston, the Joint Chiefs, the other commanders in chief for all they have done and will do working with Secretary Cohen to ensure that we continue to have the finest military in the world and that America remains the world's greatest force for peace, security, and freedom.

Today I am pleased to announce my decision to nominate General Hugh Shelton as the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Over more than three decades of service to our Nation, he has distinguished himself as a decorated soldier, an innovative thinker, a superb commander. From Vietnam to Desert Storm, he has proven his skill and courage in combat, and through long experiences in special operations, he also brings to this job a unique perspective in addressing the broad range of challenges we face on the brink of a new century, from warfighting to peacekeeping, from conventional threats to newer threats like the spread of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism.

General Shelton's extensive experience in joint military operations and building coalitions with other nations give him invaluable tools to serve as Chairman in our more interdependent world. Many of you recall his skill and professionalism in Operation Uphold Democracy, which restored hope and freedom to Haiti. As the Commanding General of the 18th Airborne Corps, General Shelton played a decisive role in planning the operation. As joint task force commander, he oversaw our last-second shift from a forced entry to a peaceful arrival. And as the first commander of the U.S.-led multinational force in Haiti, his qualities personified the best of America, strong and skillful with great sensitivity and no nonsense. Our mission in Haiti was a model of effectiveness, flexibility, and safety. It proved that our military's will to defend peace is as great as its ability to prevail in war. And thanks in large measure to General Shelton's determined leadership, America got a tough job done and helped the people of Haiti return to democracy's road.

Most important, General Shelton has always shown an exceptional concern for the men and women under his command. Their safety and well-being are his number one priority in times of peace as well as war. He's led a platoon, a company, a battalion, a brigade, a division, a corps, a unified command. But he always remembers the individual soldier, sailor, airman, or marine. General Shelton has the knowledge, judgment, and experience to advise Secretary Cohen and me on the very best way to defend our interests and to protect our men and women in uniform. I believe he is the right person for the job, the right person for our troops, for our security, the right man for our country, and I'm proud to nominate him to help to lead our military into the 21st century.

General.

[*At this point, General Shelton made brief remarks.*]

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, one of the great situations facing any new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is whether or not the troops will be coming home from Bosnia next summer as scheduled. Could you perhaps clarify your position on this? The American people really I think would like to know this.

The President. We expect the SFOR mission to end on schedule, as we have repeatedly said. We also know that there will be continuing work

that has to be done in virtually every area of the Dayton accords. The question of what, if any, role should be pursued by NATO after that in a different way and to what extent we should be a part of it has simply not been decided yet. But I think it's fair to say that none of us want to see Bosnia revert to what happened before we started this, and none of us want to see the extraordinary efforts which had to be made by the United States and our allies in NATO have to be made all over again a few years from now because Bosnia goes back into war and we all watch the same horrible, horrible scenes on television that we went through once.

We have been able to pursue our mission there with an ever more reduced presence. Today, the United States forces, I think, are about 25 percent of the total number there, with a remarkable amount of effectiveness and with virtually no casualties, as you know. There was a stabbing yesterday, but we have no conclusive evidence that it was related in any way to the arrest of the people who are wanted for trial on war crimes.

"Mir" Space Station

Q. [*Inaudible*]—the *Mir* critical now, and are you giving second thoughts to ever sending another American to be on the *Mir* spacecraft?

The President. Well, when I came to the office this morning I got a briefing about it, and as far as we know right now, they have gotten control of things and there seems to be no immediate crisis. But I have no—I'm not sure that I have all the information I need. We have the—that's the basic report I have now, and it's too soon after the incident for me to draw a conclusion about the question you ask. I can't say that we would not continue cooperation based on what little I've heard this morning; I just don't know enough.

TWA Flight 800 Tragedy

Q. Mr. President, on this anniversary of the TWA Flight 800 disaster, are you disappointed that a solution has not been found to what caused the crash, and what efforts do you think need to be redoubled in order to find a solution?

The President. Of course I'm disappointed that we don't conclusively know, but I'm not sure what else we can do. This is an issue that I have had a great deal of personal interest in. The Vice President, who as you know has done an enormous amount of work on our behalf for airline safety, has spent a lot of time on. I don't know what else we can do. If anybody has any ideas about what else we can do to try to definitively put this issue behind us, I would be happy to explore them. But it's been a very frustrating experience for me not to be able to know 100 percent what caused that crash.

Q. There are some who say——

Boeing-McDonnell Douglas Merger

Q. Are you determined to make sure the Boeing-McDonnell Douglas deal goes through even if it means a trade war with Europe?

The President. Let me say I'm concerned about what appear to be the reasons for the objection to the Boeing-McDonnell Douglas merger by the European Union, and I think that it would be unfortunate if we had a trade standoff with them. But we have a system for managing this through the World Trade Organization, and we have some options ourselves when actions are taken by Europe in this regard. I don't know that Airbus—the Europeans have more people living on their continent than we do in the United States, and I don't believe Airbus has an effective competitor in Europe. So I have mixed—quite a lot of concern about what the Europeans have said. But I think there is an orderly process for our handling this, and I think we had better let the orderly process play itself out before we talk ourselves into a trade war. I think we're a long way from that, and I think we'll probably avoid it.

Thank you very much.

Joint Chiefs of Staff Nomination

Q. Do you have any reason to believe that General Shelton will survive confirmation, Mr. President?

The President. Yes. I think—I have reason to believe that General Shelton can survive just about anything.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:55 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to General Shelton's wife, Carolyn.

Remarks to the NAACP National Convention in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
July 17, 1997

Thank you very much. First, let me thank all of you for that warm welcome and for what you do. I thank Myrlie Evers-Williams for the wonderful comments she made and for the distinguished service she has performed as your chair. And I thank your president of the united NAACP. That was pretty good, Madam Mistress of Ceremonies, you did a good job. [*Laughter*]

Let me say that when Kweisi called me and told me he has going to leave the Congress to become president of the NAACP, I had very mixed feelings. I felt a little bereft. I don't like it when a great Member of Congress leaves. But I thought it was a higher calling, and my instinct, it was—it would be a good thing for him and for our country. And I think it has certainly proved to be. And I thank him for that.

Of the many things that I have to be grateful for, I thank you for the extraordinary effort you've made to bring young people into the NAACP. I think that is a great, great thing.

I'm glad to be joined here by the mayor of Pittsburgh, my good friend Tom Murphy. And I'm glad to see all the board members. I have many friends on this board. Bishop Graves is my bishop, and if they let me go home, I'll be in his jurisdiction again. And I know that—I've been looking for them out of my eye, but I know there must be a delegation from Arkansas here, Dale Charles and the others. Where are you? Where are my people from home there? Thank you very much.

I want to thank you for honoring a number of the people that you have honored here. And I'm especially grateful for your giving meritory service awards to two members of my Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Fogelman and Admiral Kramek, the Commandant of the Coast Guard. Thank you for that.

I know you have undergone some losses. And our grief goes out to you in the untimely death of the president of the Maryland chapter, Mr. Norment, who was killed shortly before this convention. I thank you for honoring Dr. Betty Shabazz, a wonderful, remarkable woman. And I thank you for the resolution you passed just a few moments ago for Aaron Henry, who was a longtime personal friend of mine and a very great man.

I am joined today by a distinguished array of people from the administration, the Secretary of Education, Dick Riley; the Secretary of Labor, Alexis Herman—[*applause*]—I know you know them. The Chairman of our Advisory Board on Race Relations and our Executive Director, Dr. John Hope Franklin and Judy Winston, they're here. And there are a number of other people from the White House here. I'd just like to ask all the people from the administration who are here to stand up and be recognized, including—I see Chris Edley, who is helping us at the Advisory Board who is now a professor at Harvard. He doesn't fool with us mere mortals anymore. And Terry Edmonds, my speechwriter; Maria Echaveste; Minyon Moore; Ben Johnson; Sylvia Mathews—there are a lot of people here from the administration. You all stand up and be recognized here. Look at all of them. [*Applause*] Anything good I do, they had a hand in. The mistakes are mine. [*Laughter*]

I am honored to be here to add my voice to yours in discussing what we have to do to prepare our people for this new century. Since 1993 I have worked hard to build one America on a simple formula: opportunity for all, responsibility from all, a community of all Americans prepared to continue to lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity. Much has been done, but much remains to be done.

I believe, especially as it relates to bringing us together, the keys are education, economic empowerment, and racial reconciliation. It is fitting that the NAACP has made education the focus of this conference because you have always emphasized the importance of education. That was true in 1909 when you issued a mighty call for America to do its—and I quote—"elementary duty" in preparing African-Americans through education for the best exercise of citizenship. It was true in 1954 when Thurgood Marshall and the Legal Defense Fund led the successful fight to end segregation in the schools. It is true today when we know that more than ever, knowledge is power, and the struggle in education today involves two things

that are inextricably bound: a fight for equal opportunity and a fight for educational excellence.

Each generation must embrace its own battle in the ongoing struggle for equal rights. A generation ago, it was simply a fight to open the schoolhouse door that united Americans of every race and background. Today, though much segregation remains, the schoolhouse doors are open. Yet behind too many doors too little learning is taking place. Therefore, the struggle for excellence for all must be our great mission. We must demand high standards of every student; our schools and teachers must meet world-class standards. But we must demand that every child be given the opportunity to meet those standards. Every child must have a chance to succeed in this new economy. We must not replace the tyranny of segregation with the tyranny of low expectations.

We know that in this new world we're moving into so quickly, new technologies and the globalization of information and communications and the economy will require of us all new skills. We know already from what has been happening in the last 20 years that those that have the skills to succeed will do so in this new economy. They will thrive. And those who lack the skills will not. We know that we can never make real our ideal of one America unless every American of every background has access to the world's best schools, the world's best teachers, the world's best education.

This means first, not only high standards but high expectations and high levels of accountability of students and parents, schools and teachers and communities. Second, we know that we can't have high standards and high expectations unless all our students have the tools they must have to meet the standards and master the basics. If we do this, all our children, no matter where they live, can achieve.

When I came to Washington, the old title I program called for watered-down curricula and watered-down standards and tests. We ended that, thanks to Secretary Riley. Now the new title I says, we're going to have the same high standards for all of our children. We're not going to sell any of them short just because they're poor.

In the State of the Union Address, I called for national standards for the basics—not Federal Government standards but national standards—of what every child must know to do well in the world of the 21st century beginning with reading and math. English is, after all, the same in the Bronx as it is in Appalachia. Mathematics is the same in Portland, Oregon, and Tampa, Florida. And by 1999, I believe strongly that we should give every fourth grader an examination in reading to see whether these standards are being met, and every eighth grader an examination in math just to make sure the standards are being met. This is not a normal exam that you grade on the bell curve; this is an exam where you say, "Here's what everybody ought to know to do well in the world and to be able to go on in school." Everyone should be able to get over this bar. And these exams should never be used to hold children back but to lift them up. And if they are not meeting the standards, the school must change until they can.

We don't do anyone any favors by not holding them to high standards. Often when we see people in difficult circumstances, we feel compassion for them, and we should. But when this compassion leads to expecting less of their children, that is a mistake, for it sells their future down the drain. I am tired of being told that children cannot succeed because of the difficulties of their circumstances. All we do is consign them to staying in the same circumstances. It is wrong.

We now have fresh evidence, by the way, that our children can succeed. For years and years and years we have been told that Americans always lagged behind the rest of the world on any test that fairly measures our competence and knowledge and achievement of our children against children in other countries. And for many years it was true, not the least because we were unwilling to hold ourselves to high standards. Hiding behind the cherished value of local control of our schools, which I support, we pretended that there were no national standards. But for more than a decade now, people of good will all over this country in all kinds of circumstances have been working to improve our schools.

This year on the international math and science tests given to fourth and eighth graders, for the very first time our fourth graders scored well above the international average, near the top. And it was a representative sample by race, by region, and income. The children can learn. The children can learn.

Now, that's the good news. The challenging news is that the eighth graders still scored below the international average. And you know why, don't you? Because when these children start to reach adolescence, then all the problems of their circumstances, plus what goes on in everybody's life when they reach adolescence, reach a collision point. And we have not yet mastered how to take children in the most difficult circumstances through adolescence and keep them learning and keep their schools working.

But you look at those fourth-grade test scores. Don't tell me that children can't learn because they are children of color, they are children from poor neighborhoods, they are children with only the mother at home taking care of them. We can do this. But we have to believe we can do it, and, more importantly, we have to believe they can do it. And then we have to understand that it is our responsibility—not theirs, ours—to make sure they do it.

So I ask you to work with us. No one has all the answers. The NAACP has always had high expectations for America. When we were living through the worst of the civil rights movement, you had high expectations for white people. You knew we could do better. [*Laughter*] You knew we could do better. This is a high expectations organization.

You had high expectations for yourselves, which is why you have revived the NAACP, and you're riding higher than ever. Do you seriously believe we would be where we are today, with this chair and this president and this board and this crowd and all these young people here, if you had had no expectations, no dream, no discipline, no drive? Of course not. You got here because you worked for it, because you had a dream, and because you expected things of yourselves.

It is no different in this education business. We know it's going to be hard, and we know we have to do it together. But it is a solemn duty we owe to our young people. The children will follow the lead of their parents and of the people in the community who may not be their parents but do have a responsibility for them. My wife was right about that; it does take a village to raise a child.

We do have to do more to give all our students the tools they need. We know, for example, that many of our urban schools and our rural schools in really poor areas are succeeding. We know that every city can actually point to some schools where committed teachers and other staff members working with parents manage to inspire and equip students with the knowledge and skills they need to succeed.

For example, Hansberry Elementary School in the Bronx has made a remarkable turnaround. It was once shut down by the board of education, it was doing such a poor job. But when it reopened with a renewed commitment to excellence, the percentage of students passing the New York State Math Skills Test went from 47 to 82 percent. The New Visions Charter School in Minneapolis is known as the reading school. This public school has helped students who formerly struggled to make 12 to 18 months of progress in reading each year and is training teachers now in other Minnesota schools to do the same thing.

These schools are just two of hundreds of examples that show us that, given proper support, all our children can learn despite the extra hardships they carry with them to school. We have to answer the question, if it can happen somewhere, why isn't it happening everywhere? And we have to provide the answer because we know that far too many schools are not serving our children well, and too many children from our inner cities and poor rural areas are graduating without the skills they need. And I say again, that is not their failure; that is our failure. Along with demanding more of our students, we must hold schools and teachers and parents and communities to higher standards. We must have a bold and a national effort to improve schools that serve predominantly minority, inner city, and rural areas.

First, we have to make sure these kids do have the help they need to meet the standards. And that means, in the beginning, that every parent and every community leader must join the teachers. That's why we're mobilizing a million volunteer tutors to make sure that by the beginning of the next century, every 8-year-old, wherever he or she lives and whatever their native language may be, will be able to read independently by the third grade. If you can't read, you can't learn the rest of what you need to know.

The second thing we have to do is make sure that every school has good, well-qualified, well-trained teachers. Our Nation faces a very significant teacher recruitment challenge. Over the next decade, we will need to hire—listen

to this—over 2 million teachers because of increasing teacher retirements and an enrollment boom that will bring more students than ever into our classrooms, a total of 54 million students by the year 2006. Just over the next 5 years, we must hire 350,000 teachers in high-poverty urban and rural schools.

Now, for years the Government worked to reduce the shortage of doctors in many urban and underserved rural areas by offering scholarships to students who agreed to work in those communities. When I was Governor of Arkansas, I don't know how many rural communities we had that were literally saved by physicians who were serving there because they had their way to medical school paid in return for their commitment to go out to poor areas and tend to people who would never have had a doctor otherwise.

Today I am announcing a similar initiative to help recruit and prepare teachers to serve in urban and rural communities. Next month, as part of the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, I will forward to the Congress a proposal for a new national effort to attract quality teachers to high-poverty communities by offering scholarships for those who will commit to teach in those communities for at least 3 years. We will have a special emphasis on recruiting minorities into teaching because while a third of our students are minority, only 13 percent of their teachers are. We need a diverse and an excellent teaching force.

Our proposal also includes funds to strengthen teacher preparation programs so that those who go into teaching are better prepared to teach their students. We know students in distressed areas who need the best teachers often have teachers who have had the least preparation. For example, right now 71 percent of students taking physical science courses like chemistry and physics, and 33 percent of English students in high-poverty schools, take classes with teachers who do not even have a college minor in their field. So our proposal will focus not only on training future teachers well, it will also improve the quality of teaching in those schools now, through partnerships between the schools and the teacher training institutions.

And finally, there is a national board for certifying professional teachers as master teachers. In our budget—there are only a few hundred of these teachers now, and they are infectious in the enthusiasm and skills they breed in the schools where they teach. Many States are offering them higher salaries. Our budget contains enough money to have 100,000 of these master teachers so that every single school in America will have one, including every poor school in America. We cannot stop until we have given the best teachers the opportunity to teach the children who need them the most.

Third, let me say I believe that charter schools can be an important tool for improving education, especially for children having difficulties in traditional public schools. Charter schools give parents and local communities the flexibility to create performance-based schools, open to everyone, and they work. Our budget has enough funds to create 3,000 of these schools by the year 2001. They're open to all; they offer excellence and accountability; they can infect the atmosphere of an entire school district and help other public schools to perform better, by offering parents and community residents the chance to take matters into their own hands and to be held accountable for the results.

I am pleased that Rosa Parks, who taught us a lot about dignity and equality, is now working to open a charter school in Detroit. And I urge you to consider doing so in your communities. If you believe it will help, the Department of Education will help you.

Fourth, I think we have to commit to rebuilding rundown schools. Many of them are located in our central cities. When I was in Philadelphia the other day, at a beautiful old school building, the superintendent of schools told me that the average age—the average age—of the physical facilities in the Philadelphia school system was 65 years. Now, a lot of these old buildings were very well built and will stand up a long time, but they have to be rehabilitated if they're going to be serviceable.

I have been to school districts—there are school buildings in Washington, DC, where two floors are open and a whole floor has to be closed because they are literally not inhabitable. This is wrong. Forty percent of the school buildings need major repair or replacement today. My tax plan includes tax credits to finance the rehabilitation and construction of schools in distressed neighborhoods. Students cannot be expected to learn in buildings that are falling down, in serious disrepair, or painfully overcrowded.

Fifth, we have to recognize that all this new technology, which seems so far beyond the reach

of a lot of ordinary citizens, actually gives us a chance to jump-start quality and opportunity in our poorest districts. I have challenged every school and library in the Nation to be connecting all their classrooms to the information superhighway by the year 2000. We have got a plan working with the private sector, headed by the Vice President, to put the computers in the classrooms, to get the educational software out there, to train the teachers. The Federal Communications Commission has offered steep discounts and rates for hooking on to the Internet for schools and libraries so that all of our children can do it.

If we do this right, for the first time in the history of this country, the children in the poorest school districts will have access to the same information in the same way at the same time as the children in the wealthiest school districts in America. And that's what ought to be the rule.

The last thing I want to say is that we've got to send our children to schools that are safe and drug-free. There are still a lot of children who do not learn every day because they are afraid. And if you think of the times in your life when you have been afraid, it was hard to think about anything else. We must take the fear out of our schools. It is unacceptable to have children falling behind because of that.

We fought hard to keep weapons and drugs out of our classrooms. We supported parents and communities who wanted to have things like school uniform programs, tougher truancy programs, who wanted to have curfew programs, things that they thought would improve the safety of our students' lives. But the bottom line is this: We can have equal opportunity and excellence in education; we can have it only if we are determined to have both. We will not have one without the other.

And lastly, let me say, in addition to that, if you look at what this modern economy requires, we must open the doors of college education to every single American by the year 2000. We must make at least 2 years of college as universal by the time the century turns as a high school diploma is today. We must do that.

If you look at the high school graduation rates for African-Americans, it's very encouraging to see how much they have increased. There is not much difference now in the high school graduation rates between African-Americans and the white majority in America. There is a world of difference in the college completion rates. We have got to do more.

Our budget has the biggest increase in Pell grants in 20 years and provides tax credits in a way that would make the first 2 years of college opportunity literally open to everyone. We have got to keep going until we push more and more and more of our minority children into higher education. First, finish high school; then at least get 2 years more of college so that you can compete and get a decent income with prospects for growth and opportunity in the years ahead. That must be our shared objective.

Now, let me just briefly say, in addition to education, I think there are two other things we have to focus on if we're going to get where we want to go. The first is economics. We have got to rebuild the economic life of our inner cities and our poorest rural areas. They are the biggest economic opportunity today for the rest of America. Unemployment in this country is at a 25-year low—23-year low. When you hear that the unemployment rate is 5 percent, don't be fooled; that's a national rate. We've got 10 States with unemployment rates below 3½ percent. And there are that many people just moving around all the time. If you get around 3 percent, it's almost functionally zero, because people are just moving around in their lives.

But you know as well as I do there are cities or there are neighborhoods within cities that still have double-digit unemployment. There are poor rural counties that still have double-digit unemployment. There are people who are employed but grossly underemployed, who are working part time just because that's all they can do. There are places where people get up and go to work every day, but they're always going somewhere else to work because there are no businesses in their neighborhoods.

Now, that is a huge opportunity. We have development funds in the United States with countries that used to be Communist countries because we want to help build a private sector economy. We have got to move in our thinking from the idea that our inner cities and our poor rural areas should have their future dependent primarily on Government payments to saying, "No, no, they're entitled to the same range of economic opportunities as all other American communities."

We've got to have a private sector, job-related, investment-related, business-related strategy to bring economic opportunity to the young people who live in these areas. It is not true that these folks don't want to work. Most of them are working like crazy. They're working like crazy. Last year, for every entry-level job that opened up in St. Louis, Missouri, there were nine applicants—nine for every job that opened up. Now, if we can't do something to revitalize the economy of our poorer areas when we've got the lowest unemployment rate in 23 years and business is out there looking for new opportunities to invest, when can we do it? We have to do it now.

What should we be doing? We've been working on this since 1993, to try to create the environment in which people would wish to invest and give people a chance—empowerment zones, enterprise communities, community banks that loan money to people who live in the neighborhood to start small businesses, cleaning up the environment of our cities so people will feel free to invest and they won't worry about somebody coming along and suing them because we've already cleaned up the problems, giving tax relief to our lowest income working people through the earned-income tax credit, strengthening the Community Reinvestment Act so that more banks would invest money in the inner cities, opening up housing opportunities.

I heard you say that before—if you want the schools to be integrated, we've got to have middle class housing with poor people's housing in the cities again. We have to have housing back in the cities where people are living together and working together, a real serious strategy to move people from welfare to work, and a serious strategy to do something about crime, because people won't invest money if they don't think that they're going to be safe in their business operations.

Now, we've been working on that. When I spoke to the mayors in San Francisco, I said, here's what we're going to do for the next 4 years. We want to double the number of empowerment zones and enterprise communities. We want to double the number of these community banks to make loans in the inner cities. We want to clean up the brownfields of these cities so that nobody refuses to invest because the environmental problems are out there. We want to clean up 500 of the worst toxic waste dumps. Who's going to put a plant next to a toxic dump? We want to do this so that people can get investment.

We want to pass a juvenile crime bill that will be modeled on what Boston has done, where not a single child has been killed with a handgun in over a year and a half now—almost 2 years in Boston—not one. And I'll tell you something—just for the record, because we're going to debate this all year—yes, they're tougher on gangs and guns, but they also give kids something to say yes to. They have probation officers and police officers who get in the car at night and make house calls to homes of children who are in trouble. And just like a doctor making house calls, you can always find a patient there. They have 70 percent compliance with probation orders in Boston—70 percent—unheard of. Give our kids something to say yes to. So we've got to do that.

We have to do something about homeownership, as I said. We have to do something about public health, more basic services, do more to fight HIV and AIDS, include millions more children with health insurance.

All these things we intend to do, but you have to help us. The NAACP has always done a good job of involving business leaders of both parties in your endeavors. But we need to go back to the business community and say, now is the time. I will do everything I possibly can to create the environment in which people can invest and work.

Creative mayors have ideas about how to do this. But if we can't do it now with the national unemployment rate at 5 percent, when can we do it? It is America's best opportunity for continued growth. If we had this many consumers in a nation 50 miles out in the Gulf of Mexico, we would be pouring money into it, in investment money. I say to you, our cities and our rural counties, where there is unemployment and underemployment, is our next big avenue of growth. And we have to get together and make sure it gets done.

The last thing I want to say is, economics; education; thirdly, racial reconciliation. Look at the world. You pick up the newspaper any given day and you find people killing each other halfway around the world because of their racial and ethnic and religious differences: the Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda and Burundi; the Catholics and the Protestants in Ireland—my people still argue over what happened 600 years ago;

the Muslims, the Croats, the Serbs in Bosnia; the Jews and the Arabs in the Middle East. And here we are with our long history of black-white issues rooted in slavery, with the appropriation of a lot of Mexican-Americans after the war with Mexico into our country, and then with wave upon wave upon wave of immigrants.

Now, in a global economy, in a global society where we're being closer together, it is a huge asset for us that we have people from everywhere else. We just announced an initiative on Africa, on promoting economic development in Africa. And there was a lot of excitement about it. And we had a lot of Republican Congressmen interested in it because they think we can make a lot of money there. [*Laughter*] I don't mean that in a bad way. I mean several African countries grew at 7 percent or greater last year and are doing the same thing again this year. And more than half the countries on the continent are democracies.

Now, we can all understand that. But why are we in a good position to do well there? Because of you. Because of you. Why are we in a good position to unite all of Latin America with us in a common economic group early in the next century? Because of the Hispanic-Americans, all the Latinos. Why are we in a good position to avoid having Asia become a separate economic bloc and a destabilizing force in the world? In no small measure because of all the Asian-Americans in this country. Why do we have some hope of being a major force for peace in the Middle East? Because of all the Jewish-Americans here and the increasingly active and constructive Arab-American community here.

In other words, it's a good deal that there are so many of us who are so different from each other. This is a good deal, not a bad deal. This is a good thing, if we can find a way not only to respect and tolerate but to celebrate our differences, and still say, "But the most important thing is I'm an American. I'm bound together. I'm part of this country, I believe in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and I have an equal chance."

Now, that's what Dr. Franklin and Judy Winston and all the people who are working with me over the next year, that's what we're trying to figure out how to do. And we know we have to do certain things that are Government policy, but we also know that this is an affair of the mind and the heart as well.

First, the law. The law makes a difference. We've had a Community Reinvestment Act requiring banks to invest money in our under-invested areas on the books for 20 years. But since I became President and we said we were serious about it, of all the 20 years' investment, 70 percent of it has been done since 1993. The law matters. The law matters.

We have to enforce the civil rights laws. I hope you will help me to secure the confirmation of my nominee to be the next Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Bill Lee. For 23 years, this son of Chinese immigrants has worked for the cause of equal opportunity; for many years as a lawyer of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. I thank you for your support of him, but I ask you now to stay with him and let's make sure he will be confirmed.

And then I ask you to continue to work with Dr. Franklin and Judy Winston and our advisory panel. We have to do this together. For this whole century, the NAACP has been a moral beacon, reminding us that in the end we have to become an integrated society, or one America. That's going to be more important than ever before.

Today, the only State in America without a majority race is Hawaii, but within 5 years there will be no majority race in California, our biggest State, with 13 percent of our population. In Detroit—Wayne County, Michigan, which we used to think of as the great melting pot of white ethnics and black folks from the South that couldn't make a living on the farm anymore that went to find a job in the car plants, there are now more than 145 different racial and ethnic groups in that county—in Detroit. We are changing very rapidly. And we have not given much thought not only to how we're going to heal our old wounds and meet our old challenges, but how we're going to become one America in the 21st century. We need your help.

In September I'm going home to Little Rock to observe the 40th anniversary of the integration of Little Rock Central High School. When those nine black children were escorted by armed troops on their first day of school, there were a lot of people who were afraid to stand up for them. But the local NAACP, led by my friend Daisy Bates, stood up for them.

Today, every time we take a stand that advances the cause of equal opportunity and excellence in education, every time we do something that really gives economic empowerment to the

dispossessed, every time we further the cause of reconciliation among all our races, we are honoring the spirit of Daisy Bates, we are honoring the legacy of the NAACP. We have to join hands with all of our children to walk into this era, with excellence in education, with real economic opportunity, with an unshakable commitment to one America that leaves no one behind.

I came here to offer you my hand and to thank you for your work and to challenge you for the days ahead.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. in the David Lawrence Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Myrlie Evers-Williams, chair, and Kweisi Mfume, president, NAACP; Bishop William H. Graves, presiding bishop, Christian Methodist Episcopal Church; Dale Charles, NAACP Arkansas State conference president; the late Hanley Norment, NAACP Maryland State conference president; the late Betty Shabazz, widow of civil rights activist Malcolm X; the late Aaron Henry, NAACP Mississippi State conference president; and Rosa Parks, civil rights activist.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the National Association of Black Journalists in Chicago, Illinois

July 17, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. I must say, when Arthur was speaking, I thought to myself that he sounded like a President. [*Laughter*] And I said to myself, if I had a voice like that, I could run for a third term, even though the—[*laughter*].

I enjoyed meeting with your board members and JoAnne Lyons Wooten, your executive director, backstage. I met Vanessa Williams, who said, "You know, I'm the president-elect; have you got any advice for me on being president?" True story. I said, "I do. Always act like you know what you're doing." [*Laughter*]

I want to say to you, I'm delighted to be joined here tonight by a distinguished group of people from our White House and from the administration, including the Secretary of Labor, Alexis Herman, and the Secretary of Education, Dick Riley, and a number of others from the White House. Where is my White House crew? Would you all stand up, everybody here from the administration, Department of Education, Department of Labor.

I don't know whether he is here or not, but I understand Congressman Bobby Rush was here earlier today, and I know there are some other local officials from Chicago who are here. And this is a great place to come. Chicago is such a wonderful city that there was an article this morning in the New York Times bragging on Chicago. And I saw the mayor today; he said, "I know we have finally arrived. If they're bragging on us in New York, we have made it." And I congratulate all the people here on the remarkable improvements they've made in this magnificent city in the last few years.

I'd also like to say a special word of thanks to Reverend Jesse Jackson. I see him here in the audience, and I know he's here. Thank you. I always kind of hate to speak when Jesse is in the audience. [*Laughter*] You know, I mean, every paragraph gets a grade. [*Laughter*] Most of them aren't very good. I can just hear it now—all the wheels turning.

I want to thank Reverend Jackson for agreeing to cochair, along with the Secretary of Transportation, Rodney Slater, an American delegation to an economic conference in Zimbabwe, where he'll be going next week. And I know you all wish him well on that. We are doing our best to have a major initiative reaching out to Africa, recognizing that more and more countries in Africa are becoming functioning, successful democracies; that half a dozen countries in Africa have had growth rates of 7 percent or more last year and will equal that again this year; and that this is an enormous opportunity for us not only to promote better lives for the millions and millions of people who live on that continent but also better opportunities for Americans and better partnerships with Africa in the years ahead.

Well, you heard your president say that I promised to come here in 1992 if I got elected.

And I'm trying to keep every promise I made. And I'm sure glad I got a second term so I didn't get embarrassed on this one. [*Laughter*]

In the years since I assumed office, I have worked very hard to create an America of opportunity for all, responsibility from all, with a community of all Americans, a country committed to continuing to lead the world toward greater peace and freedom and prosperity. And that begins with giving every person in this country the chance to live up to his or her God-given abilities. Many of you chose to become journalists because you thought it was the best way to use your God-given talent, your gift with words, your knack for asking tough questions, which some of us find maddening—[*laughter*]—and for getting the answers, your instincts with a camera or a microphone, your ability to connect with people and get them to understand what it is you're trying to get across. And you did it not just to make a living but to make a difference. I thank you for that. And I think that all of us want that opportunity for everyone in this country.

Last month in San Diego I called upon Americans to begin a dialog, a discussion over the next year and perhaps beyond, to deal with what I think is the greatest challenge we'll face in the 21st century, which is whether we really can become one America as we become more diverse, whether as we move into a truly global society we can be the world's first truly great multiracial, multiethnic, multireligious democracy. I asked the American people to undertake a serious discussion of the lingering problems and the limitless possibilities that attend our diversity. I came here tonight to talk a little more about this initiative, to ask each of you to examine what role you can play in it and the vital contributions as journalists and as African-Americans you might make in leading your newsrooms, your communities, and our Nation in the right kind of dialog.

Five years ago, I talked about how we could prepare our people to go into the 21st century, and we've made a lot of strides since then. Our economy is the healthiest in a generation and once again the strongest in the world. Our social problems are finally bending to our efforts. But at this time of great prosperity, we know we still have a lot of great challenges in order to live up to our ideals, in order to live up to what we say America should mean. And it seems to me that at this time when there is more cause for hope than fear, when we are not driven by some emergency or some imminent cataclysm in our society, we really have not only an opportunity but an obligation to address and to better resolve the vexing, perplexing, often painful issues surrounding our racial history and our future.

We really will, whether we're prepared for it or not, become a multiracial democracy in the next century. Today, of our 50 States, only the State of Hawaii has no majority race. But within 3 to 5 years, our largest State, California, where 13 percent of us live, will have no majority race. Five of our school districts already draw students from over 100 different racial and ethnic groups, including the school district in the city of Chicago. But within a matter of a couple of years, over 12 school districts will have students from over 100 different racial and ethnic groups.

When I was a boy, I knew that a lot of people went from my native State in Arkansas to Detroit to make a living because they couldn't make a living on the farm anymore. Many of them were African-Americans, and they joined the white ethnics, many of whom were from Central and Eastern Europe and from Ireland, in the Detroit area, working in the car plants, getting the good middle class jobs, being able to educate their children, looking forward to a retirement. Some of them actually are coming back home now and buying land. Nicholas Lehman traced that movement in a great book he wrote not so long ago.

But now Detroit is not just a place of white ethnics and African-Americans. In Wayne County, there are over 145 different racial and ethnic groups represented today. So the paradigm is shifting. And so, as part of our engagement in this national dialog, we have to both deal with our old unfinished business and then imagine what we are going to be like in 30 years and whether we can actually become one America when we're more different. Is there a way not only to respect our diversity but even to celebrate it and still be one America? Is there a way to use this to help us economically and to spread opportunity here? Why are there so many people in the Congress in both parties excited about this Africa initiative? Because we have so many African-Americans. Even people who were never concerned about it before understand this is a great economic opportunity

for America. Why do we have a unique opportunity to build a partnership with Brazil and Argentina and Chile and all the countries in Latin America? Because we have people from all those countries here in our country. Why do we have the opportunity to avoid having Asia grow but grow in a more closed and isolated way, running the risk of great new problems 30, 40, 50 years from now? Because we have so many Asian-Americans who are making a home here in America with ties back home to their native lands and cultures. We are blessed if we can make this work.

We also may have a chance to make peace in other parts of the world if we can make peace within our borders with ourselves. But let's not kid ourselves; the differences between people are so deep and so ingrained, it's so easy to scratch the surface and have something bad go wrong. And we see that in countries less privileged than ourselves when things go terribly wrong, whether it's between the Hutus and the Tutsis in Rwanda and Burundi; or the Catholics and the Protestants in the home of my ancestors, Ireland; or the Croats, the Serbs, and the Muslims who are, interestingly enough, biologically indistinguishable, in Bosnia; or the continuing travails of the Jews and the Arabs in the Middle East.

If you look through all of human history, societies have very often been defined by their ability to pit themselves as coherent units against those who were different from themselves. Long ago in prehistory, it probably made a lot of sense for people that were in one tribe to look at people in another tribe as enemies, because there was a limited amount of food to eat or opportunities for shelter, because people did not know how to communicate with each other so they had to say, "People that look like me are my friends; people that don't look like me are my enemies." But why, on the verge of the 21st century, are we still seeing people behave like that all over the world? And why here even in America do we find ourselves, all of us at some time, gripped by stereotypes about people who don't look like we do?

So we shouldn't kid ourselves. This is not going to be an easy task. But there is hardly anything more important, because we know we have a great economy; we know we have a strong military; we know we have a unique position in the world today with the fall of communism virtually everywhere and the rise of market economies and the success that we've offered. But we know we also have these lingering inequalities and problems in America. And if we can overcome them and learn to really live together and celebrate, not just tolerate but celebrate our differences and still say, "In spite of all those differences, the most important thing about me is that I am an American," that there is no stopping what we can do and what our children can become.

This week in Washington, John Hope Franklin convened the first meeting of the advisory board I appointed on racial reconciliation. The Executive Director of that board, Judy Winston, who has been our Acting Under Secretary of Education, is also here with me tonight. I am very proud that she has agreed to do that and very excited about what has happened. The first meeting was full of lively debate and honest disagreement. I like that. We should discover quickly that people who are honestly committed to advancing this dialog will have honest differences, and they ought to be aired.

Earlier today, as your president said, at the NAACP convention in Pittsburgh, I reiterated my long-held belief that we will never get to our one America in the 21st century unless we have both equality and excellence in educational opportunity. We have to give every American access to the world's best schools, best teachers, best education. And that means we have to have high standards, high expectations, and high levels of accountability from all of us who are involved in it.

But I want to say to you, we know our children can learn. For years and years, ever since 1984, when the "Nation At Risk"—1983—when the "Nation At Risk" report was issued, people said, well, you can't expect American education to compete favorably with education in other countries because we have a more diverse student body and because we have so many more poor children and so many immigrants and because, because, because, because.

This year on the international math and science tests given to fourth and eighth graders, for the first time since we began a national effort to improve our schools over a decade ago, our fourth graders—not all of them but a representative sample, representative of race, region, income—scored way above the international average in math and science, disproving the notion that we cannot achieve international excellence in education even for our poorest

children. It is simply not true. This year, again, our eighth graders scored below the international average, emphasizing the dimensions of the challenge, because when the kids who carry all these other burdens to school every day, the burden of poverty, the burden of crime and drugs in their neighborhoods, the burden of unmet medical needs, often the burden of problems at home—when they hit adolescence and when they are pressured and tempted to get involved in other things, it gets to be a lot tougher.

So we haven't done everything we need to do. But the evidence is here now; it is no longer subject to debate that we can't compete. And that's good, because we need to, and because our children, however poor they are, are entitled to just as much educational opportunity as anybody else.

Now, I believe that we made a big mistake in the United States not adopting national standards long before this. And I believe our poorest children and our minority children would be doing even better in school had we adopted national standards a long time ago and held their schools to some measure of accountability. It is not their fault; it is the rest of our faults that we are not doing it.

So when I say by 1999 we ought to test all our fourth graders and all our eighth graders—the fourth graders in reading, the eighth graders in math—it's not because I want the individual kids to get a grade, it's because everybody ought to make that grade. If you have a standard, everyone ought to clear the bar. And if they're not, there is something wrong with the educational system that ought to be fixed. And you can't know it unless you understand what the standard is and hold people to some accountability. But don't let anybody tell you that these kids can't do it. That is just flat wrong. They can do it.

Today I did announce one new initiative that I think is very important, and that is a $350 million, multiyear scholarship program modeled on the National Medical Service Corps. You know, a lot of us come from places that have a lot of poor rural areas that are medically underserved. We got doctors into those areas, into the Mississippi Delta, because we said, hey, if you'll go to medical—we'll help you go to medical school, but you've got to go out to a poor underserved area and be a doctor to people who need you. Then later you can go make all the money you want somewhere else. But if we help you go to medical school, will you go out here and help people where they don't have doctors? And the National Health Service Corps has done a world of good.

So what I proposed today, and what we're going to send up to Capitol Hill with the reauthorization of Higher Education Act, is a series of scholarships that will go to people who say, "I will teach in a poor area for 3 years if you will help me get an education."

This is the first specific policy to come out in connection with our yearlong racial reconciliation initiative. There will be more policies. But it's not just a matter of public policy. There will also be local actions, private actions which will have to be taken. And we also need the dialog, the discussion. It is about the mind and the heart. And therefore, I say again, your voices and your observations are going to be very valuable.

In the communities where we have a constructive, ongoing dialog, where people not only talk together but work together across racial lines, there are already stunning stories that stir the heart and give us hope for the future. There is nothing people can't do. Most people are basically good. Their leaders have to give them a framework in which the best can come out and the worst can be repressed. And that's what we have to do here. We've got to learn how to deal with a fundamentally new and different situation as well as deal with a lot of old unresolved problems in our past that dog us in the present.

As journalists, you have experienced firsthand both the progress and the continuing challenge of race in our country. Some of you in this audience are pioneers in your field, perhaps the first people of color ever to claim a desk, a phone, a typewriter in the newsrooms of our big-city papers and stations. Some of you, when you were beginning your careers, knew that it was hard enough to find just one editor who would consider your work, let alone the hundreds of newspaper and broadcasting executives who this week have descended on this job fair that you sponsored to recruit the young people who are here today. They've come here not just because they recognize the value of a diverse and racially representative staff but also because they know from experience that they'll find some of the best talent in American journalism here at this convention.

But our newsrooms are like all of our other working environments: They've come a long way; they've still got a ways to go. Just as in other workplaces in America, minority representation on many staffs and mastheads is not what it ought to be. Wide gaps continue to exist in the way whites and minorities perceive their workplaces and in the way they perceive each other. We have to bridge this gap everywhere in America.

But it is especially important in the press because you are the voice and, in some ways, the mirror of America through which we see ourselves and one another. I encourage you to continue to reach out to your colleagues, to listen to each other, to understand where we're all coming from, to lead your organizations in the writing, the editing, the broadcasting fare and the thought-provoking stories about the world we live in and the one we can live in. We have a lot to do to build that one America for the 21st century, but I believe we're up to the challenge, and I know that you are up to the challenge.

Thank you very much.

Arthur Fennel. Thank you very much, Mr. President. As is customary in these forums here at our national convention, at this time, we bring forth our questioners. We are journalists, after all, and you knew this was coming. [*Laughter*] We have selected four journalists who will ask the questions of the day: Eric Thomas, reporter and anchor at KGO–TV in San Francisco; Chinta Strausberg, reporter of the Chicago Defender; Cheryl Smith, a reporter at KKDA-Radio, Grand Prairie, Texas——

The President. I know where that is.

Mr. Fennel. Yes. And Brent Jones, our student representative, a junior at the University of Florida in Gainesville.

To the questioners.

Federal Funding for Mass Transit

Ms. Strausberg. Chinta Strausberg, the Chicago Defender newspaper. Mr. President, do you support an $8 billion superhighway, NAFTA superhighway at a time when Congress has reduced funding for mass transit in Chicago as well? And if that superhighway is built, sir, will black contractors be a major part of it as a downpayment on reparations?

The President. What superhighway? Say it again. Did I—what's this project?

Ms. Strausberg. It's a proposed congressional plan—$8 billion NAFTA superhighway that would connect the United States with Canada and Mexico, and it is being discussed in Congress.

The President. Well, I don't know that I'm familiar enough with the project. I do believe we need to continue to improve our infrastructure. Secretary Slater and I have argued that we should not underfund mass transit and urban transportation. And indeed, in the transportation bill I sent to the Congress, we asked for several hundred million dollars more directly targeted to help people on welfare who are required to go to work, get to where the jobs are if their jobs aren't within walking distance. Only about 10 percent of the people on public assistance own their own cars. And we believe we need more investment in mass transit in the cities. So—and I don't think it should be an either/or situation.

And in terms of contracting, I support affirmative action programs generally in employment, in education, and in economic development. And I've done everything I could to fix what were the generally recognized shortcomings of some of the programs, to graduate out the firms that may not need it anymore but to continue it where I think it is appropriate. So I continue to support that.

And I think it is a mistake for us not to have initiatives to help create minority-owned businesses. I think we should—as a matter of fact, let me just back up and say, when I was in San Francisco at the mayors conference not very long ago, I said to them that I thought we ought to develop a private-sector, job-related model for high unemployment areas in our cities and—because there was no way the government social services could ever create enough economic opportunity for people. And I thought, if we couldn't do it when the national unemployment rate was the lowest in 23 years, when could we do it?

So I think we need to do more to help people organize and start their own businesses, to help build economic clusters of activity, to help give people models as well as opportunities to work, to see that we can do this. I don't think we're doing nearly enough in this area, and I think we have a new opportunity to do it because the unemployment rate is low in the Nation.

As I've heard Reverend Jackson say for 20 years, the biggest undeveloped market in America are the poor unemployed and underemployed people in our inner cities and our rural areas. Now is the time we should be creating more businesses there, not having fewer businesses. That's what I believe.

Affirmative Action

Mr. Thomas. Mr. President, Eric Thomas with KGO–TV in San Francisco. Mr. President, your scholarship proposal notwithstanding, there is still an assault on affirmative action in this country. In my home State of California, in the wake of Proposition 209 and last year's vote by the University of California Board of Regents, minority applications and enrollment in the UC system this year are down. There will be not one new black student enrolled at the prestigious Boalt Hall School of Law at the University of California this fall. What specific programs, scholarship program notwithstanding, do you propose to stem this tide and make sure that there is diversity in higher education in this country?

The President. First of all, I think we need to make sure that we continue to use Federal law to the maximum extent we can to promote an integrated educational environment so that we have to review, whether in the Education Department, in the Justice Department, whether there are any further actions we can take legally to promote an integrated educational environment in higher education in the States where these actions have been taken.

Secondly, I think we need to look at whether there is some way by indirection to achieve the same result. I know that the legislature in Texas, in an attempt to overcome the impact of the Hopwood decision in Texas, just passed what they call the "ten percent solution," which would be to guarantee admissions to any Texas public institution of higher education to the top 10 percent of the graduating class of any high school in Texas. And because of the way the African-Americans' and Hispanics' living patterns are in Texas, that may solve the problem. Whether that would work in California, I don't know. I haven't studied the way the school districts are organized enough. But I think we have to come up with some new and fairly innovative ways to do that.

Thirdly, I think on the professional schools, my own view—I'm a little stumped here. We have to really—we're going to have to reexamine what we can do. I don't know why the people who promoted this in California think it's a good thing to have a segregated set of professional schools. It would seem to me that, since these professionals are going to be operating in the most ethnically diverse State in the country, they would want them to be educated in an environment like they're going to operate. I don't understand that.

But there may be some ways to get around it, and we're looking at it and working on it. But I think it's going to be easier to stop it from happening at the undergraduate level than at the professional school level. And we're going to have to really think about whether there is some way around it, whether it would be some sort of economic designation or something else. But we're working on that.

And finally, let me say, I think we need to continue to provide more resources, because one of the real problems we have is, even in the last 5 years, when we've had economic recovery, the college enrollment rates of minorities in America have not gone up in an appropriate way. And in this budget that I'm trying to get passed through Congress, we've got the biggest increase in education funding in 32 years, the biggest increase in Pell grant scholarships in 20 years, another huge increase in work-study funds, and the tax proposals as we structured them would, in effect, guarantee 2 years of college to virtually everyone in America and help people with 2 more years of college. We've got a huge dropout problem in higher education among minorities that I think is having an impact on then what happens in the graduate schools and in the professional schools.

I don't think there is a simple answer. And I think, frankly, the way 209 is worded, it's a bigger problem even than the Hopwood case in Texas. But I can tell you we're working on it. First, is there anything the Justice Department or the civil rights office of the Education Department can do? We're examining that. Second, is there a specific solution like the Texas "ten percent solution" that would overcome it at least in a specific State? Third, come up with some more funds and some more specific scholarship programs to try to overcome it.

It's a great concern to me, and I think it is moving the country in exactly the wrong direction. And I might say, if you look at the performance of affirmative action students, it

doesn't justify the action that was taken. That's another point that ought to be made.

So the one thing that I believe is, I believe that the rather shocking consequences in the professional schools in both Texas and California will have a deterrent impact on other actions like that in other States. And I believe you will see more efforts now to avoid this. I think a lot of people who even voted for 209 have been pretty shocked at what happened, and I don't believe the people of California wanted that to occur. And I think the rhetoric sounded better than the reality to a lot of voters.

So I can tell you that, while I'm very concerned about it, I think if we all work on it, we can reverse it in a matter of a couple of years. And we just have to hope we don't lose too many people who would otherwise have had good opportunities because of it. But it is an urgent matter of concern to me.

Education

Mr. Jones. Brent Jones, University of Florida. Good afternoon, Mr. President.

The President. Good afternoon.

Mr. Jones. My question also has to do with education for more at a high school and middle school level. The dropout rate, crime, and drugs are more prevalent in inner-city schools than in suburban schools, consequently leading to a lower quality education in many inner-city schools. What will your administration do through Government-aided programs or initiatives to combat these problems and ensure everyone in America is receiving a comparable education?

The President. I want to answer your question, but first I'd like to start with a compliment to the African-American community. Last year the high school graduation rate nationally among African-Americans was well above 80 percent and almost at the level—almost equal to the level for white Americans. And it's a little known and appreciated fact. And it's a great tribute since, as you pointed out, people who are in inner-city schools, particularly where there's a lot of violence, a lot of drugs, a lot of problems, have to struggle harder to stay in, get through, and come out. It's a stunning achievement that the differential in graduation rates is now only about 4 percent. That's a stunning thing. That's very, very good.

Now, I'll tell you what we're trying to do. We're trying to do several things. We're trying, first of all, to help these schools work better with helping the teachers and the principals to operate drug-free and weapon-free schools, with supporting juvenile justice initiatives like the one in Boston where, I might add, not a single child has been killed by a handgun in nearly 2 years in Boston, Massachusetts. So we've got to create a safe and drug-free environment.

Then we're trying to support more parents groups in establishing their own schools. For example, I met with a number of Hispanic leaders recently—a lot of you are familiar with the group La Raza. They are operating—La Raza is operating 15 charter schools, where the parents have been permitted to work with teachers to establish their own schools within the public school system and set up the rules which govern them and make sure that they're good for the kids.

There are a number—there's no magic bullet here, but what we're trying to do is to take the lessons from every public school that is working in a difficult environment where there's a low dropout rate and a high performance rate, and say, they all have five or six common elements, and then we're trying to provide the funds and the support to people all over America to replicate that.

I want to take my hat off to the people of Chicago here who have had a very difficult situation in their schools, and they have been turning it around and raising student performance quite markedly in the last couple of years with the involvement—aggressive involvement of parents and students. There's a student who sits on the local board governing the schools here now. And I think that's—I guess the last thing I'd say is, I would favor having communities have someone like you on their governing boards because I think if they'd listen more to the young people about what it would take to clean up and fix up the schools, I think we'd be ahead.

Let me just make two other comments. I think there are some places where money will make a difference. I mentioned one in trying to get good teachers there. We're going to have to replace 2 million teachers within the next decade, 2 million, with retirements and more kids coming to school. Another is old school buildings. I was in Philadelphia the other day. The average age of a school building in Philadelphia is 65 years of age. The school buildings

in Philadelphia should be drawing Social Security. That's how old they are. [*Laughter*] Now, a lot of those old buildings are very well-built and can last for another 100 years, but they have to be maintained. We have school buildings in Washington where they're open—where there are three stories in the school building, and one whole floor has to be shut down because it's not safe for the kids to be there. So we've got to be careful about that. We need an initiative to help repair the school buildings.

And finally, let me say that I think technology offers young, lower income kids an enormous opportunity. If we can hook up every classroom in America to the Internet by the year 2000, get the computers in there—a lot of you do things with computers that people who are in your line of work couldn't even imagine 5 years ago. When I go on a trip now on Air Force One, I go back and watch the photographers send their pictures over the computer back to the newsroom. If we can hook up every classroom to the Internet, have adequate computers, adequate educational software, properly trained teachers, and then involve the parents in the use of this to keep up with the schoolwork and all that and get to the point where the personal computer is almost as likely to be in a home—even a below-income person has a telephone—we can keep working in that direction.

I think technology will give young Americans the chance, for the first time in history, whether they come from a poor, a middle class, or a wealthy school district, the first time ever, to all have access to the same information at the same level of quality at the same time. That has never happened in the history of the country. So if we do it right and the teachers are trained to help the young people use it, it will revolutionize equality of educational opportunity at the same time it raises excellence in education. So those are basically some of my thoughts about this.

And thank you for asking and for caring about the people that are coming along behind you.

President's Record

Ms. Smith. Mr. President, Cheryl Smith, KKDA-Radio, Dallas, Texas. Every 4 years, African-Americans cast their votes for a Presidential candidate who will hopefully address some of the issues affecting black Americans. Do you feel African-Americans should be pleased with your efforts thus far? And what can we expect from you in the future, especially in the area of judiciary appointments?

The President. Well, the short answer is, yes. [*Laughter*] I do. I mean, if you look at what's happened to African-American unemployment, African-American homeownership; if you look at the fight that I've waged on affirmative action and what I've tried to do for access to education as well as quality of education; if you look at my record on appointments in the administration, in the judiciary, which far outstrips any of my predecessors of either party; if you look at the larger effort that I've made to try to get Americans to come together and bridge the racial divide and to make people understand that we are each other's best assets, I would say that the answer to your first question is, yes.

Now, what else do we still have to do? The first thing that I think is terribly important is we have to, in addition to what I've talked about—I've already talked about education and the racial initiative, so we'll put those to the side; I've already talked about them—I think we have got to recognize that there is a legacy here which has not been fully overcome and that the United States is consigning itself to substandard performance as a nation if we continue to allow huge pockets of people to be underemployed or unemployed in our inner-city neighborhoods and in our poor rural areas, who are disproportionately minority. At a time when we have a 5 percent unemployment rate, we ought to be able to seriously address what it would take to put people to work and to give people education and to create business opportunities.

But let me just give you two examples. We've had a Community Reinvestment Act requiring banks to make loans in traditionally underserved areas for 20 years. We decided to enforce it. Seventy percent of all the loans made under the Community Reinvestment Act have been made in the 4½ years since this administration has been in office. In the 20 years, 70 percent of all the loans. That's the good news. The bad news is, not enough money has been loaned.

We set up these community development banks modeled on the South Shore Bank here in Chicago. A lot of you are familiar with it if you've been around here. In our new budget agreement, we have enough funds to more than double that. We set up the empowerment zones and the enterprise communities. In our new

budget act, we have enough funds to more than double that. We have a housing strategy that we believe can attract middle class people as well as low income people to have housing together in the inner cities so that we can also attract a business base here. We know a lot more than we used to about what it would take to have a thriving and working private sector in our urban areas. I have not done that yet. And that's what you ought to expect me to be working on.

And then there are a lot of unmet social problems that we need to deal with. It's still—you know, I got my head handed to me, I guess, in the '94 elections because I had this crazy idea that America ought not to be the only country in the world where working families and their children didn't have health care. It seemed to be a heretical idea, but I still believe that, and I'm not sorry I tried. So now we're trying to give our children health coverage. And I think you ought to expect all the children in the African-American community to be able to go to a doctor when they need it. I think you ought to expect us to continue our assault on HIV and AIDS. And until we find the cure, I think you ought to expect us to stay at the task. I think you ought to expect us to continue to make headway on other medical problems which have a disproportionate impact in your community.

These are some of the things that I think that you should expect of us: more opportunity, tackling more of the problems, bringing us together. I have tried to be faithful to the support I have received, not only because it was the support I have received but because I believed it was the right thing to do. And I believe that when our 8 years is over, you'll be able to look back on it and see not only a lot of efforts made but a lot of results obtained.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:30 p.m. in the Hyatt Regency Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Arthur Fennel, president, JoAnne Lyons Wooten, executive director, and Vanessa Williams, vice president/print, National Association of Black Journalists; Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago; and civil rights leader Jesse Jackson.

Remarks at the Funeral Service for Hilary Jones in Jasper, Arkansas
July 18, 1997

Pastor, to the members of Hilary's family, and to the legion of friends who are here today, let me say, first of all, that I feel profoundly honored to have been asked by the family to speak for a moment or two about my friend. There's not a person here today who couldn't stand up here and entertain us and relieve our grief for a few moments with Hilary Jones stories. So as we come here to mourn the death of our friend, let us remember, as the pastor said, that death is a part of life for all of us. And let us take a few moments to celebrate his life, for he would have wanted that very much.

I first met Hilary Jones over 23 years ago now, when I first came to Newton County. And I can't exactly describe it, but after the first time I met him, I knew that my life would never quite be the same. He wasn't like anybody I had ever met before, and I have seen a little bit more of the world since then, and I never have met anybody like him since. [*Laughter*]

He introduced me to the beauty, to the history, and the fantastic characters of the Arkansas Ozarks. Some of them are in this church building today. He took me into his home and his heart. I learned a lot about politics and people. I learned that he was quite a disarming human being. The language he spoke was pure Arkansas hillbilly, and I think he enjoyed it if you underestimated his intelligence, which could be a fatal error, for he was a very smart man.

He was deeply interested in people who were different from him and deeply compassionate with people who were in trouble if he thought they were basically good-hearted. And he was so passionate about what he cared about. He cared about his family, and he was so passionate, he had a very big one. [*Laughter*] And he was very proud of them.

He was so passionate about politics that, when I first him, he could actually look at the vote totals in Newton County, precinct by precinct, and tell you whether a family had told him the truth or not about how they were going to vote. [*Laughter*]

He was so passionate about being a Democrat that 22 years ago, when I spoke at the Jasper High School commencement and commended to the seniors the example of Abraham Lincoln as a person who could overcome adversity time and again and keep going in his life, Hilary and a few others—some of whom are in this church today—took me outside and said, "Bill, that is a wonderful speech. And you can give that speech in Little Rock any day. Don't you ever come up here and brag on that Republican President again." [*Laughter*]

I must say that years later I was amused when I finally talked him into coming to visit me at the White House. I persuaded him to spend the night in the Lincoln Bedroom—[*laughter*]—something I failed to do with Bo Forney, sitting back there. [*Laughter*] And afterward, as we kidded him about spending the night at the Lincoln Bedroom, he said, "I did that for the President, but I stepped on the side of the bed that was under Andrew Jackson's picture." [*Laughter*]

He was passionate about fish and wildlife. He loved his service on the Game and Fish Commission, and I was honored to appoint him. I think Steve Wilson, whom I see here today, will tell you that they never had a commissioner like him either. He was absolutely fool enough to believe we could bring the elk back to Arkansas. No one else in the State believed it, but he kept doing it. And sure enough, somehow we had the elk come back to Arkansas.

If you were his friend, he was your friend, through thick and thin, in lightness and dark, no matter what happened. If you were his political friend, he was your friend whether you won or you lost. But he believed that people were basically good. And he believed that the purpose of politics was to help ordinary people live their lives better.

And I learned a lot from him about going to the sale barns and the country stores and remote places where most people never went, just to listen to people's hopes and dreams and hurts and fears. And I learned what ferocious power can beat in the heart of any ordinary citizen who believes that he or she can make a difference. Hilary Jones always believed he could make a difference. And he always believed he had an obligation to try, whether it was in the lives of his children or his grandchildren or his friends.

I always felt that somehow, some way, he had adopted me into his family. And I believe he would want me here today if I had never been reelected Governor and had gone out in life as one of history's losers, because Hilary didn't judge people by whether they were on top or on the bottom, he judged them by what they thought was in their hearts.

I loved this man. He was my friend, my brother, my surrogate uncle or father. But what he was to me he was to literally hundreds of other people. Look around this church today. God gave Hilary Jones a great gift, a unique blend of heart and mind and energy and passion that very few people in this life in any position ever have. And he used it well.

We will miss him. We may not ever see anybody like him again. But I ask his family to remember as their hearts are broken that this, too, is part of God's plan and how blessed they were that he was their father and our friend.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 10 a.m. in the Jasper First Baptist Church. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. Manual Macks, pastor, Jasper First Baptist Church; Bo Forney, longtime friend of the President and Mr. Jones; and Steve N. Wilson, director, Arkansas Game and Fish Commission.

Joint Statement on Republic of Georgia-United States Relations
July 18, 1997

During their July 18, 1997 meeting in Washington, Presidents Clinton and Shevardnadze underscored the special importance they attach to the close and productive relationship between the United States and Georgia. They committed to work together actively to expand cooperation throughout the foreign policy, security, economic and commercial spheres. The Presidents noted that the growing U.S.-Georgia partnership is firmly based on common goals and values and reflects the national interests of both states.

President Clinton praised President Shevardnadze's staunch leadership in vigorously implementing democratic and free-market principles, which has made Georgia a model of political and economic reform among the new independent states. President Clinton underscored the full support of the United States for the efforts of the Georgian government and parliament in pursuing reform in recent years. Georgia's continued commitment to democratization and respect for human rights will only further strengthen the warm ties between the two states and peoples.

The two Presidents noted positively the contribution to Georgia's reform efforts made by U.S. technical and humanitarian assistance. President Clinton pledged continued robust support for Georgia's reforms.

The Presidents called for expanded cooperation, both bilateral and multilateral, to promote Georgia's further integration into emerging European security structures. They expressed satisfaction with the entry into force on May 15, 1997 of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Flank Document. President Clinton encouraged Georgia's active involvement in NATO's new Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC). He also expressed strong commitment to assisting Georgia's efforts to address non-proliferation and export control concerns and to develop a modern military under civilian control and a viable border guard.

President Clinton reaffirmed U.S. support for Georgia's territorial integrity and a peaceful settlement to the tragic conflict in Abkhazia. The United States and Georgia support the early resumption of negotiations on Abkhazia, under the aegis of the UN, with Russia as facilitator and the participation of the OSCE and the other Friends of Georgia countries—France, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The two Presidents agreed on the need to expand commercial relations between the United States and Georgia, including higher levels of trade and investment. In support of these goals, the instruments of ratification for the U.S.-Georgia Bilateral Investment Treaty were exchanged during the visit. The two sides agree to continue close cooperation in support of Georgia's rapid accession to the World Trade Organization on commercial terms generally applied to newly acceding members, which will further Georgia's integration into the global economy.

President Clinton praised Georgia's efforts to strengthen regional cooperation in the Caucasus, including its strong support for the Eurasian transport corridor. The Presidents agreed that this project is vitally important to the economic future not only of Georgia, but the region as a whole.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

The President's Radio Address
July 19, 1997

Good morning. Today I want to talk about the important progress we're making in our efforts to get guns out of the hands of violent juveniles.

Our administration has put in place a tough, smart anticrime strategy, relying on more community police, stricter punishment, and better afterschool prevention efforts. This strategy is

working. For 5 years in a row, we've seen serious crime drop nationwide. Last year, we saw the largest one-year decline in violent crime and murder in 35 years. Our most recent figures even show a slight decline in juvenile crime. But we all know that juvenile crime and violence are still significant problems in our country. We know that children are still killing children for shoes, for jackets, for turf. We know that too many of our young people are drawn to guns and violence as a way of life.

One fact stands out and demands our attention. Over the past decades, the number of gun murders by juveniles has skyrocketed by 300 percent. This is simply unacceptable. We know we must break this deadly trend. Some of our cities are beginning to do it. In Boston, thanks to a comprehensive effort by prosecutors, police, probation officers, community leaders, and ordinary citizens, not a single juvenile murder has been committed with a gun in 2 full years. Boston police commissioner Paul Evans should be commended for his leadership role in this outstanding effort, and I'm very glad that he's joined me here today.

A year ago, I looked at Boston's approach, and it was clear that tracing guns seized from young criminals was a key to the city's success. So I directed the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to launch a national initiative in 17 cities to replicate Boston's effort and trace all the guns used in crimes. A year later, the first results are in. Police departments in these 17 cities submitted for tracing nearly twice as many guns used in crimes as they did the year before. We found that almost half of all guns used in crimes came from young people. More importantly, for the first time, we know where the juveniles are getting these guns, how they are getting them, and what kinds of guns they are using.

One crucial fact is now clear, that guns are finding their way quickly from legitimate retail stores to black markets through a network of gun traffickers and corrupt gun dealers. Make no mistake: Gun traffickers are funneling guns to lawless youth. We know how they operate, and we intend to shut them down.

In Milwaukee, thanks to our youth gun-tracing initiative, police officers were able to find a pattern. Several guns used in drive-by shootings and armed robberies had originally been purchased by one man, a security guard named Larry Shikes. Police investigators quickly discovered that Shikes was selling brand new semiautomatic weapons from the trunk of his car. Police swept in and arrested him in April. He pled guilty to trafficking charges, and he will be sentenced next month.

Our youth gun-tracing initiative has been so effective that I'm pleased to announce we will expand our efforts to 10 more cities, including Philadelphia and Los Angeles. I want to thank the ATF and all the people who have worked on this initiative, especially Under Secretary of Treasury Ray Kelly, who is also with me today. We will work with Congress to hire more ATF agents to work with local police officers and prosecutors to pursue traffickers based on the leads we're generating now every day.

We also have a chance to build on our progress by passing a smart, tough juvenile justice bill that cracks down on guns and gangs. We need to provide for more prosecutors, tougher penalties, and better afterschool gang prevention programs. We should require that every new gun sold in America has a child safety lock. And we should prohibit violent teenagers from buying guns once they become adults.

Last week, I was disappointed that a Senate committee considering a juvenile crime bill voted against requiring Federal firearms dealers to provide child safety locks. I urge the full Senate to reconsider this action.

A juvenile crime bill must be comprehensive. Of course, it must get tough on violent juvenile offenders, but it also must cut off their access to guns. That's one big reason why Boston's program works. To keep guns away from crime-committing youth, we must also continue to perform background checks on gun-buying adults. The Brady law has already stopped more than 250,000 fugitives, felons, and stalkers from buying handguns. The Supreme Court recently struck down a portion of the Brady law that requires local officials to perform these checks. But in a meeting this week with law enforcement officials from around the country, Attorney General Reno and Treasury Secretary Rubin confirmed that the overwhelming majority of police departments are continuing to do the responsible thing, to perform these background checks voluntarily because they work.

Now that we're making every effort to keep criminals from getting guns through the front door of a gun shop, we're turning our attention to locking the back door, too. We have started to crack the code of the black market in illegal

weapons. We are tracing the guns, targeting the traffickers, taking more of our children out of harm's way. Cities like Boston have shown us great results. And if we'll all work together, there is no reason why every community in America can't expect and achieve the same success.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 7:48 p.m. on July 18 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 19.

Statement on the Cease-Fire in Northern Ireland
July 19, 1997

On behalf of the American people, I welcome the cease-fire declared by the IRA on July 19. This declaration, which we expect to be implemented unequivocally and permanently, can open the door to inclusive negotiations to achieve a just and lasting settlement of the conflict in Northern Ireland, a settlement that will heal age-old divisions and create an environment in which both vibrant traditions can flourish and prosper.

This is a moment of great possibility. As Northern Ireland's political leaders begin to shape their future, I urge them to do so on the basis of the principles of fairness and compromise that underpin all democratic systems. These negotiations must be based on a commitment to bringing about positive change and respecting the eventual settlement, even though it will not fulfill all the desires of any one party or community. The negotiations must ensure equality, justice, and respect for both cultures. As I have said many times, such negotiations can only take place free from the shadow of the violence or the threat of violence. That is why we look to Sinn Fein, like the other parties participating in the talks, to give their full commitment to the Mitchell principles.

Many men and women have taken great risks to bring about a peaceful resolution of this conflict. I commend the leaders of Sinn Fein who have helped bring about the cease-fire, as I commend the loyalist leaders who have sought to maintain their own cease-fire through many difficult months. The possibilities opened by today's announcement are also a tribute to those political leaders who have steadfastly condemned violence and worked to forge a democratically negotiated settlement. I particularly appreciate the efforts of the Governments of Great Britain and Ireland, who have dedicated themselves to pursuing peace and a democratically negotiated settlement that will benefit all the people.

The United States will work closely with the two governments and the political parties to build on this historic opportunity. On the basis of this cease-fire, implemented unequivocally, my administration will work with Sinn Fein as with the other political parties. The United States will strongly support those who take the risks of principled compromise as they seek a peaceful and prosperous future for themselves and their children.

Message to the Congress on Most-Favored-Nation Trade Status for Mongolia
July 18, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

On September 4, 1996, I determined and reported to the Congress that Mongolia is in full compliance with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. This action allowed for the continuation

of most-favored-nation (MFN) status for Mongolia and certain other activities without the requirement of an annual waiver.

As required by law, I am submitting an updated report to the Congress concerning the emigration laws and policies of Mongolia. You will find that the report indicates continued Mongolian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the area of emigration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 18, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 21.

Remarks Following a Meeting With the Budget Team and an Exchange With Reporters
July 22, 1997

Budget Negotiations

The President. I'd like to make a brief statement, and then I'll be glad to answer some questions.

I've just finished a meeting with my budget team, reviewing where we are on the budget negotiations. We have worked very hard to pursue an economic strategy of reducing the deficit, cutting where we could, then investing more in education, in the future of this country, and selling more American products and services overseas. And it's working. I believe it's very important now to complete the job and get a balanced budget agreement that will continue to invest in our country and enable us to grow.

This agreement—let me say again what this agreement does. I think it's important. It has $900 billion in savings over the next 10 years. It reforms the Medicare program and preserves the Trust Fund for another 10 years. It also contains the biggest expansion in health care for children since 1965—5 million; the biggest expansion in investment in education from the national level since 1965; the biggest increase in access to higher education since the GI bill passed 50 years ago; and billions of dollars to put people on welfare in the work force, as well as special incentives to help the distressed areas of this country get some jobs and participate in this recovery. That's what this agreement does. Now, there are those who say that we'd be better off without an agreement; none of these things will happen without an agreement.

As to the tax cut, my priorities are clear. I want to help children; I want to support education; I want to make sure that we give appropriate relief to middle income families. I do not believe it is right to deprive teachers, police officers, firefighters, nurses who have children in the home and who have only one earner and therefore earn less than $30,000 a year, of the benefits of this tax cut. And we believe we have found a way to get around the objection that some Republicans have made of having the IRS collect it as a tax payment. We think we can avoid that.

But on the other hand, we don't want to—that's on the Medicare premiums—we don't—let me back up and say, we believe, first of all, that the tax cut is a tax cut even if it's a refund. Secondly, on the Medicare premiums for higher income people, I strongly support that. I said as soon as I got back from Europe that I would be disappointed if it were not in the bill. There is a dispute about exactly how we should collect the premiums. We think we have found a way to meet the Republican objective that it shouldn't look like a tax payment and still collect the premiums. If you're going to have a collection on upper income people, it's not fair to have some people pay it and some people not. So we think we've gotten around that.

Now, let me finally say that I am still quite optimistic that we will get an agreement that is consistent with our principles. We've had good bipartisan cooperation throughout this process, and I expect it will continue. Our budget team is going up to the Hill again shortly, and we expect that we'll keep working until we get success.

Q. Since you're that optimistic, what's the stumbling block? What's holding it up?

The President. We still have some differences of opinion. Let me go back through them. On the upper income premiums for Medicare, we have some differences in how we think it should be structured, but the main stumbling block seems to have been that the Republicans don't want it to look like an IRS tax payment. They don't want it to look like a tax increase, even though it wouldn't be.

Our problem is if HHS collected these upper income premiums, they'd have to set up a whole new bureaucracy, and our people estimate that half the money would be lost. And we don't want another big problem of fraud and abuse here. So we've come up with an idea that we think would allow Treasury to collect the money but to have it go directly to the Medicare Trust Fund so there would be no question of a tax payment. And we think that would ease a lot of the Republican and, frankly, some of the Democratic concerns that it wouldn't look like a tax increase. But if we're going to collect the upper income premiums, surely, all Americans would say we shouldn't give away $12 billion. And you can't expect the really honest person to go out of his or her way to pay it and then half the people not pay it, and there would be a lot of disillusionment there. So we think we've solved that problem. That's a stumbling block.

And we still have a difference over this refundability. We're going to try to work through that. But I think we can get it, but we—I offered a tax plan, as you know, right before I left for Europe, to show good faith in working with the Republicans. And I think we'll keep working through it until we get something that we can both live with.

Nazi Gold and the Vatican

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned about the revelations overnight that the Vatican may have been involved in stashing Nazi-era gold? And have you been in touch with the Vatican Government over this?

The President. Well, let me say, I have talked to the—all I know is that there was apparently some suggestion that maybe there is a document here, somewhere in the Government Archives, which would shed some light on that question.

As you know, the United States has taken the lead on this. We've worked very hard. I well remember the first time I heard about it when Mr. Bronfman talked to the First Lady about it. And we've worked very hard on this. And the Treasury Department has assured me that they have historians combing the records, and we will reveal whatever information we have and let the facts take us where they lead us. But we'll keep working on this until we do everything we can to make it right.

Boeing-McDonnell Douglas Merger

Q. Mr. President, on Boeing, besides talking to Italian Prime Minister Prodi, what other European leaders have you talked to? And having made some phone calls, what is your sense? Do you get a feeling that there is a chance that the European Commission will not block the Boeing-McDonnell merger?

The President. I'd like to see a resolution of this. This merger—the Federal Trade Commission, which, as you know, is independent under our law, has ruled that this is clearly not a violation of our laws because there is only room for two big commercial manufacturers. And indeed, the commercial side of the McDonnell Douglas business has suffered with the rise of the European company, Airbus.

The European antitrust laws are slightly different. Boeing has offered a good-faith resolution of this; they're trying to work through it. Our main concern is that only the antitrust considerations play a role in this decision and that we do everything we can to avoid a more political decision which would lead to an unfortunate trade conflict between the United States and Europe. And we're working hard to avoid that, and I've done quite a bit of work on it over the last 3 days and will continue to do so. I think there is a way to work this out, and I'm hopeful that by Wednesday when the Commission meets that an agreement will have been reached.

Medicare

Q. Two questions on the tax budget deal. Number one, one of the criticisms, vis-a-vis Medicare, was whether you had sent a strong enough signal that you wanted these higher Medicare premiums. Is that the signal that you're now trying to send? And number two——

The President. No. If you will remember, I think it was—as soon as I got back from Europe, I said that I would be—publicly—that I would be quite disappointed if we did not have an

upper income premium as a part of the agreement. I believe that that was a public statement I made the minute I got off the plane, practically.

Secondly, our negotiating team has made it very clear to the House and Senate negotiators for a long time that we thought it was an appropriate thing to do, that our only concerns were: number one, if we were going to do it, we wanted it to be collectible, we wanted it to be real; and number two, we did not want upper income recipients to receive absolutely no discount at all because that would encourage them to get out of the program all together, number one, and number two, because in the '93 agreement to reach our $500 billion deficit target, which we greatly exceeded, but we took the cap off of the payroll tax that pays into Medicare. So upper income people now are paying a very high percentage—or much more money into the program than they will ever draw out anyway. So, for those two reasons, we thought that we should not charge 100 percent of the value.

Now, I think we can work those two things out. As I said, I understand why a lot of the Members of Congress say, "Well, we don't want the—if the IRS collects this, it will look like a tax payment, and we don't want it to look like a tax increase." And we agree with that. So we've now come back and offered them another way to do this, which I am very hopeful will break the impasse and enable us to go forward and have this. I think it's an important principle.

Most of the savings in the first 5-year period, indeed, most of the savings in the 10-year period, will come from the structural reforms that we've offered in Medicare: more competition, more choices, more managed care. But still I believe when you look well down the road at the time when the baby boomers will retire, it's good to put this principle in place now, and I'm very hopeful that we can get it.

And let me say, I saw some stories today about people worried about the political repercussions of this. My best judgment is that a big majority of the American people will support this. They understand how big the baby boom retirement generation is. They understand how large the subsidy is on Medicare. And I would be happy to defend the vote of any Member of Congress, Democrat or Republican, who votes for this.

Q. The second part of the question, if I may——

Nomination of William F. Weld To Be Ambassador to Mexico

Q. How about Weld? Are you sending him up——

The President. Yes.

Bipartisan Cooperation

Q. Hold on, the second part of the question, if I may. One of the issues on the budget deal is how much is it complicated by Republican infighting. Can you talk about that a little bit?

The President. Well, my best judgment is that we should do what we've been doing. I think—I have seen in the last year a spirit of bipartisan cooperation which did not prevail in the previous period. And I think that it will continue to prevail. I think it is so clearly in the interest of the country. And I don't have any comment about what's going on among the Republicans, except that I don't believe it will interfere with our ability to reach an agreement. I don't think that they will permit it to do so. I think it is in the interests of the country, and I think that's what we'll do.

Drug Sentencing Guidelines

Q. Mr. President, can you comment on Attorney General Reno's suggestions on crack cocaine?

The President. Yes. Attorney General Reno and General McCaffrey have sent me their recommendations. I have accepted it, and I have urged them now to go to work immediately with the Congress to try to reach an acceptable resolution of this. They did a lot of work on it. They deserve a lot of credit for the exhaustive analysis that they applied to this problem, and I've accepted it. And that's our position, and we're going to try to work with Congress now to achieve a resolution.

Nomination of William F. Weld To Be Ambassador to Mexico

Q. Today or tomorrow—are you going to be able to pass by Helms, or are you going to fight him, or what?

The President. Well, I'm going to nominate him, and we're going to work hard to see if we can confirm him, and we'll see what happens. We're going to do what we can.

Q. Do you think it's possible? Albright's using her wiles. [*Laughter*]

The President. I don't know. That's better than I could have said it. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:25 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Edgar Bronfman, president, World Jewish Congress; Barry R. McCaffrey, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Senator Jesse Helms; and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

Statement on the Report on Religious Freedom
July 22, 1997

I welcome today's release of the Secretary of State's report on United States Policies in Support of Religious Freedom. Promoting religious freedom around the world is a key part of our human rights policy and an important focus of our diplomacy.

Today's report will help shine a spotlight on the serious problem of religious intolerance and persecution. It also underscores the importance of concerted actions by the United States and other like-minded nations to promote religious freedom.

The report fulfills a congressional request for a summary of U.S. policies to reduce and eliminate persecution against Christians around the world. It also describes our efforts to address religious persecution more broadly, which have included defending the rights of Muslims, Jews, Buddhists, Baha'is, and others to practice their faiths freely. Religious freedom is a fundamental human right, and the United States vigorously condemns persecution against any believer and all faiths.

Our Nation was founded by men and women seeking refuge from religious persecution. Religious freedom is the first freedom guaranteed in our Bill of Rights. I am pleased that our Nation has been a leader in promoting religious rights, including through the establishment last year of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Religious Freedom Abroad, through our willingness to press for religious liberty at the United Nations and in our relations with other nations, and through our determination to report fairly and accurately on these issues around the world. Today's report is part of America's larger commitment to help people of all faiths to live free of persecution and to worship in the freedom that is their birthright.

Remarks at a Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Reception
July 22, 1997

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, one of the things that I really want before I leave this office in 3½ years is to be able to stand here with Dick Gephardt and have him introduce me and have me say, "Thank you, Mr. Speaker." And your presence here tonight makes that more likely.

I thank Martin Frost for his tireless efforts, often thankless efforts. Some of you he has doubtless almost irritated asking for help. [*Laughter*] But we are working hard to bring back the House of Representatives to our party in the 1998 elections. And let me assure you that it can be done. I know that it can be done, but what I want you to understand is that it should be done. And I will just give you—just think about two or three things.

Number one, as Congressman Gephardt said, in 1993, with only votes from Members of our party, we passed an economic plan which exceeded all of our expectations. The deficit is now 77 percent lower than it was in 1993—with only votes from our party—and it helped to grow this economy.

We also passed in 1993 and 1994, with only a handful of votes from the other side, the family and medical leave bill, the Brady bill, the crime bill, which is putting 100,000 police on our streets. We've now had the biggest drop in crime, for the last 5 years, we've seen in a very long time and last year the biggest drop in violent crime in over 35 years, thanks to the support I received from Democrats.

Then in 1995 and '96, when our friends in the Republican Party won the majority, if it had not been for the staunch, strong, steely determination of the Members of our party in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, we would not have been able to stand against the tide of the Contract With America. They made it possible. My veto pen was not worth a flip without their support, and don't ever forget it. They deserve every bit as much support.

Now, in 1997, we are actually on the verge of getting a budget agreement which includes not only a balanced budget and $900 billion worth of savings and 10 years of life on the Medicare Trust Fund but, in this Congress, the biggest increase in child health since 1965, the biggest increase in aid to education since 1965, the biggest increase in aid to help people go to college since the GI bill 50 years ago. Why? Because the Democrats have stood in there with us, and they know that the President's veto pen is good, so we can work together to do things that are right for America.

Now, if we balance the budget, if crime is coming down, if the welfare rolls are dropping, if our foreign policy is strong and our defense policy is strong—if you look ahead to the 21st century, what do we have to do? We have to deal with the health care problems of American children; we have to deal with the continuing crisis in our cities; we have to make our education the best in the world; we have to prove we can grow the economy while we preserve and improve the environment. Who should be doing that? The Democratic Party of the 21st century, the Democratic Party that you are going to help to elect.

Thank you, and God bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:05 p.m. at the Mayflower Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Representative Martin Frost, chairman, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

Remarks on the Childhood Immunization Initiative

July 23, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Dr. Guerra. Senator Kennedy, Senator and Mrs. Bumpers, Secretary Shalala; to all the childhood immunization advocates, the State and local officials, all of you who have worked in this garden for so long, we welcome you here.

Hillary and I were the first—part of the first generation of Americans to receive the polio vaccine. Some of you, perhaps, are in our age group, and you were also. I remember when I got the polio vaccine. I remember being a child and having seen the pictures of all the children who were afflicted with polio. And I remember being very conscious that some enormous burden was being lifted off of my life, that I was being given a chance that people just a little older than me didn't have. And it made me grateful in an incredibly personal way for immunizations, I think in a way that nothing else ever could have, although, to be sure, my mother saw that I got all my other shots, and I screamed and squalled with the best of children. But I was old enough to know what I was doing when I got my first polio vaccine.

And I'll never forget—I think Betty Bumpers was the first person who ever talked to me about this whole immunization issue, and I just never could figure out what the problem was. To be honest, I didn't understand—even 20 years later, I'm not sure I fully understand why it has been as hard as it has been. But I now know what all the elements of this endeavor have been, and I cannot thank those of you who have labored as long as you have to make this day come to pass.

The American people will never know that countless number of people who have harbored the dream that every child could be immunized, have labored to break down all the barriers, have struggled against all the problems so that

we could come here today and say that the new statistics released by the Centers for Disease Control tell us that more than 90 percent of our 2-year-olds have actually received the critical doses of routinely recommended vaccines. But you know what it means, and America is in your debt, and we thank you.

Now record numbers of our children, our youngest and most vulnerable children, are actually safe from potentially deadly diseases, such as diphtheria, tetanus, measles, polio, and meningitis. We set a goal, and we're meeting it. And all of you who have been part of it deserve a lot of the credit. I want to join what Hillary said and again thank Dale and Betty Bumpers for what they've done and for their personal inspiration to us. And I thank you, Dr. David Satcher, for all you've done as head of CDC, for your personal inspiration to so many.

Today, we have to look ahead to see what challenges are left for our children and their health. Almost a million children under the age of 2 are missing one or more of their recommended shots still. Too many children across America continue to fall ill with diseases that a simple immunization could have prevented. We have to make sure that every child now is safe from every vaccine-preventable disease. We're taking two steps to help close the gap.

As parents move from place to place, they often leave their children's immunization records behind. Their new doctors often cannot get access to these records. So I'm directing Secretary Shalala to start working with the States on an integrated immunization registry system. That's the kind of thing most people can't remember, but it may have something to do with whether their children live or die. And we have to do it and do it right.

We're also requiring that all children in federally subsidized child care centers be immunized. Since so many of our youngest children spend at least part of their days in child care outside the home, this, too, can be an important step in our efforts to reach some of the children still falling through the cracks.

The progress we've made in immunization is one of our proudest achievements, and we have the opportunity this summer and fall to take even bolder steps. But let us remember, we have to finish this job. We are celebrating a milestone today, but we have not completed the job. Let me also say that we are on the verge, as Hillary said, of enacting the single largest investment in health care for children since Medicaid was passed in 1965. Today, 10 million of our children have no health insurance.

The balanced budget agreement that we reached with the leaders of Congress and that passed both Houses with large majorities takes dramatic and concrete steps to right this wrong. Originally it included $16 billion for child health care. Then in the United States Senate, a strong bipartisan majority passed a 20-cent-per-pack increase in the cigarette tax to add $8 billion more for a total of $24 billion. That will clearly give us enough money to cover another 5 million children. That is the right thing to do. I regret that some now believe they should back away from it. It would be a mistake. I intend to fight to keep that money in the budget and fight for our children. And I want to thank Senator Kennedy for his leadership and ask all of you to join us. Thank you. [*Applause*]

Let me say that in some ways, as many of you understand, this is a problem not unlike the immunization problem, because there is more than money involved. That is, what does it mean to provide health care coverage to 5 million more children? How can we make sure that there are 5 million kids who don't have insurance now and not just children that are being dropped from insurance and picked up on a public program? And what kind of insurance should they have anyway?

The Congress has some very challenging, substantive policy issues before it. But I think in the end the goal ought to be pretty simple: We want the children without health insurance to have the kind of health care we want for our own children. This means everything from regular checkups to surgery. Some in Congress want a very watered-down package of benefits at a level well below that now provided by Medicaid and Federal employee health plans. I think that would be a big mistake. It is not necessary, and we shouldn't do it. I am also determined that this money be invested wisely, truly providing new medical insurance and not simply replacing benefits already covered.

Finally, let me say that this 20-cent increase in the cigarette tax not only will provide necessary resources to protect and improve children's health; by raising the price of cigarettes, it will discourage children from starting to smoke in the first place. It is the right thing to do.

This is the opportunity of a generation. It has literally been a generation since we did anything this much for children's health insurance. We mustn't waste it. The balanced budget plan, the tax cut, all these things we have to keep in mind putting our children first. In the days to come, as we try to hammer out the details, a breakthrough for children's health should be at the heart of our objectives.

We also ought to make sure that the tax cut we pass is good for our children. I have proposed a plan that focuses on the needs of families, to help them raise their children and send them to college. It is responsible; it is affordable. We don't want to return to the days when, under the guise of helping people, we gave them endless exploding deficits. Fiscal responsibility helped to produce a strong economy, and fiscal irresponsibility would surely weaken it. We can have the right kind of tax cut plan, but we ought to keep the children in mind there, too.

Finally, let me say that, as I said earlier, one of the things we expect to do that will really help us close the remaining gaps in immunization is to require children in federally subsidized child care centers to be immunized. I'm convinced the next great frontier we have to cross to really, truly enable American families to reconcile the demands that they face in the workplace and the demands they face at home is to make sure we have quality, affordable, available child care for all the American people who need it.

One of the reasons I've supported this children's tax credit and one of the reasons I want it to be given to people of modest means who are working hard out there for salaries of less than $30,000, is I want to help people pay for the right kind of child care. This is very important.

On October 23d, the First Lady and I will convene the first-ever White House Conference on Child Care, to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the present system in America and to try to find ways to translate that discussion into action to achieve our goal, just as we have achieved this goal today.

Immunization, health care, child care, all these reflect our faith in the potential of every child and honor our obligation to every family. For all the work you have done to help make this remarkable day come to pass, I thank you, your fellow citizens thank you, and I hope someday the American people will truly understand the magnitude of the endeavors that so many of you in this room have undertaken for the next generation of our children.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:20 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Fernando Guerra, director of health, San Antonio Metropolitan Health District; and Betty Bumpers, wife of Senator Dale Bumpers.

Statement Announcing the White House Conference on Child Care
July 23, 1997

Today the First Lady and I are pleased to announce that on October 23, 1997, we will host the White House Conference on Child Care. The conference, which will take place at the White House, will examine the strengths and weaknesses of child care in America and explore how our Nation can better respond to the needs of working families for affordable, high quality child care.

Over the past decade, the number of American families with working parents has expanded dramatically. Making high quality child care more affordable and accessible is critical to the strength of our families and to healthy child development and learning. It is also good for the economy and central to a productive American work force.

This Nation can and should do better. Each of us—from businesses to religious leaders to policymakers and elected officials—has a responsibility and an important stake in making sure that children of all ages have the best possible care available to them. From infancy through adolescence, in child care settings and after-school programs, children can learn and thrive with the right care, attention, and education.

I hope that this conference will be the beginning of a national dialog about how best to care for all of America's children and will make a valuable contribution to our effort to improve child care in this country.

Statement on European Union Approval of the Boeing-McDonnell Douglas Merger

July 23, 1997

I am pleased that Boeing and the EU have resolved their differences and that the EU has agreed in principle to approve Boeing's merger with McDonnell Douglas. The Boeing-McDonnell Douglas merger will promote consolidation and efficiency in the U.S. defense industry and preserve the jobs of 14,000 workers at Douglas Aircraft Co. Our own independent Federal Trade Commission determined that the merger would not harm competition. We hope that the EU will give the merger final approval expeditiously.

Remarks During a Discussion on Climate Change

July 24, 1997

The President. Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, first let me thank you for being here—members of the administration and concerned members of the public, the scientists, and other experts that are here.

I would also like to say a special word of thanks to the Vice President. In one of our earliest meetings together—we meet once a week and have lunch—he went over the whole history of greenhouse gas emissions and climatic change. And I became convinced first that he was convinced that something was wrong. [*Laughter*] Then I became convinced something was wrong. And it's been a great help to me and I believe to the people of the United States to have him in the position that he's in, not only with the convictions that he has but with the knowledge that he has. And I'm very grateful to him for what he has done to help me come to grips with this issue.

To me, we have to see this whole issue of climate change in terms of our deepest obligations to future generations. I have spent most of my time in the last 4½ years trying to prepare the American people for a new century and a new millennium. It is also very important that we protect the Earth for that new millennium, to make sure that people will be able to take advantage of all the things we are trying to do, the opportunities we are trying to create, the problems we are trying to solve.

It is obvious that we cannot fulfill our responsibilities to future generations unless we deal responsibly with the challenge of climate change. Whenever the security of our country has been threatened, we have led the world to a better resolution. That is what is at stake here. And the scientists have come here to explain why.

As the Vice President said, the overwhelming balance of evidence and scientific opinion is that it is no longer a theory but now a fact that global warming is for real. The world scientists believe that if we don't cut our emissions of greenhouse gases, we will disrupt the global climate. In fact, there is ample evidence that human activities are already disrupting the global climate and that if we stay on our current course, the average global temperatures may rise 2 to 6 degrees Fahrenheit during the next century. To put that in some context, the difference in average temperature between the last ice age, which was 10,000 to 12,000 years ago—10,000 to 12,000 years ago—and today, is about 9 degrees Fahrenheit. So we could have two-thirds of that change in 100 years unless we do something.

If we fail to act, scientists expect that our seas will rise 1 to 3 feet, and thousands of square miles here in the United States, in Florida, Louisiana, and other coastal areas will be flooded. Infectious diseases will spread to new regions. Severe heat waves will claim lives. Agriculture will suffer. Severe droughts and floods will be more common. These are the things that are reasonably predictable.

In the face of this, the United States must confront a challenge that in some ways is the most difficult of all democracy's challenges to face. That is, we have evidence, we see the train coming, but most ordinary Americans in their day-to-day lives can't hear the whistle blowing. Unless they have lived in a place where they have experienced severe and unusual and completely atypical weather disruptions in the last 5 years or so, the degree of the challenge is inconsistent with the actual perceived experience of most ordinary Americans. And this is true, indeed, throughout the world. And that presents us our challenge.

A democracy is premised on the proposition that if the American people, or any people in any democracy, know what the facts are and believe them, way more than half the time they will do the right thing. And so what we are doing today is beginning a process in which we ask the American people to listen to the evidence, to measure it against their own experience, but not to discount the weight of scientific authority if their own experience does not yet confirm what the overwhelming percentage of scientists believe to be fact today. This is a great exercise and a great test for our democracy.

I do want to say that I am convinced that when the nations of the world meet in Kyoto, Japan, in December on this issue, the United States has got to be committed to realistic and binding limits on our emissions of greenhouse gases. Between now and then, we have to work with the American people to get them to share that commitment. We have to emphasize flexible market-based approaches. We have to embrace research and development efforts in technology that will help us to improve the economy—improve the environment while permitting our economy to grow. We have to ask all nations, both industrial and developing, to participate in this process.

But if we do this together, we can defuse this threat. And we can make the 21st century what it ought to be, not only for our children but for all the children of the world. I believe the science demands that we face this challenge now. I'm positive that we owe it to our children. And I hope that we can find the wisdom and the skill to do democracy's work in the next few months, to build the consensus necessary to actually make action, as opposed to rhetoric, possible. And for all of you for your commitment to that, I thank you.

And now I'd like to ask Dr. Rowland to be the first of our distinguished scientists to lead off.

Doctor.

[*At this point, the discussion proceeded.*]

The President. Let me again thank you all for your patience and your interest. I think we should give our panelists and scientists another hand. [*Applause*] I wish every American could hear what we've heard today. But thanks to our friends in the media, a good number of them will hear at least a portion of what we have heard today. And this is the beginning of a consistent long-term effort that we all have to make to involve the people of this country in this decision. And I thank you all for the points you've made because in different ways each of them will resonate with citizens of this country in a way that I believe will give us the support we need to take the action that has to be taken.

In the weeks and months ahead, the Vice President, the Cabinet, other members of the administration, and I will be out in the country discussing this. We'll be working with the American people. We'll be talking about solutions as well as problems. The truth is, it's like anything else—the quicker you get—another answer Dr. Holdren might have given is that the quicker you get after this, the less extreme the remedy you have to embrace to have a measurable effect to avoid an undesirable outcome. And the longer you wait, the more disruptive the ultimate resolution will be. So that's another thing that I'd like to emphasize.

Death of William J. Brennan, Jr.

Before we close, I hope you will permit me to make a brief statement. Just before I came in here to this meeting, I learned that today, and not very long ago, retired Supreme Court Justice William Brennan passed away. He was a remarkable human being, one of the finest and most influential jurists in our Nation's history. He served on the Supreme Court for 34

years. He was perhaps during that period the staunchest, most effective defender of individual freedom against Government intrusion. His devotion to the Bill of Rights inspired millions of Americans and countless young law students, including myself. And one of the great honors I have had as President was to be able to award him the Presidential Medal of Freedom in my first year in office.

He once said the role of the Constitution is the protection of the dignity of every human being and the recognition that every individual has fundamental rights which Government cannot deny. He spent a lifetime upholding those rights, and he authored some of the most enduring constitutional decisions of this century, including *Baker* v. *Carr*, on one person, one vote; *The New York Times* v. *Sullivan*, which brought the free speech doctrine into the latter half of the 20th century. The force of his ideas, the strength of his leadership and his character have safeguarded freedom and widened the circle of quality for every single one of us.

We will miss him greatly. And I know you join me in sending our best wishes and our prayers to his family and friends, and our gratitude for his life.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:57 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to discussion participants F. Sherwood Rowland, professor, University of California at Irvine, and John Holdren, professor, Harvard University. The proclamation on the death of William J. Brennan, Jr., is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Statement Announcing the Fast Track Legislation Team
July 24, 1997

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Jason S. Berman to serve as Special Counselor to the President and coordinate the administration's effort to pass fast track legislation.

During his tenure at the White House, Mr. Berman will take a leave of absence from his current position as chairman of the Recording Industry Association of America. I am grateful to him for setting aside this work to join our team. Mr. Berman's extensive knowledge of trade policy and unparalleled experience on the Hill will be invaluable to our effort.

I am also pleased to announce that I have asked Victoria L. Radd, an outstanding member of my staff, to join Mr. Berman in coordinating this effort. Ms. Radd is an Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff to Erskine Bowles. During the past 4 years, she has also served as Associate Counsel to the President and as Deputy Director of Communications. Prior to joining the White House, she was a partner in the law firm of Williams & Connolly.

The economic strategy of my administration, based on reducing the deficit, investing in the education and skills of our people, and opening markets, has helped produce the strongest economy in the world. I am calling on the Congress to enact fast track legislation so we can continue our aggressive drive to open markets to our goods and services and create more high skilled jobs for the American people. Every President, Republican and Democrat, in the past two decades has had this vital tool to maintain effective American leadership in the global economy. Fast track authority is in the national interest of the United States, and my appointment of Jay Berman makes clear my determination to fight for passage of this important legislation.

Statement on Proposed Immigration Reform Transition Legislation
July 24, 1997

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress today the "Immigration Reform Transition Act of 1997." This proposal reflects my commitment to balance firm controls against illegal immigration with common sense and compassion. It would provide a needed transition for individuals who apply for a form of immigration relief called suspension of deportation and who had immigration cases pending before the 1996 immigration law took effect. It would prevent the inherent unfairness of applying new rules to old cases.

This legislation also addresses the special circumstances of Central Americans who came to our country because of civil war and upheaval. Today, the remarkable progress in that region means that many of those people can return home. But as I assured the leaders of Central America when I visited the region in May, we want that to occur in a manner that avoids destabilizing the nations and economies of Central America or imposing undue hardships on families. We also want to make sure that people who sought refuge in our country and who have contributed greatly to their local communities here in the United States are treated with fairness and dignity. To meet that commitment, this proposal ensures that certain groups of Central Americans whose cases were pending before the new immigration law took effect would be eligible to apply for suspension of deportation under the prior rules.

I am determined to do all I can to preserve our Nation's tradition of generous legal immigration. But just as we are a nation of immigrants, we also are a nation of laws. To uphold the tradition of generous legal immigration and to do right by legal immigrants, we need to continue working to stop illegal immigration. The bill I am submitting today in no way diminishes the important enforcement objectives of the 1996 immigration bill, nor is it an amnesty or waiver program. Rather, it eases the transition to the new law for individuals who have put down deep roots in the United States, and it advances our Nation's strategic interest in promoting peace, prosperity, and stability in Central America.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Proposed Immigration Reform Transition Legislation
July 24, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to submit for your immediate consideration and enactment the "Immigration Reform Transition Act of 1997," which is accompanied by a section-by-section analysis. This legislative proposal is designed to ensure that the complete transition to the new "cancellation of removal" (formerly "suspension of deportation") provisions of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA; Public Law 104–208) can be accomplished in a fair and equitable manner consistent with our law enforcement needs and foreign policy interests.

This legislative proposal would aid the transition to IIRIRA's new cancellation of removal rules and prevent the unfairness of applying those rules to cases pending before April 1, 1997, the effective date of the new rules. It would also recognize the special circumstances of certain Central Americans who entered the United States in the 1980s in response to civil war and political persecution. The Nicaraguan Review Program, under successive Administrations from 1985 to 1995, protected roughly 40,000 Nicaraguans from deportation while their cases were under review. During this time the *American Baptist Churches v. Thornburgh* (ABC) litigation resulted in a 1990 court settlement, which protected roughly 190,000 Salvadorans and 50,000 Guatemalans. Other Central Americans have been unable to obtain a decision

on their asylum applications for many years. Absent this legislative proposal, many of these individuals would be denied protection from deportation under IIRIRA's new cancellation of removal rules. Such a result would unduly harm stable families and communities here in the United States and undermine our strong interests in facilitating the development of peace and democracy in Central America.

This legislative proposal would delay the effect of IIRIRA's new provisions so that immigration cases pending before April 1, 1997, will continue to be considered and decided under the old suspension of deportation rules as they existed prior to that date. IIRIRA's new cancellation of removal rules would generally apply to cases commenced on or after April 1, 1997. This proposal dictates no particular outcome of any case. Every application for suspension of deportation or cancellation of removal must still be considered on a case-by-case basis. The proposal simply restores a fair opportunity to those whose cases have long been in the system or have other demonstrable equities.

In addition to continuing to apply the old standards to old cases, this legislative proposal would exempt such cases from IIRIRA's annual cap of 4,000 cancellations of removal. It would also exempt from the cap cases of battered spouses and children who otherwise receive such cancellation.

The proposal also guarantees that the cancellation of removal proceedings of certain individuals covered by the 1990 ABC litigation settlement and certain other Central Americans with long-pending asylum claims will be governed by the pre-IIRIRA substantive standard of 7 years continuous physical presence and extreme hardship. It would further exempt those same individuals from IIRIRA's cap. Finally, individuals affected by the legislation whose time has lapsed for reopening their cases following a removal order would be granted 180 days in which to do so.

My Administration is committed to working with the Congress to enact this legislation. If, however, we are unsuccessful in this goal, I am prepared to examine any available administrative options for granting relief to this class of immigrants. These options could include a grant of Deferred Enforced Departure for certain classes of individuals who would qualify for relief from deportation under this legislative proposal. Prompt legislative action on my proposal would ensure a smooth transition to the full implementation of IIRIRA and prevent harsh and avoidable results.

I urge the Congress to give this legislative proposal prompt and favorable consideration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 24, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 25.

Remarks to the National Association of Elementary School Principals in Arlington, Virginia
July 25, 1997

The President. Thank you very much, Superintendent Paz, President Allen, my longtime friend Sam Sava. Thank you, Secretary Riley. I believe the record will reflect, when your tenure is over, that you have done more for the children of America than any Secretary of Education who ever served, and I thank you.

I want to say, we are joined today by a number of other distinguished education leaders, other superintendents from cities around our country, along with Bob Chase, the president of the NEA; Sandra Feldman, the president of the AFT; Michael Casserley, the executive director of the Council of Great City Schools; and Anne Bryant, the executive director of the National School Board Association; and my good friend Mayor Beverly O'Neill from Long Beach, California. And a lot of superintendents are here. I thank you for joining the elementary school principals and for your support for better education for our children.

I want to begin by thanking the elementary principals for what they do for America's children. Like every parent, I remember very well

the first time I sent my child off to school, putting her in the hands of a principal I did not know but whom I came to know and like very well. [*Laughter*] Every year hundreds of thousands of children arrive on your doorstep, entrusted to you by their parents. And every year you prove their trust is well-placed.

When I was the Governor of Arkansas, I had the opportunity to cochair a national task force on school leadership for the education commission of the States. And we found about a decade ago what you have always known, that when it comes to the quality of education in the school, it is the principal who makes all the difference.

As school enrollments reach record levels, up to 54 million by the year 2006, and as we move into the 21st century's knowledge economy where learning for a lifetime will be essential to success, your leadership will be more important than ever. And your ability to inspire people and to make them believe that we can achieve educational excellence will be more important than ever. Beginning with our Nation's elementary schools, we have to demand excellence from every school, every teacher, every student. We have to repair and rebuild our schools. We have to make sure they take advantage of the newest technologies. We have to make sure that they are safe and drug-free. We have to make sure that we are supporting promising reforms like charter schools and other initiatives underway in many of your districts. But I believe the single most important thing we can do to give our children world-class education is to insist on high national standards, so that we make sure that we've done everything we can to see that every single child learns what he or she knows to succeed in the exciting world of the 21st century. For too long we've been unwilling to insist on that as a nation, perhaps for fear that some of our children could not reach those standards, perhaps out of a misguided notion that such standards would lead to too much Federal Government involvement or too much loss of local control.

I believe a lot of Americans have always feared that children from disadvantaged backgrounds and struggling communities just might not be able to hold their own. I believe that too many Americans have thought that with so much diversity and poverty and family difficulties among our young students, American children would simply always lag behind other countries that had more homogenous, less disruptive cultures, and perhaps longer school years. Still, for more than a decade now, at least since the issuance of "A Nation At Risk" report in 1983 and, indeed, going back some years before, Americans have been working hard, led by their educators and reform-minded public servants, to improve our schools, and it is making a difference.

As Secretary Riley said, last month we learned that our fears were wrong when America's fourth graders finished second only to Korea in science in the international math and science tests. They scored well above the average on the annual math tests. Six years earlier, our fourth graders had scored well below the international average. These tests, of course, are not of all of our fourth graders, but they are of a rather large and representative sample of them. And they tested enough of them to prove that we don't have to settle for second-class expectations or second-class goals for any of our children.

They also show, frankly, that by the time our students reach the eighth grade, the high test scores drop back below the international average. I think we all know that the problems our children face are aggravated in those middle school years, when they move into adolescence, and that in many of our communities the structure and organization of the middle school was more adequate to a previous time when a lot of those problems did not exist.

Nonetheless, the fourth grade test proved, number one, that you're doing a good job and, number two, that our kids can do it. And that is, after all, the most important thing. Therefore, I believe it is imperative now to take action and to begin the movement to high national standards for all of our children. When we don't expect or encourage our children to learn, we indirectly encourage them to fail. When we set high standards and when we insist on them, there's no end to what our kids can do. You see that every day; you know that better than anyone.

In my State of the Union Address I challenged every State and every school to adopt high national standards and by 1999 to actually test all our fourth graders in reading and all our eighth graders in math to make sure the standards are being met, not Federal standards but national ones, standards that every child can meet in every city and State in America and

standards that every child must meet if we want every child to be able to live out his or her dreams. After all, national standards are defensible because reading is reading and math is math in Appalachia and in Alaska and all points in between.

Since I issued that call, education leaders or Governors or both in seven States—California, North Carolina, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Kentucky, and West Virginia—along with our Department of Defense schools all over the world have announced their support for national standards and their desire to participate in the testing program as soon as it becomes available in 1999.

Today I am pleased to make an announcement that would have been literally unthinkable just a couple of years ago. Fifteen of our largest school districts, including schools in six of the seven largest cities in the United States, have committed to meet these standards and to participate in the tests to measure the progress of their students against them.

Now, I don't know how much news this will be tonight on the news or tomorrow in the papers, but every one of us who has been involved in education—if I had told you 5 years ago that the leaders of the school districts in New York; Philadelphia; Atlanta; Broward County, Florida; Cincinnati; Detroit; Chicago; Houston; San Antonio; El Paso; Omaha; Los Angeles; Long Beach; Fresno; and Seattle—that the leaders of these school districts have asked that their students be held to and measured against the same standards in reading and math that we expect our children to meet to have a world-class education, no one would have believed that. Educators know this is an historic, astonishing, wonderful moment in American education. And I thank them for doing that.

This commitment means that 3½ million more children, one out of every 14 public school children in America, will be held to these world-class education standards in the basics. And it means after the test is given, all of them will get better education because we'll all learn from the test results and keep working until we get the results we want in every one of those districts.

I would like to ask the representatives of those 15 school districts who are here to stand up and be recognized, the superintendents, the teachers, the principals. Thank you very much. [*Applause*]

And let me say, the Secretary of Education and I are about to leave to go out to Las Vegas to meet with the Governors. Now, if this event had gone on in 1979 or 1980 or 1983 or 1984, the Governors would have been the first group out there. And they've been dragging their feet, and don't you believe for a moment that Dick Riley and I aren't going to tell them what we saw at the elementary school principals convention.

When we get these results, they ought to be incorporated into school and school district report cards, so that parents and taxpayers can see how our kids are doing but can also measure their progress. Keep in mind—you all know this, and we have to explain this to the citizens and the parents—these tests are not graded on the curve. If you make the highest grade in the class and it's not high enough, you don't know enough. If you make the lowest grade in the class and you're over the bar, you're at least qualified to do well in the world you will live in. It is very important that we get that message across to our people. We are measuring what is required to succeed in the world our children will live in.

We in the National Government will continue to do our part. The balanced budget agreement we reached with Congress, that was voted for overwhelmingly in both Houses by Members of both parties, takes Head Start the next step toward our goal of a million children. It will fund the Technology Literacy Challenge to help us participate with the private sector in hooking up every classroom and library to the Internet by the year 2000. It will help to fund America Reads, our program to get a million trained reading tutors available to give extra help to children who need it most, to make sure that all of our 8-year-olds can read independently. I urge Congress to act to implement this program. All told, you should know that if this balanced budget agreement passes, the increase in education funding, Federal support for education, will be the largest since 1965.

I also want to emphasize that we know that one of the challenges especially that a lot of our big-city schools will face is a looming teacher shortage, that we're going to have more students coming in and more teachers retiring. Just last week I offered a new initiative to provide extra scholarship money modeled on the Federal Health Service Corps, where we pay for medical

school costs for doctors who will go out to underserved areas, to pay for the education costs of young people who will agree to teach for 3 years in areas that are especially challenging. And I hope Congress will pass that as well.

Finally, let me mention in regard to the budget that in addition to the support for education from Head Start through high school graduation, this budget takes another huge step toward opening the doors of college education to all Americans. The agreement provided for a tax credit for the first 2 years of college that would be sufficient to virtually guarantee universal access at least to community college for every high school graduate in the United States and for every adult who needs to go back to school. In addition, it provides tax relief for the 3d and 4th years of college and for graduate school. And that's what we're working on now in these budget negotiations. The agreement provided for that. The tax plan that the Republicans released a couple of days ago falls far short of the commitment in the agreement.

Now, let me say again, I believe we should have a tax cut. We can afford it and still balance the budget, because the budget is now going to finish this year over 80 percent below what it was when I took office. We've already done over 80 percent of the work in balancing the budget. But the tax cut has to, first of all, put middle class families who need the relief most at the heart of its objectives. It should help families to pay for all 4 years of college and for graduate education. It should help working people get training throughout a lifetime. It should help middle class parents to raise their children. And equally important, it should keep us within the limits of balancing this budget and keeping it balanced and not having it explode in the out-years.

We have been handicapped severely for years and years and years because we went on a binge of deficit spending in the early eighties that we couldn't break. Now we have done it. You see the results in our economy: When we have fiscal discipline you have lower interest rates; you have more investment; you have a growing economy. And it's required us to show some restraint here over the last few years, but it's also helped to swell the coffers of State and local government, which fund our schools, primarily because we have a healthy economy. So all of this has to be observed.

I have to tell you that even though there are differences which are clearly and publicly stated between the White House and the Republican leaders and, to some extent, also clearly stated between the Democrats in Congress and others, I think we're going to get this agreement. The negotiators are working even as we speak. And I think we all know that this is a remarkable moment in American history, and we have an obligation to balance the budget for the first time since 1969, to keep this economic growth going, and to do it in a way that gives us the biggest investment in education in over 30 years, and I might add also, the biggest investment in expanding health coverage to our children since 1965. And this is important. That will also help you do your jobs better. And I want to emphasize that if we pass college benefit provisions as contemplated by the budget agreement, it will be the biggest increase in access to college, federally supported access to college, since the GI bill passed in 1945. This is a very good agreement.

So this is a day that we celebrate these 15 school districts stepping forward, representing so many of our children, putting the lie to the notion that our children can't meet the high standards because they're from immigrant families or because they're from poor families or because they live in difficult circumstances. We can all make excuses until the cows come home, but in the end, these kids have to get up and live their lives. And we've got to give them a chance to live their lives in the best way possible. And we have done that. We celebrate that. We live in the expectation of a successful conclusion of these budget negotiations.

But the thing I want to close with is that when you go back to your school, I want you to know that I know that you are leading the fight for the future of our children. More than anybody else, you have to have the conviction that every child can learn to high standards. You have to have the conviction that your teachers can do what they have to do. You have to have the convictions that you can establish the alliances with your parents and your communities that you have to establish. You have to believe that if you demand high standards and have high expectations that our kids can meet them. You have to believe that we actually can succeed in giving our children the tools they need to make the most of their own lives and to keep our country the great beacon of hope

and freedom and opportunity in the 21st century.

Pearl Buck once said that if our American way of life fails the child, it fails us all. It follows that if our American way of life supports, ennobles, lifts up our children, it does that for all of us. That is what you do, and I am very grateful.

Thank you, and God bless you.

[*At this point, Samuel G. Sava, executive director, National Association of Elementary School Principals, presented the President with a bell.*]

The President. Well, I may use this in unconventional ways. Thank you very much, Sam. This means more to me than you know. The young man you mentioned, Michael Morrison, is a wheelchair-bound young man, raised by a single mother, who became my friend. On that cold November Tuesday in 1992, when it was really cold in New Hampshire, Michael Morrison got up to go to the polls to work for me, and his car was broken down, his family car. His mother couldn't take him. And so he wheeled his wheelchair alongside an icy highway for more than 2 miles to reach the polling place. He is now a college honor student. Don't ever forget what you do makes a difference.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:19 a.m. at the Crystal Gateway Marriott Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Stanley Paz, superintendent, El Paso Independent School District; and Yvonne Allen, president, National Association of Elementary School Principals.

The President's Radio Address
July 26, 1997

Good morning. I am pleased to be joined here at the White House by the young men of American Legion Boys Nation, an outstanding youth organization that has inspired thousands of young people, including me, to serve our country by serving in our communities.

I want to talk with you today about what we must do to make citizen service a part of every American's life for his or her entire lifetime. As I said at the Presidents' service summit in Philadelphia this past April, the era of big Government may be over, but big challenges remain for America, and they require an era of big citizenship, an era with new partnerships between Government and business and labor, between wealthy, middle class, and poor Americans, between cities, suburbs, and rural areas, and across all racial lines. At the Presidents' service summit, thousands of Americans pledged their commitment to service. As we prepare to go forward into a new century, every one of us must join them so that we can meet our challenges and come together as one America.

For the past 4½ years, my administration has worked to give every American a chance to serve. We want to spark a renewed sense of obligation, a new sense of duty, and a new season of service all across our Nation.

Of everything we've done to meet that challenge, I am proudest of AmeriCorps, our national service organization that has helped more than 70,000 young Americans all over the country to earn money for college while serving in their communities. AmeriCorps members do real work to address critical problems, from cleaning the environment to helping at-risk children learn to read, to working with police to keep our streets safe, to helping our Nation reach record levels of child immunization.

At the service summit one of the goals for young Americans announced by the Presidents and General Powell was that every young American should be challenged and given the chance to do citizen service. To support that goal, I announced at the summit that our administration would provide 50,000 new AmeriCorps scholarships over the next 5 years to organizations that offer young people a chance to serve. I am pleased to say today that 77 organizations have answered that challenge by offering to sponsor 10,000 new AmeriCorps members next year alone. I thank them for their commitment.

The success of AmeriCorps proves that citizen service works. And it's only one of the many things the National Government is doing to work in partnership with citizens, businesses,

and civic groups. Our administration is busy following up on the commitments we made in Philadelphia at the service summit. This fall, for example, the Department of Agriculture will hold a food recovery summit to help organize volunteers to distribute food to the needy. The Justice Department's new mentoring alliance will link children in need with volunteer mentors. And the Department of Health and Human Services' new partnership with the Girl Scouts of America will teach girls about the dangers of drugs. In all these ways, we are committed to encouraging service throughout American life.

Commitment to community should be an ethic that our children learn as early as possible, so that they carry it with them throughout their lives. That is why I have called on every State to make service a part of the curriculum in high school or even middle school. There are many creative ways to do this, including giving students credit for service, incorporating service into course work, putting service on a student's transcript, or even requiring service as a condition of graduation, as Maryland does.

In addition to the AmeriCorps scholarship program we announced at the service summit, last year we took additional steps to encourage our young people to serve in their communities while in high school. We said we would offer $500 scholarships to high school juniors and seniors with the best record of service in their class if their communities and private service organizations would match that amount.

Just a year later, I am proud to say that some of our Nation's most prominent service organizations have answered that call. Today I'm pleased to announce that 1,600 high school students—some of whom are standing with me today—will receive scholarships of up to $1,000 to help pay for college. The American Legion, the Kiwanis Club, the Rotary Club, the Elks Club, the Lions Club, the Junior Leagues, and the Miss America Foundations, these are community groups that are the glue that hold America together. And now they're giving our young people another reason to give something back to our communities.

This is just the first year of the national service scholars program. I know that next year it will be even bigger. Our goal is to make this program available in every high school, so that every high school principal in America can stand before a graduating class and announce the name of a national service scholar. And with the support of groups like those who have already committed to help, I am confident we can make it happen.

Something very important to our Nation occurred at the Presidents' service summit. There, people from all walks of life looked beyond their differences and came together around the common goal of serving our country, to give all our young people a chance to have a better life. This is the way we have to meet our challenges: business working together with government and labor, religious and community groups joining forces, people lending a hand to help one another. Today we take another important step to build on that progress.

The spirit of the service summit is stronger than ever, and it's up to us, all of us, to keep it alive as we move forward together into a new century.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 2:02 p.m. on July 25 in the East Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 26. In his remarks the President referred to Gen. Colin L. Powell, USA (ret.), chairman, America's Promise—the Alliance for Youth.

Opening Remarks at the Lake Tahoe Presidential Forum in Incline Village, Nevada

July 26, 1997

Thank you very much. First of all, ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank all of you who had anything to do with these efforts in working with us over the last several months. The members of the Cabinet and the Deputy Secretaries have been acknowledged. The Members of the Congress have been acknowledged. The other distinguished State officials from California and

Nevada have been acknowledged. But there are a lot of people who work for these Federal agencies at other levels who have just been out here killing themselves for the last few months to try to make this a good, successful 2 days. And to all the citizens who worked with them and to all the Federal employees who are here, I want to thank all of you for what you did to help these last 2 days be successful. In addition, there are four people who worked with us to help make these workshops and this forum a success: Katie McGinty, Jim Lyons, Tom Tuchmann, Phil Bayles. I can't count—six—Jeff Bailey and Dave Van Note. And I want to thank them.

I want to say a special word of appreciation to the Members of Congress from these two States who have proved that this is a bipartisan, perhaps even a nonpartisan endeavor, that we all have a stake, not just as Westerners but as Americans, in not only preserving Lake Tahoe but, if possible, reversing some of the difficulties of the last 2 years.

But I would be remiss if I did not say a special word of thanks to the person who thought this idea up and got my commitment months ago—months ago—to show up, if you'll forgive me, come hell or high water. And here we are in the middle of the budget negotiations we're trying to finish today back in Washington, but I am here because I promised Harry Reid months ago I would be here. [*Applause*] Thank you.

I also want to thank the people who took us out on the boat today and who do all this wonderful research here and everybody who took the Vice President around yesterday. You know, I got up at 5 o'clock in the morning my time, 2 o'clock your time, to come here today, and I ought to be tired, but I'm exhilarated, partly because of the beauty of the surroundings. And I always—on the few times in my life I've been privileged to be at this great site, I've always been exhilarated by it.

The other reason I am pumped up is that when I saw the Vice President this morning, he was virtually glowing, and I knew he had been here in his element. [*Laughter*] And the minute we got on the boat, I got my Marine Biology 101 lecture—[*laughter*]—about phosphorous, nitrogen, what does what, what does the other. I looked at the plankton. I mean, I could pass anybody's test now. [*Laughter*] And you have made Al Gore a happy man. [*Laughter*] He thinks that he is a—this may be one of the deepest lakes in the world, but he's just about 6 inches below heaven right now. [*Laughter*]

Let me say that the first stewards of this land, of course, were the Washoe people. They tell us that Lake Tahoe was the product of the Good Spirit's benevolent hand. They've also treated it that way. Perhaps now more and more Americans and more and more citizens of the world are tending to look at our environment that way. I certainly hope so. When Washoe families came to the lake each spring, they blessed the water and shared its bounty. And when they left their campsites each winter, they hardly left a track behind. Today it appears to me that all those who are involved in this great endeavor revere this region and have worked hard to keep it safe from harm.

Your cooperation to protect Lake Tahoe is, frankly, as the Vice President said, an outstanding model for the work we have to do to protect all kinds of national treasures and deal with all kinds of environmental challenges in the new century. And if I could be quite candid here, one of the reasons that I wanted to come here was not only to highlight to the Nation the importance of Lake Tahoe but also to show the Nation that there is a place where environmentalists and business people and ordinary citizens, where Republicans and Democrats, where tribal leaders and governmental people, where everybody is working together in common cause recognizing that there cannot be an artificial dividing line between preserving our natural heritage and growing our economy. That is the fundamental lesson as Americans we have to absorb if we hope to be able to have our grandchildren and our grandchildren's grandchildren 100 years from now celebrating the kind of country we're celebrating on the edge of this new century. So you are doing something important for the country.

As all of you know, the Vice President and I got to go out on the UC Davis research vessel this morning to see how the scientists monitor the lake's clarity and quality, and we also learned just how not only pristine Lake Tahoe still is but how much it has degraded over the last 40 years or so. We could see from measurable evidence and the charts that are tacked up inside the vessel what we have to do to reverse the decline.

We also have gotten the message in the workshops the Vice President has described. Over the last 2 months, I think it's astonishing that more than a thousand people have participated in these workshops. I believe this is the seventh such meeting; I think that's accurate. And for all of those 1,000 people plus, I want to thank you because the announcements that will be made today and the work that will be done in the months and years ahead is in no small measure the direct result of your willingness to give your time to participate in this process.

We learned that all of us have to find even better ways to work together. And I think you know that just a few moments ago I signed an Executive order to ensure greater cooperation among all the governments, agencies, and businesses working here. It's not a top-down Federal mandate but a pledge to collaborate and share resources more than ever. We will work with you, we will support you, but you—the States, the tribes, the local citizens—you will lead the way. The Executive order simply embodies the ratification of our obligation to help and to support.

The workshops also convinced us that the Federal Government must take new actions now to help protect Lake Tahoe's environment and, with it, the area's economy and quality of life. Today, with real projects based on listening to local people, we commit to take more than 25 specific actions and more than double the Federal Government's investment in the basin in each of the next 2 years to well over $50 million.

Among the things that we intend to do are, first, to expand our efforts to restore the forest and reduce the risk of catastrophic fires. The Forest Service will use prescribed fire and other means to clean out the dry brush and wood on more than 3,500 federally owned lots and 3,000 acres of open forest each year.

Second, we'll take steps to protect and restore the lake's fabled water quality. We will work with UC Davis to develop computer tools that can predict how various watershed improvements will contribute to water quality. Every Federal agency here will work to increase efforts to restore natural habitat, reduce erosion, and keep the water clean. One crucial measure we'll work hard to deliver is a new pipeline to carry wastewater out of the Tahoe Basin. And I thank all the Members who have supported that, but I particularly want to recognize the efforts of Senator Boxer and Congressmen Fazio and Doolittle.

Third, we will help to cut down on traffic congestion and auto pollution by joining with you to improve mass transit throughout the region. I'm pleased to report that the U.S. Postal Service will help by switching to cleaner natural gas trucks and expanding home mail delivery to people on the west side of the lake. The Sierra Nevada's legendary 19th century mail carrier Snowshoe Thompson would probably be proud of that. [*Laughter*]

And let me say, if I might do a little home cooking here, there are natural gas buses manufactured in Chattanooga, Tennessee, now being sold all over the world, now in use in the rainforest in Costa Rica, that would be very good for reducing air pollution around the lake. [*Laughter*] And I know someone who would be helpful in getting you in touch with the appropriate people.

Finally, the Vice President met with Washoe elders yesterday and announced that we will assist the tribe in their efforts to protect sacred areas and preserve their culture. The Forest Service intends to provide approximately 350 acres of forest to the Washoe for use in growing traditional plants and another section of land where the Washoe will establish a cultural center. As part of this action, the Forest Service intends to provide tribal members access to the water's edge for the first time in a century. I learned today from their leader that the Washoe first wrote to the President of the United States asking for help on these matters in 1877. It just took 120 years, but I can tell you, from now on, the mail will run more rapidly between Lake Tahoe and Washington, DC.

We hope to do more beyond today's announcement as we work with leaders from California and Nevada and Lake Tahoe's many friends in Congress. I also want to recognize the efforts of Governor Miller, Governor Wilson earlier this week in recommending their States' resources to the lake—recommitting their States' resources to the lake. I'm convinced we can succeed in this endeavor. And as I said before, I'm convinced as we do the model of cooperation you have established will be a model that we'll want to follow throughout the country.

We have a lot of work to do today to preserve the pristine Headwaters Forest in northern California, something of great concern I know to Senator Feinstein and many others; to restore

the Florida Everglades; to protect the endangered Sterling Forest in the Northeast; to save Yellowstone from gold mining. We have an awful lot of work to do, I think, in perhaps our biggest challenge of all, in confronting the challenge of global climate change as we move into a new century.

President Theodore Roosevelt said, standing not far from here, "We are not building this country of ours for a day. It is to last through the ages." Well, as we approach the 21st century and deal with these huge mega-challenges like climate change, you have given us a way to meet the challenge of the ages, by working together and understanding what our forebears knew centuries ago. We cannot divide our quest for prosperity from our obligation to hand nature, God's great gift to us, on down to the generations. We can do that. You have shown us the way. And we are determined to do our part.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:55 a.m. at the Hyatt Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to the following forum staff: Tom Tuchmann, Department of Agriculture Western Director and Special Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture; Phil Bayles, Deputy Director of Public Affairs, Forest Service Pacific Southwest Region; Jeff Bailey; and Dave Van Note. He also referred to Kathleen A. McGinty, Chair, Council on Environmental Quality; James Lyons, Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Senator Harry Reid; and Governors Bob Miller of Nevada and Pete Wilson of California. The Executive order on Federal actions in the Lake Tahoe region is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Closing Remarks at the Lake Tahoe Presidential Forum in Incline Village
July 26, 1997

Let me say, first of all, again I'd like to thank Senator Reid for getting my commitment to do this. When I was a boy, I grew up in a town that permitted me to grow up next to a national park, next to a national forest, in a community surrounded by three lakes, one of which was virtually destroyed. I feel like I have been through a lot of these things, and I feel very much at home here.

And the second thing I'd like to do once more is to thank the Vice President for all he's done to sensitize me about these issues and to educate me. I made a joke about it earlier, but it's not funny; it's true.

The third thing I'd like to do is to say to all of you, I leave here basically with three different conclusions or commitments in my own mind. One is the one that Senator Feinstein and Mr. Upton and Governor Miller and others, Congressman Fazio pressed home, is we don't have an unlimited amount of time; we have to keep intensifying our efforts. You have done more than anyone could ever have expected you to do, and we have to do our part. So I got the message, and we'll stay after it.

The second point again I want to reiterate is that you have done something here which, if we can properly publicize it, will help your Nation very much, because you have proved that you can bring all these people together and demolish the false choice between the environment and the economy. And that's very important, because there are lots of other places we have to do it and issues that affect local communities, the Nation as a whole, and in some cases, our entire globe.

The final thing I'd like to leave you with is that you have also proved that there is a way of doing things that makes community-based solutions work, to go back to the Congressman's point. Community-based solutions only work when people come together, agree on a common goal, share values, and are willing to give up a little of their own turf in order to work together to a common goal.

But I ask you to compare—compare just for a moment—if you want to appreciate the significance of what you are achieving here, compare what you have done—look at this group just sitting around here today—with the fact that in Bosnia today we can't even get the parties

to agree on what their currency will look like, but we just recently got reinstituted a ceasefire in Northern Ireland for people who are fighting over things that happened 600 years ago that the young college students would like to let go of and their elders won't let them.

Now, I mean, I don't want to—I'm not overdramatizing this. Mature societies, to preserve our life on this globe, when we're going to have a global economy, a global society, and a global environment, are going to have to be able to find community-based ways of bringing shared values and common cause together and overcoming false choices, like education and the environment—I mean the economy and the environment—and also overcoming past divisions.

And this is a mark of the kind of society it will take to preserve America's greatness for the next 100 years in a lot of ways. How, for example, can we have—we believed that we could reduce the budget deficit and increase our investment in education. Everybody said it couldn't be done; we did it. We believed that we could reduce the size of Government and, in the Vice President's terms, make it cost less and do more. There are 300,000 fewer people working for the Federal Government, but we're far more active—look here, today—in many important areas than we ever were before.

We have to be able to get these false dividing lines out of our minds and the idea that we have to fight with each other if we're different out of our minds. We've got to flush this out of our collective systems. This is a huge issue. If you look at the coming racial and ethnic and religious diversity in our country, we have to follow the model you have established here for reconciling our differences, celebrating them, and then coming together as one America. I say this because President Truman once said that most of his job was trying to convince people to do things that they ought to do without his having to ask them in the first place. [*Laughter*] Now, that was sort of a down-home way of saying what the President has to do is to always imagine where we're going and try to make sure people are thinking about it in the right way.

I didn't think, even myself, when I came to Washington, we'd ever be able to do what we did on this balanced budget agreement, to get huge majorities of both parties in both Houses to vote for it. I just don't accept the kind of old divisions and inevitable choices that basically rob us of the future we could create in a very dynamic time, when you get everybody together and, as Mr. Upton said earlier, whole new possibilities open up.

I want you to think about this, because you will have other challenges that don't relate to the environment and Lake Tahoe that can be dealt with in exactly this way. And our country and our world is going to have to mature to the point where we bring to bear on other challenges the way you have gone about dealing with this.

And I was sitting here, hanging on every word everybody said, and saying, what I would give to see this kind of thing happening in Sarajevo today, in Belfast today, in Gaza today, in Washington, DC, today. [*Laughter*] What I would give. And I think you need to think about that.

So I will end with a laugh, but I'm dead serious. You think about this. Think about the kind of world you want to make for your children and grandchildren. You cannot—this is a dynamic time. The best days of this country are still ahead, but we have to deal with our most profound challenges in this way.

Democracies only do things when a real majority of people really want to do them. And we have this enormous set of opportunities, and you have shown us here not only how to deal with the environmental challenges but how we ought to come together to make the most of our common future. And for that, I am very, very grateful. And you may be sure, I will be giving you a lot of free publicity around the country—[*laughter*]—in the days and months ahead.

Thank you, and God bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:47 p.m. at the Hyatt Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to John Upton, member, Eldorado County, CA, board of supervisors.

Remarks to the Lake Tahoe Community in Incline Village
July 26, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Nakada, for making us so welcome today. I must tell you that we have had a wonderful, wonderful day. I only wish that the rest of my family could be here. They'll be very jealous when I give them a report on what I saw and what I did today.

The Vice President and I are grateful to all the Members of Congress who joined us, including, of course, Senator Bryan and Senator Reid and Senator Boxer who are here with us. And a special thanks to Senator Reid for coming up with the idea and getting us committed to this months ago. It's been a very good thing, I think, this whole summit.

I want to thank Governor Miller for his leadership on this issue. He's my former colleague. I'm going to be back in Nevada just the day after tomorrow at the Governors conference, which you are hosting, and you should be very proud of the record that he's built and the things that he's done here. I certainly am.

I want to thank all of you for showing up. This is sort of the icing on the cake. I didn't realize you would be here until a few minutes ago. And I thank all the lacrosse players for letting us land on your field. I want to thank the AmeriCorps volunteers for being here, for what you do.

I want to be very brief, but I want you to be serious just for a minute and think about the fact that we are only 3 years away from a new century and a new millennium, that we are very fortunate in the present condition of our economy and in many other ways, but that we have to have a strategy for going into the future and going into the future together.

I told the people at that summit today that there were three things that I took away from this experience. One is that the United States has a responsibility to help people who are trying so hard to help themselves to save Lake Tahoe, and we will spend over $50 million in the next 2 years to do our part. The second point is that we can grow the economy and preserve the environment, and they are two sides of the same coin, not inevitably in conflict, and people here have proved that. But the third, and in some ways maybe the most important of all, is that by getting together across lines that divided people—whether they're business people versus environmentalists, Republicans against Democrats, you know, whatever the dividing lines are—and saying, "We've got to save this lake and we've got to do this together and we've got to find a way to do it together and to agree on how we're going to do it," you have shown the way to how we have to make a lot of our decisions as we move into this new century.

I very much believe that our best days are ahead of us. I've worked hard with the Vice President and our friends and allies to create a country in which there is opportunity for everybody responsible enough to work for it; a country in which we're coming together as a community, not being divided by our diversity; and a nation that's still leading the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity.

And I'm proud of the fact that we now have the strongest economy in a generation and the strongest economy in the world; that we've had years of declining—[*applause*]—that we've had years of steadily declining crime rates; that the deficit is now 80 percent lower than it was the day I took office; that we've had the biggest drop in welfare rolls in the history of the Republic. I'm proud of all those things.

The Secretary of the Interior told me a few months ago that we have protected or set aside more acres in public trust than at any time in the history of the United States, except under the Presidencies of Franklin and Theodore Roosevelt. I'm proud of that. But you and I know that we have a lot of challenges ahead, and we cannot—we cannot—allow ourselves to be imprisoned by the thought patterns or the way of doing things of the past. We cannot believe that our old conflicts have to be carried into a new century. We cannot believe that our old false choices have to be carried into a new century. We can't be forced to choose between the economy and the environment. That's a dumb choice. We have to find a way working together across the lines that divide us to achieve both prosperity and preservation of our most sacred gift from God.

We are becoming by far the most diverse democracy in the history of humanity. We cannot be forced to choose between not only respecting but celebrating our diversity and still saying, we are one America, after all, bound together by shared values and a common future for our children. We can't be forced into that division. If you wonder what happens when you do that, you have only to look at Bosnia, the Middle East, Northern Ireland, and countless other places around the world. We don't want to make that choice.

So I can now go all across America and point to what I have seen in Lake Tahoe and how people at the local level came together across lines that divided them for years to do something that was good and noble and, by the way, in their self-interest, to create a better and a brighter future for our children. And that's how we ought to do other things in America. That's why I appreciate the citizen service of these young AmeriCorps volunteers. And that's why I am determined to stay on this path. That's why the people working for the Vice President and me are back on this beautiful Saturday laboring away with Members of the Congress, trying to reach an accord that will both balance the budget and give Americans a tax cut we can afford and invest more in education and the health care of our children than we've done since 1965. Because I believe if we're willing to really think in new ways and reach out to people across the lines that divided us, the best days of this country are still ahead. I want you to believe that. I want you to work for that.

I want you to do your part to save Lake Tahoe. It's not enough to stop the degradation; we have to reverse some of it. And we can do that if we all work together. And I want you to commit yourselves to take the model that is working for Tahoe into other areas of your lives, because I want to be able to go around this country and say, don't tell me that we can't get along and work together and do better; I have seen it in Lake Tahoe.

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:55 p.m. at the Village Green Soccer Field. In his remarks, he referred to Jim Nakada, board of trustees chairman, Incline Village General Improvement District.

Remarks at a Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Dinner in Westwood, California

July 27, 1997

Thank you very much. One of two things is about to happen: Either this is working, which is good for you, or it's not working, and I will be the company that misery loves for the previous speakers. [*Laughter*]

I thank Mark and Jane and all those on the committee who are listed here for your work tonight. I thank Martin Frost for his tireless efforts. I thank Dick Gephardt for his leadership and his willingness to continue this fight.

I must say I used to get discouraged in the last couple of years when occasionally I would hear a Democratic Member of the Senate or the House complain that it wasn't any fun anymore to be in the minority. And when I thought of what the stakes were for our country, it didn't seem to me that fun was a very important issue. And Dick Gephardt has continued to fight and continued to lead, and I'm very grateful for that, and the country should be, too.

Let me thank all the members of the California delegation who are here. And I particularly want to thank Vic Fazio for his leadership in the House. I thank Maxine Waters for her leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and Xavier Becerra for his leadership in the Hispanic Caucus and so many others for the things that they do on particular issues. When I looked at the Members whose names were called, standing up here tonight, I thought, that's why I'm a Democrat. This delegation looks like America, this delegation acts like America, and this delegation is making the America of the future that I want my child and my grandchildren to be a part of. And that's one of the reasons why I'm here.

Let me say to you, I think all of you know that we are in the throes of trying to finish a budget agreement with the Republicans in the Congress that can command the support of an overwhelming majority of our caucus in the House and in the Senate as well as of the Republicans. And we are trying to get an agreement that will finish the job of balancing the budget. Now, it will be much easier now because it's clear that this year, when the books are finally tallied, as Congressman Gephardt said, the deficit will be about 85 percent less than it was when I took office. And that was brought to you by these Democratic Members of Congress, and I thank them for that.

But we have a great opportunity here, and I want to just talk about it just for a second and then try to put it in a larger context. We are fighting for a budget that will balance the budget but also contain the largest increase in funding for children's health since Medicaid was enacted in 1965—the largest increase—and enough to insure 5 million kids who don't have health insurance today; the largest increase in investment in education, from Head Start through access to college, since 1965; the largest increase in helping people to go to college since the GI bill was passed 50 years ago. That is what is in this budget.

And in addition to that, this budget restores now virtually all of the egregious cuts made last year by the Republican majority in aid to legal immigrants who come to this country, which is a very important thing for the State of California. And it contains $3 billion to give to the places in this country with the highest unemployment rate to help people move from welfare to work. This is a very good budget, if we can resolve the remaining problems.

There is a tax cut in it. The tax cut ought to be fair to working families. It ought to put a primary emphasis on education. It ought to help the economy grow. And it shouldn't explode in the later years so we go right back to the deficits that we just worked ourselves out of. And that's what we're working hard to achieve, and our team has been back working over the weekend. If we stay in a positive frame of mind and we all work in good faith, I think we have an excellent chance to get there.

But I want you to understand, this is a historic thing. Yes, there is a tax cut in it. But the tax cut, in the aggregate, will only be about one-tenth—in today's dollars—the size of the tax cut that was enacted in 1981 when we adopted the whole trickle-down economics and got ourselves in the trouble that we were in. So we're working hard to give people an appropriate tax cut without allowing it to explode the deficit.

So this is a great thing. And it will help us to continue the path of economic growth. It will help us to continue the path of fighting crime by finishing the job of putting 100,000 police on the street. It will help us to continue the historic drops in the welfare rolls we have had, not by punishing poor people but by helping them to support their children and to go into the workplace. It will do a lot of good things for this country. We'll also continue to fund our vigorous efforts on the environment.

But what I want to say to all of you is we need to see this in a larger context, because that's really what I'm convinced the two parties are all about today. I just came—yesterday I was in Lake Tahoe—you may have seen the press on it—and I went to Lake Tahoe because it's a precious, wonderful, worldwide resource. It's one of the two bluest big lakes in the world. You can still see down 65 or 70 feet clearly. Forty years ago, you could see over 100 feet clearly; now we're losing about a foot of visibility a year there. That's the troubling part. And I announced—and Congressman Fazio was there with me, and we announced an initiative. And your two Senators, Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer, were there; the two Nevada Senators; the Governor of Nevada and Congressman Miller and one of the Republican Congressmen from northern California and two from Nevada were there. It was an interesting thing.

But here's the point I want to make. That is a very conservative area of Nevada, and it is the overwhelmingly Republican portion of the State. But in Lake Tahoe now they have finally figured out one of the things we have to figure out as Americans, which is that we cannot grow our economy indefinitely at the expense of the environment; we have to figure out a way to replenish the environment as we grow the economy. So that now we have, in Lake Tahoe, the most hide-bound traditionally conservative business people sitting in a room and not just talking to but working with, on a common agenda, the most ardent environmentalists, because they have finally come to the realization that they have to stop setting up these false choices.

And that is really what this whole debate is about now. When we have the budget balanced and we have reaffirmed our commitments to education, to our children, to health care, to these other things, we have to then look ahead and say, "What are the remaining challenges this country faces? How are we going to get into the 21st century? Who offers us the best chance to get there?"

And I can say this with some level of detachment, even though I plead self-interest as a member of my party by heritage, instinct, and conviction, but at least I'm not running anymore—[*laughter*]—which, for those of you who have been supporting me for the last several years, I'm sure you're grateful for that. [*Laughter*] But let me just ask you to think about that. Just imagine, what is it that you would like this country to look like 25 or 30 years from now? I saw at least two women in the crowd, with their spouses, who are about to give birth. What do you want this country to look like when the child you're about to bear is your age?

That's what we ought to be thinking about. We're coming to a new century and a new millennium, in a time that is highly dynamic, when the way we work and live and relate to each other in the world is very different and changing. And we have a chance to make sure that our children will live in the best time in all of human history. But it is not a time free of challenge.

Since 1991 I've been going around the country like a minstrel with a broken record, saying that I have a simple vision for this country: I want every child, without regard to race or condition of birth, to be able to live out his or her dreams if they're responsible enough to work for it. I want this country to be able not only to respect but to celebrate its diversity and still be able to say, but here are the things that bind us together, that are more important, that make us one America. And I want us to continue to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity, because I think it's important as you look at the rest of the world that we not withdraw. That's what I want.

And I think a lot of what we have to do goes way beyond any specific program or specific issue or specific budget; it requires us to think differently. And we have to get beyond being forced to make bogus choices. And we have to get beyond embracing yesterday's conflicts. And that's what I think the Democratic Party is about now.

For example, when I took office, they said, there is no way you can reduce the deficit and increase your investment in education, but we did. They said there was no way you can reduce the size of Government and still make it more effective, but there are 300,000 fewer people working for the Federal Government today than there were the day I took the oath of office, and it is more effective in a whole score of ways. They said that you couldn't improve the environment and continue to grow the economy, but we have made aggressive efforts to clean the air, to have safer drinking water, to take chemicals out of the air, and we're moving forward on that. And we have to do more.

And I could give you example after example after example of this. But as you look ahead, let me just focus on the specific issue of the environment. We know now that we are putting greenhouse gases into the atmosphere at a breathtakingly rapid rate. We know we're 4 percent of the world's population, we're 20 percent of the world's wealth, putting in more than 20 percent of the world's greenhouse gases. We know that if the Chinese get rich the same way we did, since they are 4 times as many of them, we're all going to have a hard time breathing sometime in the next century. Yet we can't tell them if you work hard and you're industrious, we don't want you to make a good living and be able to support your children and educate them. So we have to build cars that give triple or quadruple the mileage that we're getting. We have to find whole different ways to get around, to move around, to do these things. We have to do this.

Now, which party do you think is more likely to say that over the long run we have got to find a way to balance our commitment to economic opportunity with our commitment to preserving our God-given natural heritage? The party that says we can do both? Not that there will never be any tough decisions, not that there will never be any hard choices, but that we have to do both. It's a huge deal.

Issue number two: We have a good economy now. It's the best it's been in a generation, and it's the best in the world. And I'm happy about that. But you can go not very far from here tomorrow morning, Monday morning, and drive down the street, and you'll see a lot of young men standing on the street who don't

have jobs. And we have—20 percent of the children in this country are living below the rate of poverty. And there is still a lot of people who are more likely to get in trouble because they don't have very much to say yes to. And a lot of our schools are still not working at the level they should.

That's why I've said I'm going to spend the rest of my time here doing everything I can to try and modernize and upgrade our schools and trying to increase their performance and trying to have high standards of excellence. And I was told for years by people who thought they were experts in education that I was whistling an idle tune because we had too many poor children, too many minority children, too many children whose first language was not English to achieve international excellence in education; and that I should stop trying to set high national standards and measure people against it because I was just setting people up for failure. It seemed to me we were setting people up for failure if they came from difficult circumstances by giving them substandard education which made sure they would never get out of their difficult circumstances. That's what I always thought.

Now, finally, for the last 13 years, since—almost 14 years now, maybe more—since 1983, when the "Nation At Risk" report was issued, there have been large numbers of people seriously working to improve our schools. And we have been subjecting ourselves steadily to various international competitions and measurements. We have never scored above the international average, ever, until this year, when on the third international math and science test our fourth graders scored well above the international average on math and science. Now, only a few thousand took the test, but they were representative by race, by income, by region, and they were well above the international average. Now, that's the good news.

The troubling news is our eighth graders still scored below the international average. And that is not surprising because they have to deal with adolescence, the fact that middle schools were organized when our society was more stable than it is now, and we're not functioning as well as that level. But the point is, we can—all of our kids can learn, and they can do well and they can learn what they need to know to achieve international standards of excellence. And if you don't want, even in a strong economy, tens of thousands of people standing around on the street, vulnerable to gangs and guns and drugs and violence and costing you money, if you just want to be narrowminded about it, then we had better rededicate ourselves to a national commitment to excellence for every child in education.

Now, which party do you believe is most likely to commit itself to international excellence in education for every child in this country without regard to race or region or background condition? That's why I'm here tonight.

Let me just give you one final issue that is terribly important. And I said this yesterday—one of you quoted this back to me when you went through the line; this was quoted on television. I said, when I saw Lake Tahoe and I saw all these people working together, I told them, I said, this is a model not just for the environment; this is a model for how we ought to behave, because this country has got—we're all so different, but we have common challenges. And yet we're taught, almost from the crib, that we're supposed to fight with people who are different from us. And many of us are raised actually to look at ourselves as something special by being able to look down on someone else. And the truth is, there is not a person in this audience tonight that at least at some point in your life did not think better of yourself by thinking, "Well, thank God I'm not that person; I may not be perfect, but at least there is a flaw I don't have." [*Laughter*] We've all done that.

But consider what I have to deal with as your President: Bosnia, the Middle East, Northern Ireland, Rwanda, Burundi. I had the President of Georgia in to see me the other day. Georgia is a small country. They have a separatist movement there. All over the world there are still people—they're fighting in Bosnia. For God's sake, they were killing each other. They stopped killing each other; now they're fighting about what their currency is going to have on it. It would be good if they had something to buy with the money. Why? Because we teach people and we lead people to look down on each other and fight each other.

We're going to have a conference on hate crimes at the White House this fall. Why? I mean, this is 1997. Why are gay people still getting beat up in public? This is 1997. Why are we doing this? Because we still—first of

all, everybody is vulnerable to our darker impulses. And secondly, we have not ingrained in ourselves a way of dealing with each other that requires us to be honest and forthright and mutually respectful and that actually says, we can work this out together.

I mean, it's great that they're doing it at Lake Tahoe, but why aren't they doing it everywhere? Why can't I finally remove the threat of the gold mine at Yellowstone? I could give you lots of other examples. But the most serious challenge is our racial and ethnic diversity, which is why I went to San Diego and gave that speech a few weeks ago and why we're going to spend at least a year working on this. But we have other kinds of diversity in this country as well. And if you look around the world, it is consuming people.

Now, we have a chance in the 21st century to be not only the most powerful, not only the wealthiest but clearly the most diverse democracy in the world in every way, still being bound together as one America. But we have to work at it, and all of us have to do our part. And it will not happen by accident. The people in Sarajevo lived together in peace for 70 years. Mr. Karadzic, the Serb leader, lived in a highrise apartment where the majority of the people in the apartment house were in different ethnic groups. And I mean, within 2 months they were shooting each other's kids.

Now, do I think that's going to happen here? No, I don't. But is it guaranteed? How long ago was the Los Angeles riot? Five years. Is it guaranteed? Look around this room. Is it guaranteed that all the people in this room and everybody you represent that we're all going to be able to work these things together and get along? It better be, because it's an incredible gift for our country to have people from everywhere living here.

We just announced a big initiative on Africa. Why? Well, 30 African countries had positive growth rates last year. Seven of them grew at more than 7 percent. We got all these people interested in it; they want to do business with us. Why? Because of who we are and who lives here. We have 600 Jewish-American and Arab-American business people who have promised to invest in Gaza and the West Bank if they will ever resolve their differences there. And they want us to. Why? Because we are tied there.

This is the only country where we have people from everywhere. And it is a great gift. But if you believe that it will just happen by accident, as a matter of course, that we will preserve one America, I suggest that you haven't looked around the world enough and remembered our recent history closely enough. Which party do you believe is more likely to bring this country together as one America?

So I'm happy tonight. I'm honored beyond belief that I was elected and reelected President. I'm grateful to the people of California for making it happen for me. I'm glad that there are 12½ million more people who get up and go to work every day and can go home with a paycheck and take care of their children. I'm glad we had the biggest drop in violent crime in 35 years. I'm glad we had the biggest drop in the welfare rolls in history. I'm glad we've got the smallest percentage of people on welfare we've had in 30 years. I'm glad about all that.

But this is a journey. There is no destination. I want us to make this balanced budget agreement tomorrow that I hope 90 percent plus of the Democrats will vote for. But even so, it's just another step on a journey. And I believe that the Democratic Party and these people that you are here to support today has demonstrated that it can be trusted to lead this country on this journey, to get beyond the bogus choices, to get beyond the false conflicts, to create the kind of country and the kind of world that you want your children and your grandchildren to inherit. That's the larger question that I believe has brought you here and that I think proves that you did the right thing by coming here tonight.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:45 p.m. at the Regency Club. In his remarks, he referred to Mark and Jane Nathanson, hosts of the dinner; Representative Martin Frost, chairman, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; President Eduard Shevardnadze of the Republic of Georgia; and former Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic.

Remarks to the National Governors' Association Conference in Las Vegas, Nevada

July 28, 1997

Thank you very much for the warm welcome. I must say, whenever I come back here, I feel terribly nostalgic. I'm eager to come, I hate to leave, and I always know there's something that we don't entirely agree on. And right before we came in here, I came into the Mirage and I saw Steve Wynn and Governor Miller, and right before we walked in, we walked through another room which is set up just like this one, a committee room. There wasn't a soul in there. And I thought, look, I know we don't agree on everything, but this is taking it a little far. [*Laughter*] I was delighted to see the real thing. Thank you very much.

I want to say that—to you, Governor Miller and to Sandy and all your team here in Nevada, Hillary and I are very grateful to you for many things but especially for what you've done on early childhood development. I congratulate Governor Voinovich on assuming the chairmanship. And I thank him for what he has done for young children. It is a remarkable record in Ohio. And Governor Carper, congratulations. I'm delighted to be joined here by many members of the administration who have been here before and will be here when I leave.

And I would like to talk today about a number of things, but let me say that I have tried to establish a better and a growing partnership with the NGA since I first took office. I've been working on one thing, really, which is to prepare our country to go into this new century where every American who is responsible enough to work for it has a chance at the American dream; where out of our vast diversity we build one America; and where we will continue to be the world's leading force for peace and freedom and prosperity, with opportunity for all and responsibility from all, an American community of all.

The Governors who have been kind enough to share with me work experiences, now going back nearly 20 years, have played a major role in a lot of what I have tried to do, because it seems to me now, as it seemed to me when I took office—although I feel more strongly about it now—that in some ways our major challenge is to develop new ways of thinking and acting about all of our problems, going beyond false choices which are imposed on us by limited thinking and beyond old conflicts. It's so much easier to keep fighting in the same old way than it is to imagine a new way of doing business. Indeed, a great deal of my time away from domestic issues is spent trying to get people to stop doing things that no one should have to ask them to stop doing. In Bosnia people lived together for decades in peace; within 2 months they were shooting at each other's children. In Ireland they're still fighting over 600-year-old disputes when the young people are dying to get away from it. But people just can't escape the habits of old conflicts. Thank goodness ours are more constrained, but we have to do better.

And I must say, Governor, the best example that I have seen of a new way of doing things I saw 2 days ago when I was in Nevada at Lake Tahoe, one of the most perfectly beautiful large lakes in the world, which is losing about a foot of its clarity every year because of pollution. And at Lake Tahoe, I saw the most conservative business people sitting with the most active environmentalists on the same page. They would say the same things. You couldn't tell after a point who was in what group, because they have concluded that they cannot preserve their economy and grow it without also preserving their environment. And it was a marvelous thing. I couldn't tell who was a Republican or who was a Democrat. I couldn't tell who was in the public interest environmental group and who was running a local business, because they have just imagined a future that is different from their past. And in large measure, that is what we all have to be doing, because the time we're living in is so dramatically different.

And we've tried to do a little bit of that in Washington. They told me when I got there we couldn't balance the budget and reduce the deficit and cut spending and still invest more money in education, but we did. They said that we couldn't have an activist Federal Government if we were going to cut the size of it and reduce regulations and give more authority to the States, but the Government is 300,000 people smaller than it was the day I took office.

And I think it's clear that we've got a different kind of partnership here.

So that's the sort of the thing I'm interested in, in all these areas. Let me just say that the most important test of any endeavor, I guess, is results. If you look at the economy, we said that we thought we had to cut the deficit but invest more in our people and their future, and we had to open new markets to American products and services. And we've got the strongest economy in a generation.

In crime, we said we had to keep being tough on criminals, but we had to do some intelligent things—that we could have reasonable restrictions on keeping guns out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them without interfering with the right of Americans to keep and bear arms, and we have done it. We said we had to punish people more, but we had to give children something to say yes to, and we've had 5 years of declining crime and last year the biggest drop in violent crime in 35 years.

In welfare, all of you proved that you could be tough on work and still supportive of children and families, that it was a false choice, and we had the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history.

Today I would like to talk about three things, basically. One is finishing the job of balancing the budget; two is following through on welfare reform; and third, achieving national excellence in education.

First, with regard to the budget, we're now in our final stage of negotiations on the details of legislation to write into law a balanced budget agreement. We know now that the deficit this year, when it comes in, will be over 80 percent less than it was in 1992—when I took office, in January of 1993. And some people are saying, well, we ought to just forget about it, the economy will keep growing and the budget will be in balance next year. That is dead wrong. It might be in balance next year or it might not, but if it is the deficit will start going up again immediately. Why? Because as all of you know, you can't reform the entitlements in an annual appropriations basis. We have over $400 billion of savings in the entitlement programs in this balanced budget agreement and $900 billion in savings over 10 years.

Secondly, one of the things that keeps the economy going is confidence that we're serious about fiscal responsibility. So if we walked away from the budget agreement we don't know what impact it would have on the stock market and on individual investment decisions and on the other things that keep our economy growing. So I think it would be a mistake.

More important, this is a remarkable budget. Because of the prosperity of our country we have a historic opportunity to balance the budget in a way that reflects our values and strengthens our economy as well; a historic opportunity to pass a balanced budget that includes the largest increase in education since 1965, the largest increase in helping people go to college since the GI bill passed 50 years ago; and, as Governor Miller said, the largest increase in health insurance and health support for children since Medicaid was enacted in 1965 with a bipartisan vote from the Congress.

We have a chance to pass a balanced budget that will move more people from welfare to work, that protects the environment, that extends the Medicare Trust Fund for a decade, although to be sure, we will have to do more on that in the future. We have an opportunity to give the American people a tax cut that is modest in the context of the overall economy but still will provide much needed relief to middle class families, will support education, and will help to grow this economy in the future.

This is an historic opportunity. It can be the achievement of a generation. It can only happen with big majorities of people in both Houses and both parties coming together. And I believe we're on the verge of achieving it.

We've worked hard over the past weekend trying to work out some of the last difficulties with which many of you are very familiar. I am pleased to say that we have reached agreement that the American people will get America's version of Georgia's HOPE scholarship, a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college. There will be other things in the agreement that are well-known, but it's clear to me that it must have a child tax credit available for working families who need it, from teachers to technicians, from firefighters to small-business people across this country. It should include $24 billion for children's health care. It should include a tobacco tax to help pay for that health care. And it should preserve the fiscal integrity of the budget. We need to be able to say to you, not just in 5 years but in 10 years, we will continue to be able to keep this budget in balance if we have a reasonably successful economy. Over the long term, the policy of fiscal

responsibility is the best economics. And we dare not go back to a policy of sustained structural deficits. We will be punished in the international markets, and people in every State in this country that you represent will be hurt if we do that. I think we're going to do it.

I know that you have some concerns over the continuing debate in the children's health package. We're trying to work through that. Let me just say that I am striving to achieve two principles that I do not believe have to be in conflict. First of all, I think there will be more flexibility than the States have had in the past ever in the administration of the Medicaid program and the new children's health program. And there will be no new costs to the States in the children's health program. But it is important also that we have an adequate benefit package for children, recognizing that there are some problems that children have in a way that is more profound than adults, including problems with vision, with hearing, with dental health. I also think it's important that the American people know if we're going to raise this tax money on tobacco that the money will actually add children to the ranks of the insured and not be used, in effect, for people to be able to drop other insurance schemes of children and put them on a public program, or that the money would be spent on things other than adding children.

So that's where we are. I feel good about it. And I think we're on the right track. And I will be surprised and deeply disappointed if we do not achieve an agreement in the near future that you will, hopefully, be quite supportive of and that will achieve sustained, big majorities from both Houses and both parties.

The second thing I'd like to talk about briefly is welfare reform. It has been one of my top priorities for a long time—as Governor Miller said, for at least 10 years, since my predecessor as head of the Governors' Association, Lamar Alexander, asked Mike Castle and I to head a welfare reform task force a decade ago.

Since I took office, we have given waivers to 43 States to help you launch your own welfare reform experiments to make welfare a second chance, not a way of life; to promote independence and family and work and responsibility. And about a year ago, I signed the welfare reform law which has tough work requirements, time limits, parental responsibility, and imposes significant responsibilities on you, while giving you more flexibility to be fully responsible for the program.

There was a lot of debate about the time I signed the bill about whether welfare reform would work, about whether people would actually move from welfare to work or whether they could. I would submit to you that after 4½ years that debate should be over, based on the evidence that you have worked so hard to amass. There are now 3 million fewer people on welfare than the day I took office and 1.2 million fewer people since I signed the welfare reform bill just a year ago. Nine States have cut their welfare rolls by more than 40 percent in the last 4 years. Wisconsin and Wyoming have cut their welfare rolls in half. This is the largest decrease in history. And we now have the lowest percentage of our population on welfare since 1970. And you should be very proud of your role in that achievement. That is something America can be proud of, the lowest percentage of people on public assistance since 1970.

Now, I know there are a lot of reasons for that. The good economy has taken some people from welfare to work. There's been a 50 percent increase in child support collections, and that's helped. The minimum wage and the earned-income tax credit have made work more attractive for people on the margins; that's helped. But make no mistake about it—our Council of Economic Advisers did a very rigorous analysis of this, making clear that a significant percentage of the people who had moved from welfare to work did so because of State welfare reform initiatives and because of the new law. So we know it can work.

Now, let me also say I know that a lot of you were concerned, as I was, about some of the things that were in the welfare reform law that I felt should not have been there, and we are moving forward in this budget agreement to fix that. Among other things, the most egregious cuts in aid to legal immigrants will be restored under agreements we have already reached with the Republican and the Democratic leaders in the Congress. And there will be another $1½ billion for food stamps, which I think is important, among other things, because it's important for us to remember that most people on welfare are single mothers and their little children. But a lot of unemployed people long term in this society are single men, and we should not forget about them. And one of the things that I like so much about what

Governor Carnahan has been doing in Missouri is the attempt to integrate the efforts to put single men into the work force with the effort to put people from welfare into the work force. If we can't do this now when our unemployment is 5 percent nationwide and when prosperity is virtually uniform across the country but there are pockets of people who are still unemployed, when can we do it?

So I believe that these restorations will help you in your efforts. And State officials were central to this budget debate without regard to party, and I thank you for your help in getting that into the agreement.

But there's also a lot more to be done. You asked to be cut loose from the Federal Government's bureaucratic strings, and we did that. But now you have continuing responsibility that is greater, and we have continuing responsibility because it's still a national priority. So I think we ought to take a look at how we're doing—our successes, our shortcomings, and our continuing challenges—in four areas: jobs, child care, transportation, and child support.

First, how well are we doing in creating the jobs that are necessary to move people from welfare to work? If we require people to work, they have to be able to work; there have to be jobs there for them. Nearly all the State welfare-to-work programs include the traditional elements of job search, training, education, community work experience, placement in unsubsidized jobs. But now—I think this is remarkable—now 36 of the 50 States are doing what I would encourage every State to do, using welfare checks to subsidize private employment for a period of time.

Almost every State in America today has more money under the welfare program of the reform law than you would have if the old law was in place, because we pegged the block grant to the time when welfare rolls were the highest, and they've dropped at a record rate. So the 36 States that are doing this I predict will find much, much greater success in getting private employers to be willing to take a chance, because now that we've moved 3 million people off the rolls, you know as well as I do that the remaining adults on the rolls, by and large, are the hardest to place in employment in the private sector, need the most training, need the most support, may have a false start or two, and we cannot do it unless we have private sector support. So for those of you who have done this, I take my hat off to you.

We also know that there will be some places in this country where the impact of welfare is so great and the present absence of private sector, successful job creation is limited that we have to do more. So this agreement will include $3 billion to go to communities and States to help you create the work opportunities in those areas where the private sector will not be able to provide them alone. And I think that is a good thing.

We also have secured in this agreement from congressional leaders a private employers tax credit to help hire long-term welfare recipients. And I believe it is drawn as narrowly as we could draw it so that the tax credit cannot, in effect, be used for people other than those who are actually moving from welfare to work. And I hope that will help you to meet your goals in each State. Pennsylvania and Massachusetts are among the States that are already doing this.

And I also believe, if I might say, that every one of these workers should earn the minimum wage. And I know there's been some debate about that. I've heard already from Governor Voinovich and Governor Miller what your position is, but I just want to reaffirm my view that when people go into the workplace and they earn the minimum wage—they ought to be able to earn the minimum wage. They should be eligible for the earned-income tax credit. That's what I believe. Whether we can work some resolution of some of the other issues, I don't know, but I feel very strongly about that. I know right now that according to our analysis, the fact that we raised the minimum wage and raised the earned-income tax credit is one of the reasons a lot of people voluntarily tried to move from welfare to work, and I don't think we ought to do anything that would undermine that incentive.

Let me say that we also have a welfare-to-work partnership nationally with CEO's of large, medium, and small businesses. And I want to thank Governors Thompson and Carper for agreeing to cochair the advisory council of that partnership. I think it would be a good thing if every State had a similar partnership. North Carolina, I know, is one of the States—a growing list—that have established them locally.

My experience has been that private employers are actually quite eager to help us solve

this problem. If we will help them with some of their problems, I think that they will carry a lot of this load for us because all of America has a vested interest in seeing that welfare is a second chance, not a way of life. MGM Grand Hotel here has hired over 1,000 welfare recipients during the past few years. And the State of Nevada has set a goal for new casinos to set aside 10 percent of all their positions for former welfare recipients. And we thank you for that.

The second thing that it seems to me that we ought to look at is child care. We all know that it's essential if low income families are going to succeed at work and at home. And I think we all agree that raising children will always be our most important job. It's more important than our day job. It is the most important thing any society can do. And we can't have people with young children moving into the work force unless they know that their children are going to be well-cared for and safe and secure in a nourishing environment while they're at work.

Now, we worked hard to add $4 billion to the welfare reform law to increase child care assistance to you. And States are now receiving more Federal dollars, and about half the States over and above that are increasing their spending beyond what is needed to receive these Federal funds. And for those of you that are doing that, I applaud you. And I think the States with the biggest drop in welfare loads would say—I see Governor Thompson nodding his head—I believe they would say that that has been critical in their endeavors. Florida, Wisconsin, and a few other States have added quite a bit more than required under the Federal law. Some States are creating seamless child care systems which provide subsidies for all workers below a certain income whether they were once on welfare or not. That is a model that I hope one day we'll be able to have everywhere in America.

The First Lady and I have worked on this—she, particularly—for a long time. We think every child should have access to quality child care, and we think it's the next great frontier if we're going to make sure all Americans can succeed at home and at work. On October 23d we're going to have the first-ever White House Conference on Child Care to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the present system and what else we have to do. And I hope you will all be involved in that and will have representatives there.

The third thing we have to do is to make sure there's adequate transportation for those moving from welfare to work, because the jobs, the training programs, and the child care centers are often outside the neighborhoods. I must say, I thought I knew a lot about welfare, but until we actually got into the end of the law here, I was unaware that only 6 percent of the people on welfare have cars, and that in many big cities, no matter how long people are willing to ride the bus or the subway, they will never get to the available entry-level jobs. That is a stunning statistic. At the same time, there are a lot of suburbs where businesses need new workers. And Congress, therefore, I think should put in this new transportation bill the proposal I've made for $600 million to help States and localities devise transportation strategies to move people from welfare to work.

Some communities and States have already started. Kentucky has an Empower Kentucky initiative that uses the resources of four different Cabinet offices in a free transportation brokerage system to assure transportation in all areas of the State. And this will probably be something that all of us who come from States with large rural populations, where there are people in rural areas on welfare, will have to adopt. Michigan's Project Zero provides transportation in its effort to put every able-bodied person to work. In Wisconsin—this was a stunning statistic to me—only 3½ percent of the people on welfare have cars. So the State has a job ride initiative to van-pool literally thousands of central city workers to suburban jobs. Other States are spending part of the welfare block grant you now have on transportation. And I would just encourage you to do more of it, and I ask you to please help me persuade Congress to put this $600 million in the new ISTEA bill, because it will help you to do what you have to do to meet your goals of employment.

Finally, let me say a word about child support. The Governors have been in the vanguard of insisting on more uniform, tougher child support requirements. The legislation that has been passed and the efforts that we've made together have led to an increase of 50 percent in child support collections between '92 and '96. And that is very good; that's billions of dollars. But with the unanimous support from this body we made sure in the welfare law there were tough

new measures to help the States track deadbeat parents across State lines.

To date, however, as you saw from the study that was published a few days ago, not all States have put these measures in place. This is one of the critical steps to welfare reform. And the more people who are obliged to pay for their children, who can pay for their children, are unable to escape the obligation to pay for their children, the more there will be public money to spend on productive ways to help the people who actually have to have help. So I would urge all the States to put in place these tough, statewide child support collections mechanisms as fully and quickly as possible.

Finally, let me say that I have some concern that the savings from welfare, which have been very considerable in some States, will not be used on welfare reform to move all the people who can move from welfare into the work force. We have lowered welfare rolls by 3 million over 4½ years, and that's a great accomplishment. But we know we've been helped by the other things that I mentioned.

Now, I know in some State capitals there are big debates about how to use extra money caused by the fact that the block grant was pegged to the peak welfare caseload and the caseload is much lower in your States. But I think if we were to revert these savings to other things away from welfare reform, it would be a big mistake that would come home to haunt the States the next time there is an economic downturn. Anybody who does it, I think, would really wind up regretting it the next time there's an economic downturn. And if you can get people—even in an economic downturn, if people lose their jobs, if they have work experience now, if we can get all these people into the work force now, then when they become unemployed, as there will always be some people who are unemployed, they will be far, far more likely to be unemployed for a shorter period of time and to get back to productive work more quickly. Maryland has decided to take the money that they have from lowering caseloads, and they're using all of it for child care, transportation, and training people. And I think that that is the way to go.

After a year of this law, we know that welfare reform will work; we know it will. But we know that we have a ways to go to make a culture of dependency a thing of the past. And so in these four areas, for all you're doing, I applaud you. But I would urge you, all of you, to make sure that you've done everything you can in each area.

Finally, let me ask your help in one other area. As all of you know, and particularly those of you who served with me know, education has been not only the centerpiece of a lot of what I'm trying to do in this second term, it's been an obsession of mine throughout my public life. We have made a lot of progress since the "Nation At Risk" report was issued in the spring of 1983, and Governors have led the way. But we have a lot more to do.

In the State of the Union Address I asked every State to adopt high national standards and, by 1999, to participate in testing every fourth grader in reading and every eighth grader in math to make sure the standards are being met. Since I issued that call, Governors and education leaders in six States have agreed to participate. And I thank the Governors of North Carolina, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Kentucky, and West Virginia—three Republicans and three Democrats—along with the Department of Defense schools all over the world for stepping up to the challenge. I wish Governor Weld were here for me to thank him, but I appreciate the fact that he's willing to go to Mexico. And I hope we can get him there.

Last week Secretary Riley and I went to the National Association of Elementary School Principals where we were able to announce, thanks to the Coalition of Great City Schools, that 15 of the largest school districts in this country, including schools in six of the seven largest cities in America, have committed to adopt national standards and to participate in the program. This will get us up to about 20 percent of the children in America who are now committed to be a part of this in 1999.

Now, this is an astonishing thing. For those of us who have been at this for a long time, just 5 years ago, the idea that 15 of the largest cities in America, which were written off in terms of their school system, would come up and say, not only do we not wish to be written off, we're willing to be held accountable, and if our kids aren't measuring up, we want to know about it, is an astonishing development in the modern history of education reform and something we should all be very, very excited about and grateful for.

Now, I know there is some reluctance here, and I would just like to deal with a couple

of issues. One is the cities wouldn't do it for a long time because they thought that our kids couldn't do it. That's the truth. They said America has a higher percentage of poor kids than other countries; America's got a more diverse student body than other countries; America's got all these problems in the way they work than other countries, and on and on and on—and these kids, they just have too many loads to bear. My theory is that the kids with too many loads to bear need to be held to the highest expectations and need a good education more than anybody else.

And now we know we can do it. The results we got just a few weeks ago from the third international math and science tests, which include a few thousands kids from America—but they are a representative sample by race, by region, and by income—had—for the very first time on any international test, our fourth graders scored way above the international average in math and science, way above the international average. It had never happened before. But we know we can do it now. That's the good news.

The bad news is, the kids in the eighth grade still scored below the international average. And we know why. When they reach adolescence, they—all the problems of adolescence come to bear. They become more vulnerable to the gangs, the guns, the drugs, all the other things. The middle schools in many, many of our States were organized—many of them are too big to be functional. They were organized when our society was far more stable and coherent than it is now.

We know there are a lot of problems we have to face, but we don't have to guess anymore about whether our kids can do it. We don't have—that's not—it's not an open debate. They proved that they could do this. And we owe it to them. So we're not doing them any favors by not saying we're prepared to be held to international standards.

The second reservation I think is that somehow this was a power grab by the Federal Government to erode States' constitutional responsibility for education or local control of the schools. Now, Secretary—Governor Riley is going to be here after I leave, and I know he's been here, but let me reemphasize, our basic role here is to pay for the development of this test. And most of you now participate in the National Assessment of Education Progress; over 40 States do. We participated in helping to pay for the development of that test, but it's a national test that is given to a representative sample of students; it has nothing to do with the Federal Government. They're not Government questions, Government standards, Government anything. We helped them to develop the test. That's what we propose to do for all the kids at the fourth and eighth grade level, not to have a Federal standard but a national standard. Governor Romer has been working on that for years. When I handed over the leadership of the standards movement and he took it up, he's been, I think, perhaps our most passionate and certainly our most well-informed advocate on this issue for a long time.

But this is not a Federal Government power grab. It's a question of whether there should be national standards. Neither is it inconsistent with the fact that the Department of Education has actually given more say to States and local school districts than our predecessors in how to spend Federal funds. So I think that that is not accurate.

Now, the third and the legitimate concern that a lot of you have is that you already have sometimes more than one other testing regime. That is a legitimate concern. And so we have to work with you if we're going to ask you to participate in this to try to reconcile these things so that you're not overburdened in terms of the administrative time, the time that kids spend, all that. I understand there are practical implementation issues that I consider legitimate. But I think we can work through those.

I just have to say, though, I do not believe that we will be the leading economy in the world 50 years from now unless we can do a more uniform job of getting people out of high school with excellent world-class educations. I do not believe that. You have to ask yourself whether you believe that. I don't believe that. We've got the finest system of higher education in the world. It will continue to carry us a long way, but we simply have to do a better job in K through 12. And I believe this will help. And I want to implore you to work with us and try to work through the legitimate administrative concerns you have of the duplication of tests and the time and all that business. We will do everything we can to help with that. But I think this is a terrific opportunity for us, and now we know we can do it.

So those are the things I wanted to say about the budget and welfare reform and education:

State responsibilities involving education and welfare reform but high national priorities; and critical to move with these forward into the 21st century.

Just very briefly let me mention one more thing. I have been helped greatly by two of your former colleagues, Governor Kean of New Jersey and Governor Winter of Mississippi, who agreed to be two of the seven members of our advisory board in this yearlong effort we're making to look at the state of race relations in America, race reconciliation, and where we're going into the 21st century. I think all of us know there is still some unfinished business represented by the continuing debates we have in America over affirmative action and other issues. But what I think has not been as clearly thought through are the implications of where we're going racially as a country.

Today, Governor Cayetano is the Governor of the only State in America that has no majority race. In Hawaii, about a third of the people are of European heritage; about a third of the people are of Japanese heritage, maybe a little lower, both; about 18 percent of Philippine heritage; about 16 percent native Pacific Islanders. But within 5 years the State of California will have no majority race. And unless there is a dramatic change in birth patterns and immigration patterns—I mean a dramatic change—within 30 to 40 years in our Nation as a whole there will be no majority race. We have to think about the implications of this.

I just welcomed all the delegates from Girls Nation and Boys Nation to the White House. And both the delegates from Girls Nation, Governor Carlson, from Minnesota were Asian-Americans—in Nordic Minnesota. This country is changing in dramatic ways. Race, ethnicity, and religion is convulsing the rest of the world. If we can somehow not only respect but actually celebrate our diversity and still have people say that the most important thing is I'm an American and we have one America, this is an unbelievable opportunity for us in the new century. It can do as much as anything else to preserve our world leadership for the things that we care about and to make America really work.

And so I would ask all of you over the course of the year, and maybe we'll take it beyond—we'll be trying to get in touch with people in every State—I hope you will participate in this. This will be a good, healthy thing for America. But it is also absolutely essential to the function of this country as we move into the 21st century. If we can't find a way to say it's good, whatever our ethnic heritage is and we celebrate it, but the most important thing is we are a part of one America, we can't achieve any of these other things we want to achieve over the long run.

And again I say, if you think about what the Governors are about—getting rid of false choices, getting rid of phony debates, going into the future—this is at the core of that. So the country is in good shape. We're moving in the right direction. We've got to finish the job of balancing the budget, follow through on welfare, put education on the front burner, and learn to work and live together. If we do that, then all of us together will leave our grandchildren an America that will be greater than it is today.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:05 a.m. in the Ballroom at the Mirage Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to the following National Governors' Association officials: Gov. Bob Miller of Nevada, outgoing chairman, and his wife, Sandy; Gov. George Voinovich of Ohio, incoming chairman; and Gov. Tom Carper of Delaware, incoming vice chairman. The President also referred to Steve Wynn, chairman and chief executive officer, Mirage Resorts, Inc.; former Governors Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, Michael N. Castle of Delaware, Thomas H. Kean of New Jersey, and William F. Winter of Mississippi; Governors Mel Carnahan of Missouri, Tommy G. Thompson of Wisconsin, Roy Romer of Colorado, James B. Hunt, Jr., of North Carolina, Parris N. Glendening of Maryland, Paul E. Patton of Kentucky, John Engler of Michigan, Benjamin J. Cayetano of Hawaii, Arne H. Carlson of Minnesota, and William F. Weld of Massachusetts, nominee to be U.S. Ambassador to Mexico; and the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA).

Statement on the Retirement of General Ronald R. Fogleman as Air Force Chief of Staff

July 28, 1997

Today General Ronald Fogleman, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, announced that he plans to retire in September, after 34 years of active duty service.

It has been a great privilege for me to work closely with General Fogleman over the last 3 years. I want to take this opportunity to commend this extraordinary officer for his dedicated service to our Nation. For over three decades, in war and peace, General Fogleman has demonstrated his inspirational leadership and dedication to the men and women of the Air Force. As Chief of Staff, his clear vision and tireless championship of air and space power have shaped the U.S. Air Force for the challenges of the 21st century. These are his legacies.

General Fogleman's leadership and wise counsel will truly be missed in the senior decision-making ranks of our national security structure. Hillary and I wish him and Miss Jane the very best.

Memorandum on the 1997 Combined Federal Campaign

July 28, 1997

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: 1997 Combined Federal Campaign of the National Capital Area

I am delighted that the Secretary of Transportation Rodney E. Slater has agreed to serve as the chair of the 1997 Combined Federal Campaign of the National Capital Area. I ask you to support the campaign by personally chairing the campaign in your agency and appointing a top official as your vice chair.

The Combined Federal Campaign is an important way for Federal employees to support thousands of worthy charities. This year our goal is to raise more than $38 million. Public servants not only contribute to the campaign, but assume leadership roles to ensure its success.

Your personal support and enthusiasm will help guarantee another successful campaign this year.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

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

July 28, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Cyprus ("the Treaty"), signed at Washington on June 17, 1996.

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

This Treaty will, upon entry into force, enhance cooperation between the law enforcement communities of both countries. It will thereby make a significant contribution to international law enforcement efforts.

The provisions in this Treaty follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 28, 1997.

Message to the Senate Transmitting World Intellectual Property Organization Treaties With Documentation
July 28, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for Senate advice and consent to ratification the World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty and the World Intellectual Property Organization Performances and Phonograms Treaty, done at Geneva on December 20, 1996, and signed by the United States on April 12, 1997. Also transmitted is the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaties.

These Treaties are in the best interests of the United States. They ensure that international copyright rules will keep pace with technological change, thus affording important protection against piracy for U.S. rightsholders in the areas of music, film, computer software, and information products. The terms of the Treaties are thus consistent with the United States policy of encouraging other countries to provide adequate and effective intellectual property protection.

Legislation is required to implement certain provisions of the Treaties. Legislation is also required to ensure that parties to the Treaties are granted, under U.S. copyright law, the rights to which they are entitled under the Treaties. That legislation is being prepared and is expected to be submitted shortly.

I recommend, therefore, that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the WIPO Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty, and give its advice and consent to ratification, subject to a declaration under Article 15(3) of the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty described in the accompanying State Department report.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

July 28, 1997.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Protection of National Information Infrastructure
July 28, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 1061 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, attached is a report, with attachments, covering Policy on Protection of National Information Infrastructure Against Strategic Attack.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 28, 1997.

Remarks at the Funeral Service for Justice William J. Brennan, Jr.
July 29, 1997

Mrs. Brennan, members of the Brennan family, Justices of the Supreme Court, Members of Congress, the administration, Father Jordan, Father O'Hara, Monsignor: Throughout our history, a few powerful ideals have transformed the lives of our people. And throughout our history, there have been a few individuals so devoted to those ideals they could hammer them on the anvil of history to reshape our land and our future.

Often, when our Nation could have fractured, a few have stepped into the breach, bringing us together and moving us forward. Justice Brennan found the ideals in the Constitution time and time again. And time and time again, he stepped into the breach to hammer them on the anvil of our history, saving us from our darker impulses and always pulling us together and pushing us forward. We thank God for his life and work, for Justice Brennan's America is America at its best.

Today we recall his decency and grace which made out of his philosophical foes some close, personal friends. We recall his humor and humility, we recall his pride in his own heritage and the stunning, almost inexplicable empathy that enabled him to walk in the shoes of those whose lives were so very different from his own. We recall him as a legal giant, the balance wheel who molded the Supreme Court into an instrument of liberty and equality during tumultuous times.

For Justice Brennan, the phrases of our Constitution were not archaic abstractions but living, vibrant guarantees of the freedom and equality God has given us. Because of him, those old words came alive in our lives as well. Think of it: Today, the votes of all Americans have equal weight because of Justice Brennan. The press can freely and robustly debate the great issues of the day because of Justice Brennan. Mr. Justice, you'll have to forgive the elected officials here if we have, time to time, doubted the wisdom of that decision—[*laughter*]—which probably proves its correctness. Women can break down the barriers of discrimination in the workplace because of Justice Brennan. The basic freedoms of the Bill of Rights apply to every State in America, giving ordinary citizens redress when their rights have been violated by government, because of Justice Brennan. Lives were lifted up and Americans summoned to live to our highest ideals because of Justice Brennan.

As a young man growing up in the South, I lived through the shame of segregation. I know what it meant when the Supreme Court spoke unanimously and said Little Rock Central High School must open its doors to all. Then, I knew things would never be the same. Now, I know that this transformation was written into our law by Justice Brennan. He became a hero to me, a model for law and service, a real belief to me that if law could serve justice and equality then, 25 years ago, young people like Hillary and me could go into the law, because we thought, like him, we could make a difference by upholding the Constitution's dignity and meaning and working to make it more real in the lives of all Americans.

One of the greatest honors of my Presidency was to bestow on him, and posthumously his friend Justice Marshall, the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Tonight the Sun will set over the hills of Arlington National Cemetery on the first night of Justice Brennan's residence there. But the life he lived will never be extinguished, and the life he breathed into our most cherished ideals will never die. He loved his country fiercely. He gave himself to it fully. He strengthened it profoundly, and we are all better for it. We thank God for his life and commend his soul to the Almighty.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:23 a.m. at St. Matthew's Cathedral. In his remarks, he referred to Justice Brennan's widow, Mary; Father Milton E. Jordan, pastor, Mother Seton Parish, Germantown, MD; Father John O'Hara, priest, Diocese of Arlington; and Monsignor Ronald Jameson, rector, St. Matthew's Cathedral. The proclamation of July 24 on the death of Justice Brennan is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks on the Balanced Budget Agreement
July 29, 1997

The President. Good afternoon. Ladies and gentlemen, we have the pleasure of announcing today an historic agreement that will benefit generations of Americans. Last night we reached agreement with Congress on detailed legislation to balance the budget in a way that honors our values, invests in our people, and cuts taxes for middle class families. After decades of deficits, we have put America's fiscal house in order again.

Above all, we are investing in education, America's most important priority. I am particularly pleased that the first balanced budget in a generation is also the best education budget in a generation and the best for future generations.

This agreement meets my goal of balancing the budget in a way that honors our values, invests in our people, and prepares America for the 21st century. It is very, very good for our country. It's a victory for every parent who wants a good education for their children, for every child in a poor household who needs health care, for every immigrant struggling to make it here, for every family working to build a secure future. It is the best investment we can make in America's future.

Let me underscore the magnitude of this achievement. Four and a half years ago, when this administration took office, America's budget deficit was $290 billion and rising. We put in place a comprehensive economic strategy to cut the deficit and invest in our people. The budget plan adopted in 1993 made a large contribution to today's conditions in America: a strong economy, low inflation, and a deficit that has already shrunk by more than 80 percent.

The budget agreement that we announced today would not be possible had it not been for the tough vote taken in 1993 to set us on the right path. [*Applause*] Thank you. Now this legislation will help to ensure the conditions for continued prosperity, keeping interest rates down and spurring investment. And just as important, it will give our people the tools to reap the rewards of economic growth.

Let me mention just a few of the details of this plan. First, at the heart of this balanced budget is a historic investment in education, the most significant increase in education funding in more than 30 years. It includes $35 billion in tax relief to help families pay for college and training, the largest investment in higher education since the GI bill 50 years ago. It will give every American who needs it a HOPE scholarship to pay for the first 2 years of college. It gives tax relief for all 4 years of college and for education throughout a lifetime. The overall budget agreement also includes the largest increase in Pell grant scholarships for deserving students in three decades, funds our America Reads Challenge, helps to connect all our schools and libraries to the Internet by the year 2000.

As the spending bills move forward in weeks to come, we will work to see that they reflect this agreement. I am pleased that this legislation also will give communities substantial tax cuts to help to build and modernize our schools. All across America, I have challenged our people to make sure that every 8-year-old can read, every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old can go to college, every adult can keep learning for a lifetime. This balanced budget makes unprecedented progress toward those goals.

Second, this a balanced budget that strengthens our families by extending health insurance coverage to up to 5 million children. By investing fully $24 billion, we will be able to provide quality medical care for these children, everything from regular checkups to major surgery. I want to thank all of the people in the Congress and among my fellow Democrats here who worked so hard on the health care issue, but I especially want to say a thanks to Senator Kennedy, Senator Rockefeller, and to the First Lady for what they have done over these years to help us to reach this important day. We want every child in America to grow up healthy and strong, and this investment takes a major step toward that goal.

I'm also pleased that Congress agreed to pay for the children's health care in part with a new 15-cents-a-pack tax on cigarettes. Not only will this new revenue help to pay for health care, it will help prevent children from taking up smoking in the first place.

Third, this is a balanced budget that provides modest tax relief to the middle class, helping families to raise their children, buy and sell a home, save for their retirement with expanded IRA's, and send their children to college. We fought very hard to make sure this tax cut helped a wide range of middle class parents, all those who are working hard to raise their children, pay their taxes, and be good citizens, and the agreement does just that.

Fourth, this is a balanced budget that will help us finish the job of welfare reform, providing $3 billion to move welfare recipients to private sector jobs, keeping our promise made last year to provide $12 billion to restore disability and health benefits for 350,000 legal immigrants. And, as the Vice President will describe, it will double the number of empowerment zones to bring the spark of private enterprise to our hardest pressed neighborhoods.

Finally, this is a balanced budget that honors our commitment to our parents by extending the Medicare Trust Fund for a decade and to the next generation by continuing our commitment to the environment to protect our air, our land, our water, to clean up the worst toxic waste sites in the Nation. And we achieve all these goals while eliminating the budget deficit by 2002. We are determined never again to repeat the mistakes of the past, when we mortgaged our economy to reckless policies. This budget reforms and cuts yesterday's Government so that we can help provide our people the means to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

Let me thank the negotiators for the administration who did a superb job, all the Democratic lawmakers here and, indeed, all of the Members of Congress who worked hard on this legislation. I also want to say a special word of appreciation to Senator Lott and Speaker Gingrich, to Senator Domenici and Congressman Kasich, and to their committee chairs who worked with us across the lines of substantial philosophical and practical differences to reach a good-faith agreement that is an honorable and principled compromise. And especially let me thank Senators Daschle and Lautenberg, Congressman Spratt, and Congressman Rangel for their leadership.

This agreement is a monument to the efforts that people of good will can make when they put aside partisan interests to work together for the common good and our common future. It reflects the values and aspirations of all Americans, and I hope and expect it will marshal strong majorities of both parties in both Houses.

This summer we had an historic opportunity to strengthen America for the 21st century, and we have seized it. Now our Nation can move forward stronger, more vibrant, more united than ever. For that, I am profoundly grateful.

Now I'd like to ask the Vice President to come forward, and let me thank you all again for this great, great day.

[*At this point, the Vice President and congressional leaders made brief remarks.*]

The President. Wait, wait. We forgot to say one thing. We still have to pass this agreement. [*Laughter*] And so, tomorrow, the next day—and I hope it will be over by then—all of us who are for it, in both parties, have a solemn obligation to go out there and try to keep moving and keep this spirit alive and actually pass it. We are celebrating an agreement. We still have to celebrate the passage of the bill and then the signing of the bill, and I look forward to being here for that with all of you and others as well.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:50 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the United States Arctic Research Plan

July 29, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984, as amended (15 U.S.C. 4108(a)), I transmit herewith the fifth

biennial revision (1998–2002) to the United States Arctic Research Plan.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 29, 1997.

Remarks on the Terrorist Attack in Jerusalem, Israel, and an Exchange With Reporters

July 30, 1997

The President. Good morning. Today's bombing by terrorists in Jerusalem was a barbarous act. There is no excuse and there must be no tolerance for this kind of inhumanity. The slaughter was aimed directly at innocent Israelis. And make no mistake, it was also aimed at the majority of Israelis, Palestinians, and Arabs who want a lasting and just peace.

The only answer can and must be concrete steps by the Palestinian Authority to increase security operations and the strengthening of security cooperation between Palestinians and Israelis and a deepened determination by both Palestinians and Israelis to pursue peace. Only when a lasting and secure peace is achieved will the enemies of peace be defeated.

I have just spoken to Prime Minister Netanyahu. I told him the hearts and prayers of Americans are with him, the people of Israel, and the victims of the attack and their families.

I have nothing further to say about this except to say, again, we must not let the enemies of peace prevail. There must be increased security operations, increased security cooperation, and a continuing commitment that is deep into the peace process.

Q. Mr. President, what kind of security could have guarded against these two people who apparently were willing to kill themselves in order to do this damage?

The President. Well, I can't answer that, but I do know that there have been long periods when the security operations have succeeded. And if these people were part of larger networks, there may well be something else that can be done, but I don't obviously know the facts of this specific case. We can't say whether any action by the Palestinian Authority, for example, could have stopped this bombing, but we can say, from our observations, that there could be increased security activity and cooperation.

Q. Will you try to reach Chairman Arafat, and what publicly do you expect him to do in the wake of this explosion?

The President. Well, he's already talked to Prime Minister Netanyahu, and I would expect him to say in public what he said to him in private. And I would expect there to be increased security activity and increased security cooperation.

Q. Mr. President, how long will the Dennis Ross trip be postponed, and what specific new steps will he bring from the United States trying to revive the peace process?

The President. I think it's inappropriate to discuss the second part of your question at this moment, but the trip will be postponed for a period—an appropriate period of mourning.

Q. Mr. President, do you think that it's time for either you or the Secretary of State to become personally involved? There has been a lot of criticism that the United States hasn't been——

The President. First of all, I think the suggestion that we've not been personally involved is just false. But certainly——

Q. In a public way, though.

The President. Well, I believe, and I think that the record will bear this out—I believe—my personal involvement has been continuing and intense in this. But I know of no example in recent history where peace is made by third parties trying to be helpful making public statements alone. I believe the way I'm doing this is the most effective way. But you should not conclude for a moment that the White House has not been intimately and intensely and continuously involved in this peace process, particularly as it has gotten more difficult.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel; Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; and Special Middle East Coordinator Dennis Ross.

Statement on Campaign Finance Reform
July 30, 1997

In my State of the Union Address, I called on Congress to enact bipartisan campaign finance reform legislation. I said that delay could be the death of reform and urged Congress to move forward quickly. I strongly support the decision by Senators McCain and Feingold to bring campaign finance reform legislation to the floor of Congress in September for a vote.

The problems with the role of money in Presidential and congressional elections are plain. Since the campaign finance laws were last overhauled two and a half decades ago, the system has been overwhelmed by a flood of campaign cash. Both political parties are now engaged in an ever-escalating arms race for campaign funds. The consequences for our political system are clear: There is too much money in politics, and it takes too much time to raise.

To make sure that ordinary citizens have the loudest voice in our democracy, we must act to change the campaign finance laws. This year, I have asked the FEC to ban so-called soft money to parties; I have asked the Federal Communications Commission to require broadcasters to provide free TV time to candidates; and the Justice Department has indicated it will defend spending limits in the courts. But these steps, however important, are no substitute for legislation. America needs—and the American people demand—strong, comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation. As the new century approaches, we have an opportunity and an obligation to restore the trust of the American people in their politics—and this is our chance to do it.

For years, the special interests and their allies have blocked reform. This year, those who seek to continue special interest influence as usual will filibuster again. But this year, we have an opportunity to come together across party lines to act and pass reform that cleans up the campaign finance system. September will be the time for Members of the Senate to stand up and be counted for reform. I will do what I can to see to it that 1997 is finally the year that it is achieved.

Remarks to the 1997 National Boy Scout Jamboree in Bowling Green, Virginia
July 30, 1997

Thank you very much. Are those Arkansas flags I see back there? Thank you for waving them.

Let me say to all of you, I want to begin by thanking John Kates for that introduction. Congratulations for passing the board of review for the Eagle Scout rank. I didn't notice whether John had a public speaking merit badge on his sash, but I'd say he earned one tonight standing up in front of all of you to introduce me. I think he did a great job. Let's give him a hand. [*Applause*]

I want to say to Jere Radcliff, Roy Roberts, Jack Creighton, to all the officials of the Boy Scouts here, thank you for what you do with our young people. I'm happy to be joined tonight by the Secretary of the Navy, John Dalton; the Secretary of the Air Force, Sheila Widnall; the Under Secretary of the Army, Joe Reeder; and the Chief of Naval Operations, the top ranking naval officer in the United States and a proud Eagle Scout, Admiral Jay Johnson. They're right over here, and we're all glad to be with you tonight. Again let me say to Major

General Dennis Malcor, the commander of the National Scout Jamboree Task Force, to all the Scout leaders, and to the men and women of the Armed Forces who are helping with this jamboree, I am grateful to you for supporting these fine young Americans.

It's a great privilege for me to be here to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the first national Scout jamboree, a pleasure to serve and an honor to serve as your honorary president. As has already been said, ever since 1910, when William Boyce founded the Boy Scouts of America, every President has proudly served as your honorary president, for every President has recognized what a great contribution Scouting has made and is making to the character of our young people and, therefore, to the character and future of the United States of America.

I, like many members of our administration, was exposed to Scouting at a young age. I began as a Cub Scout in Hot Springs, Pack 1, Ramble Elementary School, Ouachita Area Council. And those are the guys that are waving those flags back there. So don't boo them too hard. They're just sticking up for one of their own.

When I was preparing to come out here to visit you, I was reminded of how the Boy Scouts got its start in our country as the result of a good turn. I reviewed once again the classic story of how William D. Boyce lost his way in a dense London fog and received help from a British Scout who refused to accept a tip. Just think about how that one good turn set in motion millions upon millions of other good turns over the years.

I know that John Kates, the Scout who introduced me, and the other young Eagle Scouts whom I met before coming up here have done their good turns—John, his for many older people in his hometown of Detroit, where he's mobilized more than 3 dozen volunteers to bring hot meals to elderly folks who don't have families to help them during the holidays. Just yesterday Scoutmaster Andrew Leahy of Brentwood, Missouri, did a good turn on pure instinct and reflex, with an impressive tackling form as well. Surely you have heard that Andrew helped the Capitol Police apprehend a man who almost ran down several pedestrians, including a Member of the United States Congress, in his car. I believe that he is here tonight, and if he is, I want to thank him personally for that good turn. I don't know if there's a Scout merit badge for tackling dangerous people who are violating the law, but if there is one, I think he ought to get it.

You may know that last April, I and all former Presidents and General Colin Powell sponsored a Presidents' service summit in Philadelphia. At that summit, we said that we wanted every young person in America—every single one—to have the benefit of five things: a safe childhood, a healthy childhood, a childhood with a good education, a childhood with an adult mentor, and the chance for every child, himself or herself, to serve in every community in the country. In other words, what we said was we challenged all the adults in America to engage in citizen service, another way of doing a good turn. The Boy Scouts of America, as much or more than any other organization in this country, has answered our call, for the Boy Scouts committed after the Presidents' service summit to provide 200 million hours of community service through the year 2000. I thank you for that commitment.

Building community and character is what the Boy Scouts have always been about. So today I ask all of you to help spread the word about doing good turns. All of you here, each in your own way, are future leaders of this country. When you return home from the jamboree, please encourage your classmates and your friends to join you in committing to community service. If every young person in America would give back to their community in the way you do, just imagine what we could do. Imagine how many fewer problems we could have. So many times I have wished that every young person in America had the chance to be a part of Scouting. And tonight I see why, more clearly than ever. So I hope you'll go home and help others to serve and learn the joy that you share by the service you do.

And the next time you recite the Scout oath, I hope you will remember that it's not just your fellow Scouts, your parents, and the people you know well but your whole Nation that is counting on you. We need you to remain focused on the strong values you learned in Scouting, to remember that character counts and service counts. We need you if we're going to build our communities and bring our people together across all the lines that divide us. We need you if we're going to lead our country into the 21st century still the world's strongest force for

peace and freedom and democracy and prosperity. We need you if we're going to have a country where every person, without regard to race or station in life, who is responsible enough to work for it, can live out his or her dreams. We need you to keep this country coming together and coming ever closer to the ideals on which we were founded: that we are one Nation under God, all created equal. We have to work harder and harder and harder to build that one America, strong and united and good.

Over 150 years ago, the astute French observer Alexis de Tocqueville said, "America is great because America is good." You help to keep America good, and I know you will throughout your lives. Thank you for what you do. Thank you for what you are. And thank you for what you will become.

Good luck, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:05 p.m. at Fort A.P. Hill. In his remarks, he referred to Jere B. Radcliff, chief Scout executive; Roy Roberts, jamboree chairman; and Jack Creighton, president, Boy Scouts of America.

Message to the Senate Transmitting Eastern Caribbean States-United States Extradition Treaties With Documentation

July 30, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaties between the Government of the United States of America and the governments of six countries comprising the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (collectively, the "Treaties"). The Treaties are with: Antigua and Barbuda, signed at St. John's on June 3, 1996; Dominica, signed at Roseau on October 10, 1996; Grenada, signed at St. George's on May 30, 1996; St. Lucia, signed at Castries on April 18, 1996; St. Kitts and Nevis, signed at Baseterre on September 18, 1996; and St. Vincent and the Grenadines, signed at Kingstown on August 15, 1996.

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

The provisions in these Treaties follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States.

Each Treaty will enhance cooperation between the law enforcement communities in both countries. That will thereby make a significant contribution to international law enforcement efforts. Upon entry into force of the extradition treaties between the United States and Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines, the Extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland signed June 8, 1972, which was made applicable to each of these territories upon its entry in force January 21, 1977, and which continues to apply between the United States and each of the entities subsequent to becoming independent, will cease to have any effect between the United States and the respective country. Upon entry into force of the Extradition Treaty between the United States and Grenada, the Extradition Treaty between the United States and Great Britain signed December 22, 1931, which was made applicable to Grenada upon its entry into force on June 24, 1935, and which continues to apply between the United States and Grenada, following its becoming independent, shall cease to apply between the United States and Grenada.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

July 30, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 31.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Argentina-United States Extradition Treaty With Documentation
July 30, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaty between the United States of America and the Argentine Republic, signed at Buenos Aires on June 10, 1997.

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

The provisions in this Treaty follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States.

Upon entry into force, this Treaty would enhance cooperation between the law enforcement authorities of both countries, and thereby make a significant contribution to international law enforcement efforts. The Treaty would supersede the Extradition Treaty Between the United States of America and the Republic of Argentina signed at Washington on January 21, 1972.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 30, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 31.

Statement on Congressional Action on Balanced Budget Legislation
July 31, 1997

The final congressional passage of the balanced budget bill is the achievement of a generation and a triumph for every American. This budget marks an end to decades of deficits, and just as important, it honors our values, investing in the education, health, and futures of our people. This budget includes the most significant new investment in education in three decades and the largest increase in investment in higher education since the GI bill a half century ago. And it means that up to 5 million children who lack health insurance will now receive quality health care, even as we cut overall Government spending. That's the right way to balance the budget.

I am particularly pleased that our balanced budget passed with the overwhelming support of both parties in both Houses of Congress. It reflects the common values and common sense of the vital center of American politics.

This balanced budget also will strengthen America by continuing our economic strategy. Beginning in 1993, our new economic approach of cutting deficits, investing in our people, and expanding exports through tough trade agreements has created the conditions for sustained prosperity. Today we have learned that the economy grew over the first 6 months of this year at a 3.5 percent rate, with low inflation and rising incomes. Today's passage of the balanced budget will continue that strategy and help keep America's economy growing.

I look forward to the swift passage of the tax cuts in separate legislation to complete our balanced budget plan.

Statement on Congressional Action on Tax Cut Legislation
July 31, 1997

Congressional passage of tax cut legislation brings us one step closer to final enactment of landmark legislation that will balance the budget, provide meaningful tax relief to middle class families, and strengthen the Nation's economy.

This tax cut honors our values by helping middle class families raise their children, send them to college, save for retirement, and buy and sell a home. I am particularly pleased that it includes $35 billion to give every American who needs it a HOPE scholarship tax cut for the first 2 years of college, to provide further tax relief for all 4 years of college, and to help to pay for education and training throughout a lifetime. The first balanced budget in a generation is also the best education budget in a generation.

By giving working families direct tax relief, we are continuing our economic strategy of balancing the budget while investing in people. That strategy has helped create prosperity, with steady growth, low inflation, strong investment, and rising middle class incomes. Now, this tax cut will boost the standard of living for middle class families even more. Working families deserve the dividend from a growing economy and a balanced budget, and with this tax cut, they will receive it.

Statement on Renewable Fuels Tax Incentives
July 31, 1997

I am very disappointed that the tax incentives for renewable fuels were not extended in this budget agreement. By now, all Americans should be aware of the important role ethanol plays in cleaning our air and in providing economic development for rural America.

In the last two decades, ethanol has grown from a fledgling industry to make a real contribution to our environment, our national economy, and our efforts to wean ourselves from foreign sources of energy. As the Nation moves toward cleaner reformulated gasoline in 2000, it will be crucial to have a number of options for making this fuel. Specifically, Americans will need a choice of oxygenated fuels to meet their clean air needs, including ethanol and its ether, ETBE, which has properties that make it particularly beneficial to the environment. Having a broad range of oxygenated fuels from which to choose will help increase competition in that market, lowering prices for consumers.

To continue the progress made so far, and to provide Americans with a choice of oxygenated fuels, it is critical that we extend these tax incentives beyond 2000. Only by extending these incentives until 2007 will farmers and renewable fuels producers have the certainty they need to invest in new ethanol plants and thus to further expand our domestic renewable fuels industry.

I have included a 7-year extension of the renewable fuels tax incentives in the NEXTEA legislation I sent to Congress earlier this year, and I urge Congress to enact this proposal as part of the reauthorization of the transportation bill.

Statement on the Nomination of General Michael E. Ryan To Be Air Force Chief of Staff

July 31, 1997

I am pleased to nominate General Michael E. Ryan to be Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force.

General Ryan currently serves as Commander, U.S. Air Forces Europe, and Commander, Allied Air Forces Central Europe. He brings to the job of Chief of Staff broad operational and joint experience as well as proven leadership ability and a deep concern for the men and women of the U.S. Air Force.

During his distinguished career, General Ryan served a combat tour in the Vietnam war and commanded a fighter squadron and fighter wing. As Commander, Allied Air Forces Southern Europe, he directed the highly successful airstrikes in Bosnia that convinced the warring factions they could not achieve their aims through military means, which contributed to our efforts to convene the negotiations that resulted in the Dayton accords.

General Ryan assumes the post of Chief of Staff as the U.S. Air Force proudly celebrates 50 years of dedicated service to our Nation in war and peace. With General Ryan as Chief of Staff, I am confident that the Air Force will continue its tradition of excellence as it enters the 21st century.

Message to the Congress on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Iraq

July 31, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iraqi emergency is to continue in effect beyond August 2, 1997, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

The crisis between the United States and Iraq that led to the declaration on August 2, 1990, of a national emergency has not been resolved. The Government of Iraq continues to engage in activities inimical to the stability in the Middle East and hostile to United States interests in the region. Such Iraqi actions pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and vital foreign policy interests of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure on the Government of Iraq.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 31, 1997.

NOTE: The notice is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Iraq

July 31, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of February 10, 1997, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 12722 and matters relating to Executive Orders 12724 and 12817 (the "Executive Orders"). The report covers events from February 2 through August 1, 1997.

Executive Order 12722 ordered the immediate blocking of all property and interests in property of the Government of Iraq (including the Central Bank of Iraq) then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of a United States person. That order also prohibited the importation into the United States of goods and services of Iraqi origin, as well as the exportation of goods, services, and technology from the United States to Iraq. The order prohibited travel-related transactions to or from Iraq and the performance of any contracting support of any industrial, commercial, or governmental project in Iraq. United States persons were also prohibited from granting or extending credit or loans to the Government of Iraq.

The foregoing prohibitions (as well as the blocking of Government of Iraq property) were continued and augmented on August 9, 1990, by Executive Order 12724, which was issued in order to align the sanctions imposed by the United States with United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 661 of August 6, 1990.

1. In April 1995, the U.N. Security Council adopted UNSCR 986 authorizing Iraq to export up to $1 billion in petroleum and petroleum products every 90 days for a total of 180 days under U.N. supervision in order to finance the purchase of food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies. UNSCR 986 includes arrangements to ensure equitable distribution of humanitarian goods purchased with UNSCR 986 oil revenues to all the people of Iraq. The resolution also provides for the payment of compensation to victims of Iraqi aggression and for the funding of other U.N. activities with respect to Iraq. On May 20, 1996, a memorandum of understanding was concluded between the Secretariat of the United Nations and the Government of Iraq agreeing on terms for implementing UNSCR 986. On August 8, 1996, the UNSC committee established pursuant to UNSCR 661 ("the 661 Committee") adopted procedures to be employed by the 661 Committee in implementation of UNSCR 986. On December 9, 1996, the Secretary General released the report requested by paragraph 13 of UNSCR 986, making UNSCR 986 effective as of 12:01 a.m. December 10.

On June 4, 1997, the U.N. Security Council adopted UNSCR 1111, renewing for another 180 days the authorization for Iraqi petroleum sales contained in UNSCR 986 of April 14, 1995. The Resolution became effective on June 8, 1997. During the reporting period, imports into the United States under this program totaled approximately 9.5 million barrels.

2. There have been no amendments to the Iraqi Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 575 (the "ISR" or the "Regulations") administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) of the Department of the Treasury during the reporting period.

As previously reported, the Regulations were amended on December 10, 1996, to provide a statement of licensing policy regarding specific licensing of United States persons seeking to purchase Iraqi-origin petroleum and petroleum products from Iraq (61 Fed. Reg. 65312, December 11, 1996). Statements of licensing policy were also provided regarding sales of essential parts and equipment for the Kirkuk-Yumurtalik pipeline systems, and sales of humanitarian goods to Iraq, pursuant to United Nations approval. A general license was also added to authorize dealings in Iraqi-origin petroleum and petroleum products that have been exported

from Iraq with the United Nations and United States Government approval.

All executory contracts must contain terms requiring that all proceeds of the oil purchases from the Government of Iraq, including the State Oil Marketing Organization, must be placed in the U.N. escrow account at Banque National de Paris, New York (the "986 escrow account"), and all Iraqi payments for authorized sales of pipeline parts and equipment, humanitarian goods, and incidental transaction costs borne by Iraq will, upon arrival by the 661 Committee, be paid or payable out of the 986 escrow account.

3. Investigations of possible violations of the Iraqi sanctions continue to be pursued and appropriate enforcement actions taken. Several cases from prior reporting periods are continuing and recent additional allegations have been referred by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) to the U.S. Customs Service for investigation.

On July 10, 1995, an indictment was brought against three U.S. citizens in the Eastern District of New York for conspiracy in a case involving the attempted exportation and transshipment to Iraq of zirconium ingots in violation of the IEEPA and the ISR. The intended use of the merchandise was the manufacture of cladding for radioactive materials to be used in nuclear reactors. The case was the culmination of a successful undercover operation conducted by agents of the U.S. Customs Service in New York in cooperation with OFAC and the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of New York. On February 6, 1997, one of the defendants plead guilty to a 10-count criminal indictment including conspiracy to violate the Iraqi Sanctions and the IEEPA. The trial of the remaining defendants is ongoing.

Investigation also continues into the roles played by various individuals and firms outside Iraq in the Iraqi government procurement network. These investigations may lead to additions to OFAC's listing of individuals and organizations determined to be Specially Designated Nationals (SDNs) of the Government of Iraq.

Since my last report, OFAC collected four civil monetary penalties totaling more than $470,000 for violations of IEEPA and the ISR. The violations involved brokerage firms' failure to block assets of an Iraqi SDN and effecting certain securities trades with respect thereto. Additional administrative proceedings have been initiated and others await commencement.

4. The Office of Foreign Assets Control has issued a total of 700 specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to Iraq or Iraqi assets since August 1990. Licenses have been issued for transactions such as the filing of legal action against Iraqi governmental entities, legal representation of Iraq, and the exportation to Iraq of donated medicine, medical supplies, and food intended for humanitarian relief purposes, executory contracts pursuant to UNSCR 986, sales of humanitarian supplies to Iraq under UNSCR 986, the execution of powers of attorney relating to the administration of personal assets and decedents' estates in Iraq and the protection of preexistent intellectual property rights in Iraq. Since my last report, 47 specific licenses have been issued.

5. The expense incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from February 2 through August 1, 1997, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Iraq are reported to be about $1.2 million, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, and the Office of the Legal Advisor), and the Department of Transportation (particularly the U.S. Coast Guard).

6. The United States imposed economic sanctions on Iraq in response to Iraq's illegal invasion and occupation of Kuwait, a clear act of brutal aggression. The United States, together with the international community, is maintaining economic sanctions against Iraq because the Iraqi regime has failed to comply fully with relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions. Security Council Resolutions on Iraq call for the elimination of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, Iraqi recognition of Kuwait and the inviolability of the Iraq-Kuwait boundary, the

release of Kuwaiti and other third-country nationals, compensation for victims of Iraqi aggression, long-term monitoring of weapons of mass destruction capabilities, the return of Kuwaiti assets stolen during Iraq's illegal occupation of Kuwait, renunciation of terrorism, an end to internal Iraqi repression of its own civilian population, and the facilitation of access of international relief organizations to all those in need in all parts of Iraq. Seven years after the invasion, a pattern of defiance persists: a refusal to account for missing Kuwaiti detainees; failure to return Kuwaiti property worth millions of dollars, including military equipment that was used by Iraq in its movement of troops to the Kuwaiti border in October 1994; sponsorship of assassinations in Lebanon and in northern Iraq; incomplete declarations to weapons instructors and refusal of unimpeded access by these inspectors; and ongoing widespread human rights violations. As a result, the U.N. sanctions remain in place; the United States will continue to enforce those sanctions under domestic authority.

The Baghdad government continues to violate basic human rights of its own citizens through the systematic repression of minorities and denial of humanitarian assistance. The Government of Iraq has repeatedly said it will not be bound by UNSCR 668. The Iraqi military routinely harasses residents of the north, and has attempted to "Arabize" the Kurdish, Turcomen, and Assyrian areas in the north. Iraq has not relented in its artillery attacks against civilian population centers in the south, or in its burning and draining operations in the southern marshes, which have forced thousands to flee to neighboring states.

The policies and actions of the Saddam Hussein regime continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, as well as to regional peace and security. The U.N. resolutions affirm that the Security Council must be assured of Iraq's peaceful intentions in judging its compliance with sanctions. Because of Iraq's failure to comply fully with these resolutions, the United States will continue to apply economic sanctions to deter it from threatening peace and stability in the region.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 31, 1997.

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

July 31, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Barbados, signed at Bridgetown on February 28, 1996.

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

The provisions in this Treaty follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States.

This Treaty will, upon entry into force, enhance cooperation between the law enforcement communities of both countries, and thereby make a significant contribution to international law enforcement efforts. It will supersede the Extradition Treaty between the United States and Great Britain that was signed at London on December 22, 1931, which was made applicable to Barbados upon its entry into force on June 24, 1935, and which the United States and Barbados have continued to apply following Barbados becoming independent. However, that treaty has become outmoded and the new Treaty will provide significant improvements.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 31, 1997.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Trinidad and Tobago-United States Extradition Treaty With Documentation

July 31, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, signed at Port of Spain on March 4, 1996.

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

The provisions in this Treaty follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States.

This Treaty will, upon entry into force, enhance cooperation between the law enforcement communities of both countries and thereby make a significant contribution to international law enforcement efforts. Upon entry into force, it will supersede the Extradition Treaty between the United States and Great Britain signed at London on December 22, 1931, and made applicable to Trinidad and Tobago upon its entry into force on June 24, 1935, and which the United States and Trinidad and Tobago have continued to apply following Trinidad and Tobago's independence. That treaty has become outmoded, and the new Treaty will provide significant improvements.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
July 31, 1997.

Memorandum on Refugee Admissions Consultations

July 31, 1997

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: FY 1998 Refugee Admissions Consultations

In accordance with section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), you are authorized to consult with the appropriate committees of the Congress concerning refugee admissions as follows:

1. The authorization of 78,000 refugee admissions during FY 1998, which would be allocated by specific region as follows: 7,000 for Africa; 14,000 for East Asia (including Amerasians); 4,000 for Latin America and the Caribbean; 4,000 for the Near East; 46,000 for the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; and 3,000 for the Unallocated Reserve. The recommended level of funded admissions is equal to the level assumed in the FY 1998 budget request.

2. The authorization of an additional 10,000 refugee admission numbers to be made available for the adjustment to permanent resident status of persons who have been granted asylum in the United States.

3. The designation, pursuant to section 101(a) 42(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, of persons in Cuba, Vietnam, and the former Soviet Union who, if they otherwise qualify for admission as refugees, may be considered refugees under the INA even though they are still within their country of nationality or habitual residence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Remarks on Balanced Budget Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

August 1, 1997

The President. Good morning. Today Congress will send to me for my signature the first balanced budget in a generation. This budget will help millions of families to raise their children, educate them, and provide health care for them. It is an investment in the hopes and dreams of the American middle class, and I look forward to signing it.

This morning we have further evidence that the strategy of balancing the budget while investing in our people and selling more American products around the world has helped to produce sustained prosperity for Americans. The new figures indicate 4.8 percent unemployment in July and 316,000 new jobs. Our economy is growing, with the lowest unemployment in 24 years.

This economic rebirth is due to many things: first and foremost, the hard work and productivity of American businesses and American workers, the spirit of American entrepreneurs, the diligence of the Federal Reserve. But there is no doubt that the economic strategy we put in place in 1993 created the conditions for the extraordinary private sector growth we have all witnessed.

The day I took office, the deficit was $290 billion; today, even before the budget agreement, it had been reduced by 80 percent. Four straight years of deficit cuts have begun to put our fiscal house in order. The low interest rates that have resulted have produced the economic expansion as well as real benefits for ordinary Americans: lower car payments, lower mortgage rates, lower credit card rates. It also made possible—that 1993 agreement did—this budget agreement that has spending cuts and tax cuts and very large increases in investments in education and health care.

This year we had a choice: whether to succumb to gridlock and undercut confidence in our economy or continue our successful strategy into the 21st century. I am pleased that very large bipartisan majorities in both Chambers, including over 75 percent of the Democrats on all the votes, have voted to continue our economic approach and keep our prosperity going. There are many reasons why I believe it will strengthen America, but let me just mention one of them as I close.

For years, as our economy has gathered momentum, we've looked for ways to make sure all Americans reap the rewards of that prosperity. The tax cuts in this balanced budget will directly and immediately improve the standard of living of millions of middle class families. For a typical middle class family with two children, the child tax credit alone amounts to a $1,000 raise in take-home pay. The college tax cuts will help families even more. And by encouraging more Americans to get the education they need, these education tax cuts will boost the long-term earning potential of all Americans who use them and, therefore, the long-term strength and wealth of the American economy.

Let me make one other point. This balanced budget will close a chapter in American history, years—decades, in fact—when our people doubted whether Government could work for them and questioned whether our Nation could set and meet goals. Over the past 4 years, through tough, persistent, patient effort, we have made unparalleled progress, rolling back the crime rate, reducing welfare rolls by historic numbers, and now finishing the job of balancing the budget. All Americans can be proud of what has been accomplished.

But let me say, too, that we know there are still challenges we have to meet to fully prepare our people for the 21st century. We must move ahead now to set national education standards and test our children on whether they're meeting them; to make further progress in the work of racial reconciliation; to open more foreign markets to American products; to move on our environmental problems; and finally, to address the very real challenges of long-term entitlement reform. I look forward to dealing with all these issues.

If we follow the path that has proven so successful in this balanced budget process, working to find common ground on common challenges, then I have no doubt that we will move forward together into the 21st century.

Thank you very much.

Terrorist Attack in Jerusalem and Arrests in New York City

Q. Is there a connection between Hamas and the New York arrests? Is there a connection there?

Q. Mr. President, there seems to be some confusion about whether or not you think this is a good time to send Secretary of State Madeleine Albright on her first trip to the Middle East. Could you tell us where that possibility stands and the level of cooperation between the Israelis and the Palestinian Authority? And if you could, what, if any, connection to the Middle East—to the Jerusalem bombing—occurred in New York yesterday with this foiled bombing plot?

The President. Let me—Mr. Plante [Bill Plante, CBS News] asked that question, and you asked that. Let me try to answer both of them. I have to go meet with President Aliyev of Azerbaijan, but I will try to answer them both quickly.

First of all, when the period of mourning is over, I will send Dennis Ross to the Middle East, to meet with the leaders there, with our latest ideas. I think it was appropriate to delay that in view of the terrible loss of life from the bombing. And then we will see where we are. I have said all along that I would send the Secretary of State to the Middle East at the appropriate time. But I want Mr. Ross to go there to do the work I am sending him to do to get the reaction of the leaders, and then we'll make a decision.

Secondly, with regard to the arrests in New York yesterday, first of all I'd like to commend the law enforcement officials, both the New York City officials and the Federal officials who were participating in it; and secondly say that I cannot comment and cannot reach a final conclusion yet because I haven't received a report of the direct investigation done, including the interrogation of the people who were arrested.

But I will say that we have worked very hard in this country to increase our capacity to deal with terrorism. It is something we take very seriously, and we will continue to do that. We will work very hard. But I think it's important not to reach conclusions before we have ironclad evidence to support them. The main thing we need to do is to thank the law enforcement officials for what they did and to continue to heighten our vigilance and our capacity to deal with such matters.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:12 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Heydar Aliyev of Azerbaijan and Special Middle East Coordinator Dennis Ross.

Joint Statement on Azerbaijan-United States Relations

August 1, 1997

During their August 1, 1997 meeting in Washington, Presidents Clinton and Aliyev agreed on the importance of expanding the partnership between the United States and the Republic of Azerbaijan through strengthening bilateral cooperation in the political, security, economic and commercial spheres. President Clinton reaffirmed U.S. support for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and democratic development of Azerbaijan, noting that close U.S.-Azerbaijan relations are important in promoting regional peace, stability and prosperity.

The two Presidents expressed strong support for an early and peaceful resolution to the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. President Clinton made clear that the United States is committed, together with Russia and France, to work jointly through the OSCE Minsk Group for a just and lasting peace to this conflict. President Aliyev endorsed the recent proposal of the Co-Chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group as the basis for intensified negotiations to achieve a peace agreement this year. The two Presidents agreed that the settlement should be based on the three OSCE Lisbon principles.

Both Presidents noted the positive contribution made by U.S. humanitarian assistance to Azerbaijan, particularly to refugees, internally displaced persons (IDPs), and other needy

groups. They agreed that Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act limits potential cooperation between the United States and Azerbaijan. President Clinton reiterated the Administration's strong support for repeal of Section 907.

Azerbaijan is at a critical juncture in its development as a democratic and market-oriented state. President Clinton praised President Aliyev's success in strengthening Azerbaijan as a state, implementing economic reform and spurring growth in recent years. Azerbaijan's deepening commitment to an economic reform program, including recent decisions to move forward with broader and faster privatization in cooperation with the World Bank and IMF, is central to its successful transition to a market-based economy. The two Presidents agreed that democracy, economic reform and the observance of human rights play an essential role in ensuring Azerbaijan's continued stability. President Clinton also welcomed President Aliyev's commitment to strengthen market freedom, rule of law and political pluralism in Azerbaijan, including the holding of free and fair elections.

Both Presidents support expanded economic and commercial relations, including greater bilateral trade and investment. The two Presidents noted the importance of rapid development of Caspian energy resources and highlighted the extensive participation of U.S. companies in the development and transport of Azerbaijan's oil and gas resources. This has already contributed to a thriving bilateral commercial relationship. The Presidents welcomed the establishment of an official dialogue on energy policy and commercial issues. They also agreed on the vital importance of the Eurasian transport corridor to the economic future of Azerbaijan and the entire region. The two Presidents welcomed the signing of the U.S.-Azerbaijani Bilateral Investment Treaty and the U.S. Export-Import Bank Project Incentive Agreement. The United States encourages Azerbaijan's integration into the global economy, including early completion of its application for membership in the World Trade Organization on commercial terms generally applied to newly acceding members.

The United States recognizes the challenges facing Azerbaijan in assuring its national security and strongly supports Azerbaijan's active integration into newly emerging European security structures, including NATO's Partnership for Peace and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. The Presidents expressed satisfaction with the entry into force on May 15, 1997 of the CFE Flank Document and agreed on the importance of the U.S.-Azerbaijani Joint Statement released in that connection. They also welcomed the adoption of the CFE Basic Elements decision in Vienna July 23, 1997 and agreed that the adaptation of the CFE Treaty should enhance the security of each state party.

The two Presidents also discussed security threats posed by international terrorism, narcotics trafficking, international criminal activity, and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. They agreed to explore the expansion of security cooperation, including through the bilateral security dialogue inaugurated in March 1997.

Both Presidents underlined their support for increased parliamentary, cultural, scientific and educational exchanges, as well as contacts between individual citizens to enhance relations between the United States and Azerbaijan.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

The President's Radio Address

August 2, 1997

Good morning. This week we reached agreement on a bipartisan balanced budget that honors our values, invests in our people, and gives middle class families a well-deserved tax cut. With overwhelming bipartisan support in both Houses, the Congress has sent me this measure, and next week I will sign it into law. This is an historic achievement, a plan that will strengthen our economy and prepare our people for the challenges of the 21st century.

There has been a lot of cheering here in Washington, but there has been cheering on Main Street as well, for the real impact of this budget will be in the lives, the dreams, and

the futures of families all across America. Today I want to talk to you about how this balanced budget will affect millions of American families. I have asked some of them to join me here in the Oval Office today.

For 4½ years, our goal has been to keep the American dream alive and to expand opportunity for all Americans who would work for it. In 1993, when I took office, our economy was not creating that opportunity, and I vowed to change our Nation's course. We put in place a new economic approach, cutting the deficit to create the conditions for growth; investing in the education and health of our people, so that all Americans could reap the rewards of that growth; and opening foreign markets to American goods and services through tough trade agreements.

That strategy relied on tough cuts and hard choices. It produced 4 straight years of deficit cuts and slashed our deficit by 80 percent. We had well begun the work of putting our fiscal house in order before this budget agreement. And in a real sense, what was done back in 1993 made it possible. The low interest rates we've enjoyed have produced economic expansion as well as real benefits for the middle class in the form of lower car payments, mortgages, and credit card rates. Now, we learned yesterday that unemployment is at its lowest in 24 years. The economy created 316,000 new jobs last month alone. Investment is up, and inflation is low. And family incomes finally have begun to rise.

Our new balanced budget law gives us a chance to make sure all Americans have the tools to prosper in the hopeful new century ahead. For parents who work at home, there is an increase in the home office deduction. For family farmers who buy their own health insurance, there is a provision allowing them to deduct their health costs, just like other small-business people. For parents whose children go to schools that are crumbling, this budget helps them and their communities to repair those schools or build new ones. Most important, in its core provisions, this balanced budget will help working families live up to their responsibilities to their children, their parents, and their communities.

One family has three children. He's a carpenter; she cares for his mother, who lives at home with them. The $1,500 a year they will receive from the child tax credit will be the biggest increase in take-home pay they have seen for some time. In another family, the mother wants to go back to school but can't afford to until her own children finish college. The new HOPE scholarship tax credit would make it possible for her to live out her dreams and return to school. Another mother works full time but has no health insurance for her two children, one of whom has a heart ailment. She was told she works too many hours to receive Medicaid. This budget invests $24 billion in children's health care, so that parents like her can have greater peace of mind, knowing their children can get health insurance.

This balanced budget is a victory for every parent who wants a good education for his or her children, for every child in our hardest pressed households who needs health care, for every family working to build a secure future. After years in which wages did not rise as fast as they should, this tax cut will clearly provide a direct increase in take-home pay for millions of families. It is the best investment we can make in America's future. It is the achievement of a generation, and all Americans should be proud.

This is a moment of profound hope for our country. As the new century approaches, we've come together to conquer one of our most persistent problems, and we've done it in a way that benefits all our people and our future. I hope that's how we'll meet all our challenges in the years to come, because when Congress and the President put aside partisanship and find common ground, when they act together for the common good, America can meet any goal and master any challenge.

Thanks for listening.

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

Remarks Prior to a Meeting With Business Leaders and an Exchange With Reporters

August 4, 1997

Helen Thomas' Birthday

The President. Before we start, I think it's only fair to note that we are observing another anniversary of Helen's [Helen Thomas, United Press International] 50th birthday. [*Laughter*] We wanted to give you a birthday cake with a telltale number of——

[*At this point, participants sang "Happy Birthday."*]

Ms. Thomas. Now may I have a press conference? [*Laughter*]

The President. I'm going to make a statement, and you get the questions. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Thomas. Thank you.

The President. Take it to the press room and cut it up. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Thomas. Thank you. This is painful. [*Laughter*]

The President. You don't make it look that way. It's painful for me, too. [*Laughter*]

Action on Climate Change

I'm glad to be joined today by the CEO's of 10 Fortune 500 companies who have come here to meet with me on climate change. These companies represent electric utilities, the oil and gas industry, finance, high technology, and heavy industry. They are all intimately interested in this issue and will be affected by whatever happens on it in our country and throughout the world. We want a responsible approach to climate change. We believe that the science makes it clear that the climate is changing. I want to proceed based on some fairly straightforward and simple principles.

First of all, as we get ready for the Kyoto conference, I believe there should be realistic but binding limits to emissions of greenhouse gases. I believe that we have to do it in a way that keeps our economy growing. And I believe that we ought to embrace flexible, market-based policies. I believe we should reemphasize and reenergize our efforts in research and development to find as many technological solutions to this as possible and to keep our Nation in the forefront of what is now a $400 billion market for environmental technologies. And finally, I believe the agreement has to be a global one. I think all nations, developed and developing, should be a part of this. So this is part of an ongoing process that I and our administration have undertaken to try to make sure we're working together with all the people who would be affected by this issue and try to reach, hopefully, a common position.

We're going to have a good meeting today, and I'm looking forward to it. And again, I want to thank all the executives for coming here and giving vent to their views.

Q. What do you think of the opposition, who says there is no such thing as global warming and that they don't agree with the scientists—some of the scientists?

The President. Well, I think that the real question is—I don't think that very many people disagree with the fact that there is climate change now. I think there's some disagreement about what the impact of it is and what the appropriate response is. There's still some debate there. But I think the scientific evidence for the fact of climate change is pretty compelling. We had that panel of scientists, including the Nobel Prize winners, here the other day, and I received a letter from—I don't know, over 2,500 of them—from scientists about it.

So I think that there's pretty clear evidence that the climate is changing and could be changing substantially. There is still some difference about what the consequences of that will be and what we ought to do about it. But I think if we follow these principles, we'll be staking out a responsible position, which will permit us to continue to grow economically and do our part in the world. After all, we have only 4 percent of the world's population, but we account for 20 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions, which you would expect since we have slightly over 20 percent of the world's output.

Budget Agreement

Q. Mr. President, how seriously are you considering using a line item veto to kill some provisions of the budget you'll sign into law tomorrow?

The President. Well, I asked Mr. Bowles to—once we got a budget agreement and it passed—to institute an intensive process to review both the spending and the tax bills to see if there were any items that would be appropriate for the line item veto. And I have not yet received the results of that review.

I support the line item veto; I did all along. And I think if we have it, it ought to be used—I believe that it ought to be used somewhat sparingly. And my experience as Governor was that once I used it a few times, I didn't have to—I didn't need to use it very much anymore. And that's what I would hope would happen.

We'll just see—you probably know more about the likely targets for it than I do at this point. I was interested in the big-picture items in the budget. We got virtually 100 percent of what I sought, and I'm elated with the budget. I think it's good for America. I think it will keep the economy growing, and I think it's a responsible thing to do. So whatever I do on that shouldn't be in any way detracting from the terrific job that the Congress did on it.

United Parcel Service Strike

Q. Mr. President, one question on UPS. The standards for Presidential intervention are relatively high. Are you considering doing anything else to intervene to bring an end to the strike?

The President. On UPS?

Q. Yes, UPS.

The President. Well, first we urged the Federal mediator, and we got that. And we got—obviously, it didn't work. I still think the parties ought to go back to the table. UPS is a very important company to our country, and there are a lot of employees there and I hope they go back to the table. But at this time, I don't think any further action by me is appropriate.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:25 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to the National Urban League

August 4, 1997

Thank you very much. Chairman Linen and members of the board, Hugh Price. Hugh, I want to thank you for that introduction. I hope somebody got that on tape. [*Laughter*] I was embarrassed there for a while, it was so nice. [*Laughter*]

Let me say to all of you what you already know, which is that Hugh Price has been a breath of fresh air on the Washington scene. He has been a brilliant leader for the Urban League, and I look forward to his leadership for many years to come. He's not as term-limited as I am, I don't think, so we ought to keep him around for a while. I think he's been great.

Congressman Payne and ladies and gentlemen, I have many things for which to be grateful to the Urban League. The two that come most immediately to mind are Vernon Jordan and Ron Brown, and I thank you for that. And I'm delighted to see Alma here—thank you. She's already heard her quota of speeches by me, so this is great forbearance I think.

When I was Governor of Arkansas, I had the privilege of working with your local chapters. I saw firsthand how the Urban League could change the lives and the minds of people. And I want to say a special word of thanks for the support that you have given the work that we are now engaged in here for at least a year with regard to our initiative on racial reconciliation. It means a lot to me, but it also sends a strong signal to Americans that we can no longer afford to ignore the continuing racial divisions that undermine our greatness.

I might just say parenthetically what many of you already know, that this year we're spending—and with a distinguished advisory board headed by Dr. John Hope Franklin—is a year that will deal with the unfinished business of the work of reconciling and moving forward on an equal basis African-Americans and white Americans. But it also must look forward to what America is becoming. Today, we have only one State, Hawaii, which has no racial majority.

But in just a few years, within a decade, California will have no racial majority. That's over 13 percent of our population. And within 30 to 40 years, unless there is a dramatic change in our population, there will be no single race in the majority in America. We have always said our country is about ideas and ideals and principles. We're about to find out. [*Laughter*] We're about to find out. And we had best be ready for it.

In this global society of ours, it is an incredible advantage if we can not only get along and tolerate each other but actually celebrate our differences and be united as one America. And I would say in that regard, I would like to thank all the business people and others who are supporters and members of and active in the Urban League who have reached across racial lines to try to build that one America. I am grateful to you as well, and I thank you very much.

Whitney Young once said, "It's better to be prepared for an opportunity and not have one than to have an opportunity and not be prepared." Unfortunately, a lot of Americans for too long knew about being prepared for an opportunity and not having one. I come here today to say we have an opportunity, and we must be prepared.

Tomorrow I will sign the balanced budget legislation into law. We have already reduced the size of the Government's deficit by 80 percent from the time I took office, but we have done it while investing more, not less, in the education of our children and in the revitalization of our urban areas and in our preparation for tomorrow through research and development.

Tomorrow's budget I want to talk about a minute because it represents unprecedented opportunities and the means for all Americans to seize them. Already unemployment and inflation are at their lowest points in a generation. Our neighborhoods are freeing themselves from the fearful grasp of crime and violence, more than in years. Last year the drop in violent crime in the United States was the largest in 35 years. The African-American unemployment rate is the lowest in more than 20 years. We've had a historic drop in the number of people dependent upon public assistance for their livelihoods. But now we are going to try to finish the job.

Our historic balanced budget is an empowerment budget preparing Americans for the 21st century. I saw what Hugh Price said here yesterday about economic power being the last frontier, and I have seen Mr. Brack's new magazine cover, which I understand is sold out already, but I agree, we have to be about the business of giving people the power to make the most of their own lives and their families and their neighborhoods and their communities. That is the last frontier.

This budget will give every American willing to work hard and take responsibility that kind of opportunity. It honors our values by strengthening our families, investing in the education and health care of our children, moving more people from welfare to work, continuing to make our communities more livable. It is the strongest budget for our cities in over a generation. It keeps America firmly on the course of bringing new businesses, good jobs, and hopes back to our most distressed urban areas. It will help us to ensure that the blighted downtowns of the late 20th century do not follow us into the 21st. It will instead give them the chance to buzz again with energy and optimism, generated by Americans working hard, teaching children, raising families, and preparing for the future.

Beyond the right kinds of investments in this budget, we've fought for and won the kinds of tax cuts and credits that will truly benefit working families and communities. This balanced budget will keep interest rates down and investment up. Already what we have been able to do has produced 13 million jobs in 4½ years. And I am proud of that, but we have more to do.

In this budget, we fought for and won $24 billion to bring health care to as many as 5 million children who don't have health insurance today. This is the single largest investment by the National Government in health care since the passage of the Medicaid program in 1965.

Today, there are about 10 million children who don't have health insurance. Interestingly enough, if the 3 million kids who are out there today who are eligible for Medicaid could simply be identified and enrolled and then we could use this money to reach 5 million more—the children of working parents who don't have health insurance on the job—we would be almost 80 percent of the way home to providing health insurance for all American children. I hope you will help us to identify those children. And we'll do our best to make sure that the programs work. They'll be administered State

by State. And the Urban League is organized State by State; we need you out there working State by State to make sure this program reaches children.

But we can make a profound difference in the lives not only of these children but their families, by simply guaranteeing that they will have the health insurance that they ought to have for the hearing test, the vision test, to go to the dentist, to see the doctor, and if, God forbid, they needed to go to the hospital. It's a big deal, as my daughter used to say.

We fought for and won a $500-per-child tax credit to help families, millions of them, and especially those struggling to lift themselves beyond poverty and raise their children well on modest salaries. That includes firefighters, police officers, nurses, teachers, technicians, people who deserve all the help they can get to raise their children as they work hard to serve us and make America a better place.

We fought for and won the most significant new investment in education in over 30 years and the largest increase in investment in helping people to go on to college since the GI bill passed 50 years ago. Through expanded Pell grants, the biggest expansion in two decades; tuition tax deductions for the cost of all 4 years of college and graduate school and going back to school for adults; education IRA's and our HOPE scholarship, which will open the doors of college to all Americans for at least 2 years after high school, we are establishing a system in which every American who is willing to study hard will be able to go on to college and to thrive in our new economy. It is very important.

And I might emphasize that this will be especially important as we try to bring America together in this new knowledge-based economy. The African-American high school graduation rate is now, thankfully, almost as high as the high school graduation rate for white Americans. But the rate of college graduation still shows a great differential, and you can see it in the unemployment rates; you can see it in the income rates. We owe it to the young people coming up to make sure that everybody, including people already out there in the work force, who is willing to go back to school and able to go back to school should not be barred from going back to school for financial means. This budget will make sure that they will not be.

We have fought to more than triple the number of empowerment zones from 9 to 31 across America, to bring businesses and jobs back to downtown areas with a combination of tax credits that will leverage billions of dollars in new private investment over the next 5 years. I have seen this working in communities all across America. I have seen what happened in Detroit. I have watched the unemployment rate be cut in half in 4 years when the private sector works with vigorous community leaders and takes maximum advantage of the incentives in the empowerment zones. And we have to keep going until that kind of investment is present everywhere. And I might say, there are even more generous incentives to invest in the Nation's Capital, to bring it back and bring it back to where it ought to be, where people want to live here, want to go to school here, and feel safe on the streets, and we know we've got a functioning economy. And I want to assure you that I'm going to keep working until Washington, DC, is what the people of Washington and the people of the United States deserve for it to be.

We worked to provide tax incentives to businesses who agree to clean up and redevelop some 14,000 brownfields. Now, that's a term of art. Those are environmentally contaminated but otherwise attractive business sites in urban areas. Most business people simply cannot afford the risk or the cost on their own. This budget will give them the incentives necessary to do it. Our cities are full of places which would be good for new investments were it not for the environmental liability staring investors in the face. This will help to lift that burden and bring investment back to our inner cities.

Finally, we're working to more than double our investments in this budget in community development financial institutions, the community banks that make loans to individual entrepreneurs to start businesses in areas where they wouldn't be started otherwise, often the loans being made to people who couldn't get the loans otherwise.

When I became President, I found that our country through our foreign aid programs had been setting up these banks for small entrepreneurs in poor countries for years, but we weren't doing the same things for the American people who had something to contribute to their own economies in the neighborhoods of America. We're going to keep going until we've got a vigorous community development bank in every neighborhood in America. I might say,

in deference to one of your board members, I especially appreciate the support we have received from NationsBank in the community bank effort. They have made a huge difference to the acceptability and the viability of this in this country.

This budget will continue our efforts to fund 100,000 community police officers walking the beat, making our communities safe, helping our kids to stay out of trouble. Crime has dropped for 5 years in a row. And mayor after mayor after mayor tells me the more people want to live in our cities and feel good about living in our cities, the more they will invest in our cities and put people to work there.

Finally, let me say that last summer, when I signed the welfare bill into law, I promised to work to fix the severe shortcomings of the bill, to eliminate aspects of the law that had nothing whatever to do with welfare reform, and to find ways to encourage more employers to hire people from welfare rolls. This budget makes good on those promises. It restores both Medicaid and SSI benefits to the legal immigrants who work hard and pay taxes in our country. They should not be punished if they get hurt through no fault of their own. They ought to be entitled to benefits they pay taxes for like everybody else. It makes sure that disabled children who are now no longer defined as disabled under the supplemental security income law will not lose their Medicaid coverage. And it expands food stamp benefits for unemployed citizens trying as hard as they can to keep jobs and find jobs. And let me say why this is important.

It's easy in the welfare debate, it's easy in the poverty debate, to forget about the younger single men, because they do not get welfare. But we need them very badly to be educated, to be trained, to be in the work force, to be of strong families, to be a constructive role in our future. Sometimes the only public benefits they get are from food stamps. That may be the only incentive we have to involve them in education, in training, in job placement programs. So restoring these benefits is very important.

And for all of you who care a lot about the condition of poor people and helping them to become more independent and go to work, I say, yes, by all means, we have to move every able-bodied person off welfare. But let's not forget about all those young single men out there who need to be a part of America's positive future, who cannot be on welfare but can be standing on the street, and ought to be at school or at work and building good families and contributing to our future.

This budget also provides $3 billion to the cities to help welfare recipients find and keep good-paying jobs—even more money to go with child care and job training and job placement—3 billion more dollars, and it will help.

And finally, it offers tax credits for employers that hire people from the welfare rolls. We also made sure that these welfare recipients will be paid an honest wage, nothing less than the Federal minimum wage for the jobs that they do. And I think that is the right thing to do.

Finally, let me say that we know the best thing we can do to empower our children to succeed in this new global economy is to make sure they have a world-class education. You have often said education is the great equalizer. And I read in the newspaper today, so I know it's so—[*laughter*]—that you said yesterday that we had to make sure our young people discarded their second-class expectations, that none of us should impose second-class expectations on young people. I say amen to that.

One of the things that we know now, folks, is that all of our children can learn. When I started—[*applause*]—thank you. Many years ago, almost 15 years ago now, when I started in earnest the work in my State on national education reforms and national standards of what children should take and what courses should be offered, it was really commonplace to hear people say, "Well, you cannot expect America to measure up to the highest international standards from kindergarten through high school. Oh, yes, we've got the best college system in the world, but you just can't expect us to measure up." And I'd always ask, "Why?" And they said, "Well, because we have too many children whose first language is not English. We have too many children who live in poor and difficult circumstances. We have too many children who live in violent circumstances. We have too much difference in the level of funding in our schools. Our school year is not as long as it is some other places." I heard all these reasons.

You know, I remember the first time I left my home State; some people thought I was dumb just because I talked the way I did. [*Laughter*] Might have been right, for all I know. [*Laughter*] But I've heard all this, you

know, and I must say it was frustrating. Year-in and year-out, you'd see these international test scores, and America would always be below the international average. And we'd say, "Yes, but their populations are more homogenous than ours. Their education systems are more homogenous." There was always some reason that sounded pretty good.

Well, this sure—for the first time on the international math and science test scores, which several thousand American students, representative by race, by region, by income, take that test every year—this year our fourth graders scored way above the international average for the first time. So we don't have to listen to that anymore. We don't have to listen to that anymore.

Now, the bad news is our eighth graders did not score above the international average, but we do know there are some reasons for that. We know that all the social problems that our kids live with get more intense around the time of adolescence. We know that a lot of our middle schools or our junior high schools are organized for the Ozzie and Harriet days of the fifties and the sixties, when the world was different than it is now. And they're often too big and not as functional as they need to be, and we need to rethink that. We know there are a lot of reasons, but I'll tell you something: One thing we know is that we can't blame it on the kids anymore, because the fourth-grade test proves that the children can do it. The fourth-grade test proves that the children can do it.

And that's why I'm trying so hard to get America, finally, on the eve of the 21st century, to establish national standards and to test all of our kids at the fourth grade in reading and all of our kids at the eighth grade in math, because I know we can meet those standards. And I know you don't do any child a favor, in the world we're going to send them into, by holding them to lower expectations. If they're poor, if they have a difficult neighborhood, if they have a difficult home environment, you know what, they need good education even more than the rest of the kids. They need it even more. They need it even more, and they deserve it even more. They deserve it.

So I ask you to help me. And if we implement this budget—children's health care, child and education tax credits, new businesses and jobs for our cities, welfare-to-work, high academic standards, these things will help our people to make the most of their own lives. But empowerment is a concept which, by definition, implies a response from every individual. Empowerment means, here are the tools, what are you going to do with it? And believe me, we still have not done everything we should for all of our cities, for our Nation's Capital, for all of our people. There will still be more work to be done. You will be doing a lot of it one on one, as mentors helping people, but at least the tools will be there.

Now, our people must do what Whitney Young said, and every one of them has to be prepared to take advantage of these opportunities. So I hope you'll go back to your communities and enlist more people in the Urban League's mission, more people who will make sure that this budget will come alive, hiring someone off welfare, helping a child find his or her way, building partnerships with businesses to strengthen schools and create jobs, and reaching out across the lines of race and class and gender to find common ground and build our common bridges to that bright new century.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:40 p.m. at the Washington Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Jonathan Linen, chairman, board of trustees, Hugh Price, president and chief executive officer, and Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., former president, National Urban League; former Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown and his widow, Alma; John Hope Franklin, Chair, President's Advisory Board on Race; and Reginald K. Brack, former chairman, Time Inc.

Interview With Tavis Smiley of Black Entertainment Television

August 4, 1997

Mr. Smiley. Mr. President, thanks for joining us. I'm glad you could take some time to talk to us today.

The President. Glad to do it.

Balanced Budget Act of 1997

Mr. Smiley. Thank you. Let me start by asking you whether or not—let me rephrase that. I know I'm preaching to the choir when I tell you that African-Americans still lag far behind white Americans in every single leading economic indicator category. As you well know, some of your African-American critics have accused you, so to speak, of talking the talk but not walking the walk when it comes to your budget priorities. I'm wondering specifically what's in this budget that you're set to sign tomorrow, I suspect, specifically for African-American families that will help them shrink that economic gap.

The President. Well, there are several things. Let's look at a few of them.

First of all, this budget has $24 billion in it for health insurance for families, for children, for families of modest means—disproportionately minority families. We're talking about people here who are working for a living but don't make much money, don't get health insurance for their children at work, but aren't poor enough to be on Medicaid. And it's the biggest expansion of health care for needy people since Medicaid passed in 1965—the single biggest one.

Second, the bill has a $500-per-child tax credit that goes even to working families that get the earned-income tax credit, that is, that make modest incomes, that make under $30,000 a year, which are the vast majority of African-American families—have children in the home—police officers, nurses, firefighters, folks like that, they'll get $500 a year per child.

Third, this bill has the biggest increase in spending for education from Head Start through college since 1965, in over 30 years, and the biggest increase in help for people to go to college since the GI bill passed 50 years ago, the biggest increase in Pell grants in over 20 years—and that's going to really help—college tax credits, all kinds of other financial provisions to help people to go to college.

Fourth, the bill remedies everything I promised to fix in the welfare bill. It restores benefits to legal immigrants who are hurt through no fault of their own. It keeps children who are no longer classified as disabled eligible for Medicaid. It expands food stamp benefits to single men who are looking for work. It provides $3 billion to the cities, to help the cities put people who are on welfare to work.

And finally, the bill has a huge, broad array of economic incentives for people who invest in the inner cities. It triples the number of empowerment zones. It more than doubles the funds for community development banks to loan money to people who start businesses in the inner cities. It provides tax incentives and other investments to clean up 14,000 so-called brownfield sites in urban areas that are otherwise attractive for development but have environmental problems.

So it's a stunning budget. It's been at least 30 years since a budget this good for working Americans, lower income Americans, and minority Americans has passed.

Welfare Reform

Mr. Smiley. My time with you is limited, and there is so much I want to talk to you about, but let me follow up very quickly if I can. Since you mentioned welfare, I suspect tomorrow around here at the White House there will be handshakes and smiles tomorrow as the Republicans and Democrats come together to watch you sign this bill. But I'm wondering what specifically you're going to do to follow up on what the Republicans have already threatened to do; that is to say, they want to, on Wednesday, I suspect, come after you in terms of gutting the welfare provisions that you insisted be a part of this bill. They specifically do not want to pay minimum wage to welfare workers who you want to move from welfare to work. How are you going to deal with what their next strike is going to be? And they've already indicated what it is.

The President. Well, I think some of them are upset because of the stories which indicate that we got about a 100 percent of what we were looking for out of this budget. But they got what they wanted. They got a capital gains

and the changes in the estate tax and things of that kind.

I believe that everybody who works ought to get the minimum wage. And I'm going to hang tough, and unless they can get enough votes to override a veto, then the people that go to work are going to get the minimum wage. I don't think there's a problem with that.

Now, to be fair, they say that the Governors are saying that some employers, even community nonprofits, which you might consider liberal employers, are reluctant to hire people off welfare who may be hard to place and may have—take time to train, if they also have to pay all the accompanying costs of employment like the unemployment tax and the Social Security tax and all of these other taxes. And they say they're looking for help on that. Well, I expect we'll have some dialog about that, but I simply don't think that they ought to be able to take the minimum wage away from working people. I just don't.

President's Advisory Board on Race

Mr. Smiley. You've said, and you've of course undertaken—put together a commission to undertake getting this country to have a conversation about race, the issue that you've called America's constant curse. In the first public meeting of your race commission, a small dispute erupted in that the commission Chairman, Dr. John Hope Franklin, and commissioner Angela Oh, a Korean-American commissioner from Los Angeles, had a dispute about what the focus, what the mission, the work of the commission ought to be. Dr. Franklin believes that the focus and the mission ought to be around the black-white conflict, which he sees as the nucleus for every other race problem this country has endured and continues to endure. Angela Oh, commissioner Oh suggests that the work of the commission really ought to be about multiracialism and multiculturalism.

As the leader, the President who put this commission together, what kind of leadership are you going to provide? How are you going to get them on the right track? If the commission can't have a clear-stated mandate, how do we talk about it as a country?

The President. My sense is that the division was not as great as it appeared. First, I agree with John Hope Franklin that if you don't understand the black-white issue, you can never understand how race works in America. If you don't understand the history and if you don't know what the facts are now, you can never understand the rest. And I think that's really the only point he was making, and I think that's important. I think we have to deal with our unfinished business, if you will.

There are some other issues. If you don't understand that Mexican-Americans first came to this country, if you will, by annexation because of the war we had with Mexico, it's hard to understand the unique history of the United States with its Mexican-American population. But there is something special about the whole legacy of slavery and all of that, and we have to understand that. So I agree with that.

On the other hand, I also believe that one of the most important things this commission can do when there is no riot in the cities, when there is no real social dislocation, when unemployment is coming down and incomes are finally going up again, and we seem to be making some progress on crime and other issues, I think that it's time that we say, Gosh, we're going to be in this new century in only 3 years; within 5 years, California will have no majority race; within 30 to 40 years, the United States will have no majority race. What does that mean? What do we want America to look like in 35 years? How are we going to get along? How are we going to avoid these problems that have so bedeviled other countries when they didn't have a majority race, these tribal fights in Africa or the religious-based conflicts of the ethnic groups in Bosnia? Or what's going on in the Middle East; how are we going to get around that?

I think that if we think about it now and we sort of make it a part of our project as we start the new century and we kind of empower our young people especially to talk about it and work through it, my guess is that when we do become the first truly multiethnic, multiracial democracy in the world, it will turn out to be a huge advantage for us, a huge advantage, because of the global society we're living in, as long as we say we respect, we even celebrate our differences, but we're still one America. I mean, that's the trick. And I think that ought to be the future focus of this.

Affirmative Action

Mr. Smiley. You mentioned California. As you well know, you gave a race relations speech at UC-San Diego. And as you probably know, 200

African-Americans have applied to med school in San Diego; none were accepted. In Texas, at the University of Texas, admissions of African-American students are down 26 percent. It's an ugly picture, and I can make it uglier if I had more time, but I won't do that. But the question I do want to ask is——

The President. They shouldn't have passed that 209.

Mr. Smiley. I totally agree with you on that. The question I want to ask is, there is a bill that's pending in the Texas Legislature that suggests that if scores—test scores are going to be the sole criteria for all students being admitted to college, why not include athletes in that regard? I'm wondering how you feel about that. I actually think it may help the Razorbacks, because the kids that can't go to school in Texas may go up to Arkansas. [*Laughter*]

The President. What a low blow. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Smiley. Well, no, I just—it may help the program. But what do you think about including athletes, though, seriously?

The President. I think if you did it, people would bring back affirmative action. I mean, that would make the point. I couldn't help thinking, when they explicitly excluded athletes, that you could have, let's say, an Hispanic young athlete who was a C student out of high school get in the best university in the State, and another young Hispanic who was an A-minus student in high school that wore Coke-bottle glasses and was an academic, who couldn't get in. I mean, the whole thing is bizarre. It's all mixed up.

Mr. Smiley. You think it ought to include athletes?

The President. Well, I think universities ought to have a right to develop their athletic programs, but I think that it is ridiculous to say that a great university needs to have different academic standards for athletics so you can have diversified athletics but doesn't need a diversified student body when it comes to race and ethnicity. I think it's just an absurd argument. It is completely absurd, I think.

So I would say you've got to—you can pick one. You can have it one way or the other, but you can't have it both ways. That's kind of what I—it's like these people who put this together saying, "Well, if these folks can entertain us, we'll let them come to school. But if they're not entertaining to us, never mind that they're going to be a big part of our future; they can't come to school." I think it's a mistake.

Of course, I believe—I don't think there was ever a constitutional problem with affirmative action in college admissions and professional school admissions, as long as no one who was unqualified—that is, someone that clearly couldn't meet high standards and couldn't do the work—was admitted, because there are measures other than test scores and grades which are pretty valid indicators of whether people can do good work in high-quality institutions. And you want the students themselves to have valid experiences when they're going through school.

And I personally believe, since we're going to live in a multiracial, multiethnic, multireligious society, if I were running a private university, I'd certainly want one to be like that. And I think it's a cruel irony that in some of these States they seem to be moving toward putting it all on the private universities to have a diverse student body, at least in the graduate level.

Now, Texas is trying to overcome this now with their so-called 10 percent solution—you may know about that—saying that anybody who graduates in the top 10 percent of any high school can go to any State university. The problem with that is it doesn't deal with the professional schools, number one, and number two, it might work for Texas because of the racial distribution of people throughout the State in high schools. It wouldn't necessarily work in other States. I think—you know, my own view is we need an effective, constitutional affirmative action program.

Cocaine Sentencing Guidelines

Mr. Smiley. Let me get to a couple of other quick areas before my time runs out here. You recently recommended—your administration recommended that the disparity between the crack and cocaine—powder cocaine sentencing be reduced from 100 to 1 to 10 to 1. I'm wondering, why not 1 to 1? And apparently the CBC, the Congressional Black Caucus, was quite upset that they were not consulted before that decision was announced. Your thoughts?

The President. On the second issue, I don't know about that, and I was surprised because I had just had a very long meeting with the Black Caucus in which we'd gone over a huge number of issues. And we had given them good followup on everything, and I was personally

stunned to understand that they had not been consulted on this. And I found that hard to believe. What I think happened was someone involved in this in one of those departments leaked the decision before it was ripe to be made and kind of cut off all the consultations before it got in the newspaper. That's not an excuse. We should have done better.

Now, on the merits, let me say, we came to 10 to 1 for two reasons. One is all the senior people at the Justice Department and in the office of drug control believed that there had to be some difference because of the difference in violent crime associated with powder and crack. None of them believe that the 100 to 1 was justifiable. They all thought it was totally unconscionable. And they all thought it ought to be reduced dramatically. So they recommended 10 to 1.

Secondly, prison sentences are longer than ever now. And it was—the conclusion was reached that if they recommended anything lower, what Congress would do in reaction would be to try to raise the minimums for everybody and leave everyone worse off. And so I think we need to take a hard look at that Federal prison population anyway to see whether there are too many nonviolent offenders in there. And I think this should be viewed for just what it is, a major step forward. Let's see. Hopefully, we'll be permitted to implement it, and if we are, we'll see if it works.

Slavery and Reparations

Mr. Smiley. Your challenge to America to have a conversation about race has certainly spun off a number of conversations, including conversations about slavery and reparations. And I'm wondering whether or not, since you've had more time to reflect, you think an apology to African-Americans is warranted. And more specifically, what do you think of at least having a commission to study the feasibility of reparations, regardless of what your opinion is?

The President. Well, I don't believe that—what I think I should do now is let this advisory board do its work and see what they have to say about the apology issue and all the related issues. The one thing I did not want to do is to define the work of this commission, which I hope will be quite broad, as I explained, in terms of any particular issue early on. I just don't think I should do that. So I'm going to let them have their hearings. I'm going to go to some of the hearings with them. We're going to go around the country. I'm going to keep announcing special initiatives like our big scholarship fund to move teachers into the inner cities and pay for their college if they go back to inner cities and teach. I'm going to keep doing those things and just see how it comes out. And if the board wants to recommend that—and Dr. Franklin, I think, is in about as good a position to judge that as anybody in America—I'll wait and see what they say.

Dialog on Race

Mr. Smiley. Two last quick things and I'll let you go. I'm wondering whether or not you think that an apology to African-Americans might reenergize this debate. I'm talking to some African-Americans over the last few days who think that since your speech in San Diego, the conversation has kind of gotten quiet. You don't really hear a lot about this race discussion. Don't you think that apology might reenergize this debate?

The President. Well, I don't know. I keep trying to do something about every 2 weeks to juice it up. Today I talked to—I gave a speech to the Urban League, in terms of what was in the budget for African-Americans and minorities, just like I did with you a few moments ago. And I previously gave a speech saying that we were going to offer scholarships to people and pay their way through college if they'd go teach in distressed areas. I'll keep trying to do that. But I think there will be a lot of interest in it. It's hard to keep the media's interest all the time unless there's conflict. You know that. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Smiley. Absolutely.

The President. But I'll keep trying to find innovative ways to do it.

President's Future Visit to Africa

Mr. Smiley. Let me ask you finally—and I respect you and appreciate the time you've spent with us today—let me ask you whether or not there's any truth to the rumors, and I underscore the word rumors, that you may, in fact, be heading to the continent of Africa at some point in the near future. Does the President care to confirm that, or do you want to disabuse me of that notion?

The President. No, no. I want to go to Africa next year. And I hope it won't be too long into next year. We're looking at the calendar

now, and I'll just—and we'll have to pick. I've got—I owe a number of visits. I'm trying to work out a lot of different conflicts next year, but I very much want to go to Africa next year. And I intend to go, and if something doesn't happen, I will go.

Mr. Smiley. Mr. President, thanks for taking the time to talk to us.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 5:28 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House.

Remarks on Signing the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997

August 5, 1997

Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Senator Lautenberg, Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen. We come here today, Democrats and Republicans, Congress and President, Americans of good will from all points of view and all walks of life, to celebrate a true milestone for our Nation. In a few moments I will sign into law the first balanced budget in a generation, a balanced budget that honors our values, puts our fiscal house in order, expands vistas of opportunity for all our people, and fashions a new Government to lead in a new era.

Like every generation of Americans before us, we have been called upon to renew our Nation and to restore its promise. For too long, huge, persistent, and growing budget deficits threatened to choke the opportunity that should be every American's birthright. For too long, it seemed as if America would not be ready for the new century, that we would be too divided, too wedded to old arrangements and ideas. It's hard to believe now, but it wasn't so very long ago that some people looked at our Nation and saw a setting Sun.

When I became President, I determined that we must believe and make sure that America's best days were still ahead. After years in which the deficit drained our economy and dampened our spirit, in which our ability to lead the world was diminished by our inability to put our own house in order, after years in which too many people doubted whether our Nation would ever come together again to address this problem, we set off on a new economic course to cut the deficit, to create the conditions in which business could thrive, to open more foreign markets to our goods and services, to invest in our people so that all Americans would have the tools they need to make the most of their own lives.

Today, our budget deficit has been cut by more than 80 percent. It is now among the smallest in the industrialized world, as a percentage of our economy. Our businesses once again lead in world markets, now made more open, more free, more fair than ever before through our efforts. Our workers are clearly the most competitive on Earth, and we have recast our old Government so that a new one can take shape that does give our people the tools to make the most of their God-given abilities.

This year we, Democrats and Republicans alike, were given the opportunity and the responsibility to finish the job of balancing the budget for the first time in almost 30 years and to do it in a way that prepares Americans to enter the next century stronger than ever. By large bipartisan majorities in both Houses, we have risen to that challenge.

The balanced budget I sign into law today will continue our successful economic strategy. It reflects the most fundamental values that brought us together. It will spur growth and spread opportunity. Even after we pay for tax cuts penny by penny, there will still be $900 billion in savings, including half a trillion dollars in entitlement savings over the next 10 years. It opens the doors of college to a new generation, with the largest investment in higher education since the GI bill 50 years ago. It makes it possible for the 13th and 14th years of college to become as universal as high school is today. It strengthens our families with the largest expansion in health care for children since the Medicaid program 32 years ago. It modernizes Medicare and extends the life of the trust fund

for a decade. It helps our communities to rebuild, to move a million more people from welfare to work, to bring the spark of private enterprise back to our most isolated inner-city neighborhoods. It provides the largest tax relief to help families raise their children, save for the future, and pass on their home and a dream to the next generation. These tax cuts are the equivalent of a $1,000 raise in take-home pay for the average family with two children.

For so many Americans, what goes on here in Washington often seems abstract and remote, unrelated to their daily concerns. Well, this balanced budget deals with the big issues of the deficit and long-term economic growth in ways that respond to the practical challenges ordinary American citizens face every single day.

Because we have acted, millions of children all across this country will be able to get medicine and have their sight and hearing tested and see dentists and doctors for the first time. Millions of young Americans will be able to go on to college. Millions of Americans not so young will be able to go back to school to get the education and training they need to succeed in life. Millions of families will have more to spend on their own children's needs and upbringing. This budget is an investment in their future and in America's.

Today it should be clear to all of us, without regard to our party or our differences, that, in common, we were able to transform this era of challenge into an era of unparalleled possibility for the American people. I hope we can tap this spirit of cooperation and use it to meet and master the many challenges that remain before us.

I want to thank, in closing, the many people whose work made this day possible. I want to thank Speaker Gingrich and Senator Lott, Mr. Armey and the other members of the House and Senate leadership, especially Senator Domenici and Senator Kasich. And let me thank Chairman Archer and Chairman Roth and the other leaders of the House and Senate committees. They were dedicated partners. They fought hard for their priorities. I want to thank Senator Daschle and Congressman Bonior and Congressman Fazio and Congressman Hoyer and the other members of the House Democratic leadership who worked with us.

I want to thank especially Congressman Spratt and Senator Lautenberg, Congressman Rangel and the other members of the House and Senate Democratic minority leaders in the committees for the work that they did. I thank all the Members of the Congress who are here present and the many whom they represent who are already back home, who could not be. All of them deserve our thanks, and I would like to ask the Members of the Congress who are here today to stand and be recognized and appreciated by the crowd. [*Applause*]

I'd like to thank the members of our budget team: Erskine Bowles, Secretary Rubin, John Hilley, OMB Director Raines, Gene Sperling, Janet Yellen, Rahm Emanuel, Jack Lew, Larry Summers, Chris Jennings, and many others, especially those who work in our legislative shop, too numerous to mention, for the enormous work that they did on this agreement.

I would like to thank the First Lady, Mrs. Gore, the Vice President for their concern for the health of our children, for the mental health of the American people, and the Vice President, especially, who led the fight to protect our urban initiatives and our environmental program and the interests of legal immigrants in America. We owe to them a great deal.

Again, I say to all, I thank you. I believe that together we have fulfilled the responsibility of our generation to guarantee opportunity to the next generation, the responsibility of our generation to take America into a new century, where there is opportunity for all who are responsible enough to work for it, where we have a chance to come together across all of our differences as a great American community, where we will be able to continue to lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity. That is worthy work, and you have all contributed doing it.

We can say with pride and certainty that those who saw the Sun setting on America were wrong. The Sun is rising on America again. And I thank you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:33 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. H.R. 2015, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, approved August 5, was assigned Public Law No. 105–33. H.R. 2014, the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, approved August 5, was assigned Public Law No. 105–34.

Statement on Signing the Balanced Budget Act of 1997

August 5, 1997

It is with great pleasure that I have signed into law today H.R. 2015, the "Balanced Budget Act of 1997." This Act, together with the tax cut legislation that I have also signed today, implements an historic agreement that will benefit generations of Americans.

These bills will balance the budget in a way that honors our values, invests in our people, and cuts taxes for middle-class families. They are a victory for all parents who want a good education for their children and for all families working to build a secure future. This package is the best investment we can make in America's future, and it prepares our Nation for the 21st century. After decades of deficits, we have put America's fiscal house in order again.

The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 is a balanced package of spending provisions that includes targeted program cuts while it invests in America's future. It includes the following noteworthy features.

First, it strengthens our families by extending health insurance coverage to up to 5 million children. By investing $24 billion, we will be able to provide quality medical care for these children—everything from regular check-ups to major surgery. I want every child in America to grow up healthy and strong, and this investment takes a major step toward that goal. I am also pleased that the Congress agreed to pay for this investment in our Nation's children in part with a 15-cents-a-pack tax increase on cigarettes. Not only will this new revenue help to pay for health care, it will help prevent children from taking up smoking in the first place.

Second, the bill helps finish the job of welfare reform, providing $3 billion to move welfare recipients to private sector jobs and $1.5 billion in Food Stamp assistance for people who want to work, but cannot find a job. In addition, it keeps my promise to provide $12 billion to restore disability and health benefits for 350,000 legal immigrants.

Third, H.R. 2015 honors our commitment to our parents by extending the life of the Medicare Trust Fund for a decade. It also provides structural reforms that will give Medicare beneficiaries more informed choices among competing health plans, authorizes a number of new anti-fraud provisions, and establishes a wide array of new preventative benefits.

The bill includes proposals to revitalize the District of Columbia. It includes my proposals to assume financial and administrative responsibility for certain District pension plans and to increase the Federal contribution to the District's Medicaid program. The revitalization measures will benefit the city and the region by reducing the city's financial burdens and improving the delivery of city services. The Federal assumption of these State-like responsibilities will enable the District Government to focus more intensively on local issues, such as education and law enforcement.

The bill also establishes a sentencing commission made up of District and Federal representatives charged with developing a Truth-in-Sentencing system. The bill also provides for the Federal Government to assume the costs and responsibilities of the District of Columbia's courts, public defender, and pretrial services systems as well as for felony offender incarceration, supervision, and parole. This assistance will strengthen the District's criminal justice system and improve public safety. Unfortunately, the Act fails to guarantee that the Justice Department's Bureau of Prisons will have the time, management flexibility, and resources needed to achieve a safe transition of responsibility for District of Columbia inmates. I look forward to working with the Congress to rectify these problems.

I am also pleased that the bill responds in part to my proposal to narrow the gap between the treatment of insular areas and States with respect to Medicaid payments, and I look forward to working with the Congress to provide more equitable funding for children's health care in the insular areas.

The Department of Justice has identified a number of Establishment Clause constitutional concerns with respect to section 4454 of H.R. 2015, entitled "Coverage of Services in Religious Nonmedical Health Care Institutions Under the Medicare and Medicaid Programs," and with respect to section 4001, concerning the Medicare Plus program and treatment of religious fraternal benefit society plans. The Department of

Health and Human Services will consult with the Department of Justice regarding how best to address these concerns.

Section 4422 of the bill purports to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a legislative proposal for establishing a case-mix adjusted prospective payment system for payment of long-term care hospitals under the Medicare program. I will construe this provision in light of my constitutional duty and authority to recommend to the Congress such legislative measures as I judge necessary and expedient, and to supervise and guide my subordinates, including the review of their proposed communications to the Congress.

The bill also broadens and extends the Federal Communications Commission's authority to auction the right to use the radio and television spectrum. This authority has been a successful means of streamlining the spectrum licensing process and for facilitating the deployment of new and innovative information technologies into the market place. I remain concerned, however, about the lack of a firm date for the termination of analog broadcasting, which made it necessary to find alternative and troubling savings from the universal service fund. I am also concerned about the waiver of media concentration rules.

This legislation represents an historic compromise. Together with its companion tax cut legislation, H.R. 2015 is a monument to the progress that people of goodwill can make when they put aside partisan interests to work together for the common good and our common future. It reflects the values and aspirations of all Americans.

This summer, we had an historic opportunity to strengthen America for the 21st century—and we have seized it. Now our Nation can move forward stronger, more vibrant, and more united than ever. For that, I am profoundly grateful.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
August 5, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2015, approved August 5, was assigned Public Law No. 105–33.

Statement on Signing the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997

August 5, 1997

I have today approved H.R. 2014, the "Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997." Together with the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, this legislation implements the bipartisan budget agreement.

I have long considered tax cuts for middle-income Americans and small businesses a top priority. In 1993, I worked with the Congress to cut taxes for 15 million working families by expanding the Earned Income Tax Credit, and by providing investment incentives for small businesses. A year later, I proposed my Middle Class Bill of Rights, including child tax credits, deductions for higher education, and expanded Individual Retirement Accounts. Then, in 1996, I signed into law a number of other tax benefits for small businesses and their employees—including greater expensing for small-business investments, greater deductibility of health insurance premiums for small businesses and their employees, and expanded and simplified opportunities for retirement savings. Also in 1996, I signed into law a $5,000 tax credit for adoption expenses ($6,000 for adopting children with special needs) and higher limits for tax-deductible contributions by spouses to Individual Retirement Accounts.

This year, I once again proposed my Middle Class Bill of Rights. On May 2, 1997, the congressional leadership and I reached a historic bipartisan budget agreement that included the broad outlines of key elements of my tax-cut plan.

As my Administration has worked with the Congress over the last few months to develop the details of the balanced budget agreement, I have insisted that the tax-cut package meet four basic tests. First, the tax cuts must be fiscally responsible by avoiding an explosion in revenue costs in years outside the budget windows. Second, the tax cuts must provide a fair balance of benefits for working Americans. Third, the tax cuts must encourage economic growth.

Fourth, the tax package must reflect the terms of the bipartisan budget agreement, including a significant expansion of opportunities for higher education for Americans of all ages.

I believe that H.R. 2014 meets these tests. It will provide an estimated $95 billion in net tax cuts over the next 5 years. It is a fair plan that places a priority on education tax cuts and provides a child tax credit to families who work hard and pay taxes. It also incorporates Republican priorities in a good-faith effort to honor the budget accord and to reach final agreement on a tax cut the American people deserve. This legislation will not only provide needed tax relief for middle-class Americans, but will also encourage economic growth. It is also fiscally responsible: the costs of these tax cuts are fully offset in accordance with the balanced budget agreement.

I am especially pleased that the legislation includes, with certain modifications, the key features of my Middle Class Bill of Rights designed to give middle-income families the tax relief they need to help them raise their children, save for the future, and pay for postsecondary education.

Education

I have long believed that the tax system should better encourage investment in college education and job training. This legislation incorporates the key aspects of my proposals for a $1,500 HOPE Scholarship to make 2 years of college universally available and a 20 percent tuition credit to make the third and fourth years of college more affordable and to promote lifelong learning.

The legislation also contains a number of other education initiatives that my Administration has strongly supported. These include tax incentives for public school repair, renovation, and educational enhancement in poor neighborhoods through Education Zone Academy Bonds; student-loan forgiveness exemptions similar to those that I have previously proposed; tax incentives to help public elementary and secondary schools obtain up-to-date computer technology; increased availability of tax-exempt financing for new capital expenditures by private colleges and universities; and a special tax-favored savings vehicle to help families save for higher education.

The bill also includes a 3-year extension of the exclusion of employer-provided educational assistance from taxable income. While I am disappointed that the Congress did not adopt my proposal to extend this exclusion permanently or to include graduate education, I intend to continue to work with the Congress to achieve these important goals.

Child Credit

I have long advocated a child tax credit for tax-paying working families. Consistent with my proposal, H.R. 2014 will provide $500 per child tax credits ($400 in 1998) for families with children under 17. In working with the Congress to develop this legislation, I have insisted that the group that can benefit from the child credit include working families with incomes between $15,000 and $30,000. I am pleased that the child credit as contained in H.R. 2014 meets this requirement so that these families receive relief from both income and payroll taxes.

IRAs and Other Savings Incentives

Since 1994, my budget has contained proposals to provide greater tax incentives for long-term savings for retirement and other important purposes. I am pleased that, consistent with my budget proposals, H.R. 2014 permits penalty-free withdrawals from existing IRAs to finance higher education expenses and for first-time home purchases, makes deductible IRAs more widely available, and gives taxpayers the choice of a new backloaded IRA. I am pleased that the Congress moved from its original position so that the IRAs contained in H.R. 2014 are more targeted to lower- and middle-income families. I am concerned, however, that the Congress did not move far enough, and that the bill contains other features that will provide a windfall to high-income individuals who will merely shift savings from taxable vehicles into IRAs, rather than create new savings.

Distressed Areas and Urban Tax Initiatives

Revitalizing distressed urban and rural areas throughout the country is a high priority of my Administration. I have proposed a number of initiatives to increase investment in disadvantaged areas. I am pleased that H.R. 2014 includes versions of most of these initiatives. As I have earlier proposed, the bill would encourage the cleanup of polluted urban and rural areas, known as brownfields, by allowing a current deduction for certain costs incurred by

businesses to remediate environmentally contaminated land in certain areas. I am disappointed, however, that this provision is scheduled to sunset after 3 years.

My 1993 tax plan included certain tax incentives for nine empowerment zones and 95 enterprise communities. Over 500 communities submitted applications for these 104 designations. The final designations were announced in December 1994. To build upon the success of this program, and to mobilize more communities to promote business development and to create jobs, I proposed two additional urban empowerment zones as defined by the 1993 legislation, and proposed a second round of competition to designate 20 additional empowerment zones, with a different mix of tax incentives, and 80 additional enterprise communities. I am pleased that H.R. 2014 provides for the designation of the additional empowerment zones, but disappointed that it does not make provision for the new enterprise communities.

It has been an important goal of my Administration to encourage employment of disadvantaged residents of the District of Columbia and to revitalize those areas of the District where development has lagged. I am pleased that H.R. 2014 includes tax incentives for the District of Columbia. I am disappointed, however, that it does not include my proposals to create an Economic Development Corporation for the District, stimulate investments in Community Development Financial Institutions, or facilitate the restructuring of our Nation's affordable housing portfolio.

Welfare-to-Work

I am pleased that H.R. 2014 includes a modified version of my welfare-to-work tax credit proposal, which is designed to generate new job opportunities for long-term welfare recipients. I am also pleased that the bill extends the Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC), but I am disappointed that it modifies the structure to allow employers to claim the WOTC for hiring workers for a very short period of time and does not expand the program to cover childless, able-bodied adults ages 18–50 who are subject to the Food Stamp time limit and work requirements.

Small Business Tax Cuts

I am pleased that H.R. 2014 enacts many of the recommendations of the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business. For example, it includes my proposal to exempt from the alternative minimum tax (AMT) corporations with gross receipts of less than $5 million. Under this proposal, roughly 95 percent of all corporations (more than two million) would be spared the complication of calculating the AMT.

Earlier this year, my Administration announced its support for expansion of the home office deduction and the small business capital gains incentive. These proposals were intended to help high-tech and bio-tech entrepreneurs, start-up companies, parents who work out of their homes, and other Americans who are seizing the opportunities of the new economy. I am pleased that H.R. 2014 expands the home office deduction, but disappointed that it contains only limited modification of the small business capital gains incentive.

Capital Gains Relief

I am pleased that H.R. 2014 includes my proposal to exempt up to $500,000 in capital gains on the sale of a home from all capital gains taxes. This encompasses over 99 percent of homes sold in the U.S. and will dramatically simplify taxes and record keeping for over 60 million homeowners.

I had also proposed a 30 percent exclusion for capital gains. I continue to have concerns that the across-the-board capital gains relief in H.R. 2014 is too complex and will disproportionately benefit the wealthy over lower- and middle-income wage earners. I am pleased, however, that H.R. 2014 does not contain the House provision to index capital gains, which would have caused even greater complexity and would have contributed to an explosive revenue cost after 2007.

Estate Tax Relief

I am pleased that, consistent with my proposal, H.R. 2014 contains a special exemption for interests in qualified farms or small businesses that, when combined with the unified credit, will exempt up to $1.3 million in value. I am also pleased that the bill includes a version of my proposal to provide liquidity relief for estates containing small businesses and farms. The bill also increases the unified estate and gift tax credit on a phased-in basis to reach $1 million in 2006. I continue to have concerns that this provision is too expensive and will be

of no benefit to the vast majority of American families.

Tobacco Taxes

Earlier this year I proposed an increase in tobacco taxes that would be separated into a trust fund and dedicated entirely to expanding health coverage for children, addressing other children's development issues, and improving the overall public health. I am pleased that such a provision has been included in H.R. 2015. I am seriously concerned, however, that H.R. 2014 provides that the increase in tobacco taxes collected is to be credited against the total payments made by parties pursuant to the tobacco industry settlement agreement of June 20, 1997.

Simplification

I am pleased that H.R. 2014 includes many of the items previously contained in my April package of some 60 measures designed to simplify the tax laws and enhance taxpayers' rights. I am concerned, however, that the sheer multitude of miscellaneous tax code amendments contained in H.R. 2014, will contribute significantly to complexity for taxpayers and tax planners. I am also concerned that some of the provisions that will affect many taxpayers, such as the capital gains provision, are unduly complex. I continue to support revenue-neutral initiatives to simplify the tax laws and to promote sensible and equitable administration of the tax laws. I urge the Congress to continue to work with me to achieve these goals. In addition to supporting legislative initiatives, my Administration is committed to taking appropriate administrative action to implement this tax legislation in a manner that minimizes taxpayer burdens, and further, that simplifies the tax laws and enhances procedural safeguards for taxpayers.

Other Presidential Initiatives

My tax plan included extensions of the research tax credit, the orphan drug credit, and the tax incentive for contributions of appreciated stock to private foundations. I am pleased that H.R. 2014 includes such extensions. I am also pleased that H.R. 2014 includes my proposal to extend the foreign sales corporation benefit, which exempts a portion of income for tax purposes, to include computer software licensed for reproduction abroad.

I am disappointed, however, that H.R. 2014 omits a number of my important initiatives, including my proposal to protect the rights of disabled persons by extending the time such people are allowed to claim a tax refund to include the period during which they are mentally or physically impaired.

The bill also omits my proposal to restore the wage-based tax incentive for new investments in Puerto Rico. While I agreed last year to ending the credit not directly based on economic activity, I opposed phasing out the wage-based incentive. It is a mistake not to continue this credit and open it to new investments in Puerto Rico, which has a jobless rate three times the national rate.

I am also very disappointed that the tax incentives for renewable fuels were not extended in this budget. Earlier this year, I proposed extension of the excise tax exemption for ethanol in our surface transportation reauthorization proposal. I urge the Congress to extend the ethanol subsidy when it considers the reauthorization bill later this year.

Other Issues of Concern

The bill extends the Airport and Airways Trust Fund taxes and sets new fee structures without the benefit of the pending study by the National Civil Aviation Review Commission. The Administration may propose changes to these provisions after it reviews the Commission's recommendations.

The bill also transfers the 4.3 cents per gallon in fuel taxes currently dedicated to deficit reduction from the General Fund to transportation trust funds. While the transfer provision itself has no revenue or spending effect, I am concerned that transferring the revenue may spur efforts to move the trust funds off-budget and create pressure to increase ground transportation spending to levels significantly higher than contemplated by the bipartisan budget agreement.

Finally, H.R. 2014 contains a provision that is intended to address the capital needs of Amtrak. The provision is contingent on the enactment of subsequent Amtrak reform legislation. Although the provision is highly problematic in terms of tax policy, my Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to secure the enactment of Amtrak reform legislation that is fair to all parties.

Conclusion

Despite my reservations, H.R. 2014 meets the basic tests established by my Administration and

provides needed tax relief for working Americans. I am grateful for the bipartisan support that this measure received in the Congress, and I am pleased to have signed it into law.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
August 5, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2014, approved August 5, was assigned Public Law No. 105–34.

Statement on Signing the Taxpayer Browsing Protection Act
August 5, 1997

Today I have signed into law H.R. 1226, the "Taxpayer Browsing Protection Act," to provide additional criminal penalties and civil remedies to help ensure that taxpayers' returns and return information remain confidential.

Our system of taxation relies heavily on taxpayers' voluntary compliance with their tax reporting obligations. Maintaining the confidentiality of the information submitted by taxpayers is critical to the operation of this system. If taxpayers do not believe that the Government is adequately safeguarding their personal financial information they may be less willing to supply that information in the future.

Taxpayers have the right to expect that their returns and return information are, and will remain, confidential. Such information should be inspected or reviewed only for proper purposes, including tax administration, in accordance with the criteria established by law. It is my Administration's clear policy that unauthorized inspection of tax information will not be tolerated. This is a bipartisan issue on which everyone can agree: "browsing" taxpayer information is wrong, and we all condemn it.

Using currently available tools, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has stepped up its efforts to end browsing, and my Administration has supported providing the IRS with additional tools. Significant progress was made on this issue last year. The National Information Infrastructure Protection Act of 1996 made it a crime to access intentionally a Federal computer without proper authority and obtain information from any department or agency of the United States Government. Thus, browsing tax records stored in a Federal computer is already punishable as a crime. The bill I have signed today will further strengthen the tools the IRS can employ against unauthorized inspections of taxpayer data.

This legislation will add a separate provision to the Internal Revenue Code specifically prohibiting unauthorized inspection or browsing of tax returns and return information. It will make a misdemeanor of certain activities that are not covered under current law. For example, it will prohibit the unauthorized inspection of noncomputerized tax information, such as "hard copies" of paper returns or return information. It will prohibit unauthorized inspection using computers belonging to State or local governments or contractors when Federal tax information has been conveyed to them pursuant to existing law. Finally, the new misdemeanor will serve as an additional option for prosecutors even in cases already covered under current law.

I am pleased that the bill provides additional civil remedies to those taxpayers whose privacy has been invaded by unauthorized inspection or disclosure of their tax information. Current law requires an actual disclosure to a third person of taxpayer information before a civil remedy is available. This bill will provide a civil remedy to taxpayers whose tax information has been unlawfully inspected, regardless of whether there has been a subsequent disclosure. Further, H.R. 1226 will require notification to taxpayers whose tax information has been either improperly inspected or disclosed whenever a person is indicted or otherwise charged with a violation of criminal provisions applicable to browsing or unlawful disclosure.

It is entirely appropriate for taxpayers whose tax information has been improperly inspected to have the same remedies as taxpayers whose information has actually been unlawfully disclosed. Further, notification to the taxpayer is appropriate when the Government has sufficient evidence to support a criminal charge. Acknowledging that we believe someone has violated the confidentiality rules, and advising taxpayers

that we are vigorously pursuing such individuals with criminal penalties, will ultimately enhance taxpayers' confidence that the Government is vigilant about protecting their privacy.

These actions should deter persons who have access to tax returns and return information from unauthorized browsing, and the number of such instances should decline significantly in the future.

For these reasons, I am pleased to have signed H.R. 1226 into law.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
August 5, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 1226, approved August 5, was assigned Public Law No. 105–35.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Terrorists Who Threaten To Disrupt the Middle East Peace Process

August 5, 1997

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

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments concerning the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergencies Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On January 23, 1995, I signed Executive Order 12947, "Prohibiting Transactions with Terrorists Who Threaten to Disrupt the Middle East Peace Process" (the "order") (60 *Fed. Reg.* 5079, January 25, 1995). The order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of 12 terrorist organizations that threaten the Middle East peace process as identified in the Annex to the order. The order also blocks the property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons designated by the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, who are found (1) to have committed, or pose a significant risk of committing, acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process, or (2) to assist in, sponsor, or provide financial, material, or technological support for, or services in support of, such acts of violence. In addition, the order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, any other person designated pursuant to the order (collectively "Specially Designated Terrorists" or "SDTs").

The order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDTs, including the making or receiving of any contribution of funds, goods, or services to or for the benefit of such persons. This prohibition includes donations that are intended to relieve human suffering.

Designations of persons blocked pursuant to the order are effective upon the date of determination by the Secretary of State or her delegate, or the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the *Federal Register*, or upon prior actual notice.

Because terrorist activities continue to threaten the Middle East peace process and vital interests of the United States in the Middle East, on January 21, 1997, I continued for another year the national emergency declared on January 23, 1995, and the measures took effect on January 24, 1995, to deal with that emergency. This action was taken in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)).

On January 25, 1995, the Department of the Treasury issued a notice listing persons blocked pursuant to Executive Order 12947 who have been designated by the President as terrorist

organizations threatening the Middle East peace process or who have been found to be owned or controlled by, or to be acting for or on behalf of, these terrorist organizations (60 *Fed. Reg.* 5084, January 25, 1995). The notice identified 31 entities that act for or on behalf of the 12 Middle East terrorist organizations listed in the Annex to Executive Order 12947, as well as 18 individuals who are leaders or representatives of these groups. In addition the notice provides 9 name variations or pseudonyms used by the 18 individuals identified. The list identifies blocked persons who have been found to have committed, or to pose a risk of committing, acts of violence that have the purpose of disrupting the Middle East peace process or to have assisted in, sponsored, or provided financial, material or technological support for, or service in support of, such acts of violence, or are owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of other blocked persons. The Department of the Treasury issued three additional notices adding the names of three individuals, as well as their pseudonyms, to the List of SDTs (60 *Fed. Reg.* 41152, August 11, 1995; 60 *Fed. Reg.* 44932, August 29, 1995; and 60 *Fed. Reg.* 58435, November 27, 1995). The OFAC, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, is continuing to expand the List of (SDTs), including both organizations and individuals as additional information is developed.

On February 2, 1996, OFAC issued the Terrorism Sanctions Regulations (the "TSRs") (61 *Fed. Reg.* 3805, February 2, 1996). The TSRs implement the President's declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against certain persons whose acts of violence have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process.

The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from January 23 through July 22, 1997, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to organizations that disrupt the Middle East peace process are estimated at approximately $3.2 million. These data do not reflect certain costs of operations by the intelligence and law enforcement communities.

Executive Order 12947 provides this Administration with a new tool for combating fundraising in this country on behalf of organizations that use terror to undermine the Middle East peace process. The order makes it harder for such groups to finance these criminal activities by cutting off their access to sources of support in the United States and to U.S. financial facilities. It is also intended to reach charitable contributions to designated organizations and individuals to preclude diversion of such donations to terrorist activities.

In addition, comprehensive counter-terrorism legislation was enacted on April 24, 1996, that would strengthen our ability to prevent terrorist acts, identify those who carry them out, and bring them to justice. The combination of Executive Order 12947 and the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 demonstrates the United States determination to confront and combat those who would seek to destroy the Middle East peace process and our commitment to the global fight against terrorism.

I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against extremists seeking to destroy the hopes of peaceful coexistence between Arabs and Israelis as long as these measures are appropriate and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on August 6.

The President's News Conference
August 6, 1997

The President. You notice he didn't fall going up the steps. [*Laughter*]

Thank you very much. Good afternoon. Before I begin, let me first say that I join with all Americans in expressing our deepest condolences for the victims of the terrible plane crash yesterday in Guam. I have spoken with Governor Gutierrez, and I want to commend him, the hundreds of volunteers, and the United States military personnel who are working so hard on the response and the rescue effort. The National Transportation Safety Board will lead the investigation of the crash, with technical assistance from the FAA and other agencies as needed.

Now today I want to briefly review what our Nation has accomplished during the first 7 months of this year and to spell out the opportunities and the obligations that we have to continue that progress.

As I have said over and over again, our common mission must be to prepare our people for the 21st century, to master the challenges and seize the opportunities of this remarkable time. I believe the American people are coming to see that and coming to believe that as we pass through this period of remarkable change, the future holds far greater rewards than risks if our people, our Government, and our other institutions are ready for tomorrow.

In these past months, we have seen how the politics of the vital center can work to make progress on many of our most difficult problems. We ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention, a landmark treaty that will protect our soldiers and our citizens from the threat of poison gas. We reached agreement in Madrid to open the doors of NATO to Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, while creating a stronger partnership with Russia and Ukraine to build a Europe that is undivided, democratic, and at peace.

These past months have been a remarkably fruitful time for bipartisan action in the national interests, and I think we have to continue that work. I should mention, too, that we worked in a bipartisan fashion to maintain our normal trade relationships with China, reaching out to a quarter of the world's population while making our differences with the government over human rights and other matters clear. These are major accomplishments, all achieved with support of Americans, both Democrats and Republicans. They have strengthened our Nation.

Yesterday we took a historic action to eliminate the annual budget deficits we have been seeing and piling up since 1969. The first step toward that was taken back in 1993, when we abandoned supply-side, trickle-down economics, opened a new chapter in fiscal responsibility with a new strategy of growth based on reducing the deficit, investing in education and training, opening the world to trade and American products and services.

Even before yesterday, the deficit had been reduced by over 75 percent as a result of this strategy. But yesterday, when I signed into law the first balanced budget act in a generation, we know that it will add to the long-term economic growth potential of the United States. We know, too, that it includes the largest increase in college aid since the GI bill 50 years ago, the largest increase in children's health since Medicaid was enacted first, over 30 years ago.

Today I have some more good news. Our efforts have led to an even lower deficit than we had previously projected. In this, the 4th year of the 5-year economic plan adopted in 1993, we now expect the deficit to drop to $37 billion. Yet without the bipartisan balanced budget we just passed, my budget officials estimate the deficit would rise next year to 50 to $100 billion and stay at that level for years to come. With our bipartisan balanced budget plan, we now expect it not only to reach balance by 2002 but to have a surplus in excess of $20 billion and to be able to maintain that for several years thereafter.

There are still big challenges and tough decisions that we have to make beyond the balanced budget, however, if we're going to keep our economy growing and keep our people fully prepared for the new century. To meet them, Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle and Americans from all walks of life must summon the same will and spirit that led to the balanced budget. We have a lot of work to do in the rest of this year.

First, if we expect to keep our economy strong and growing, we must continue to invest in the education and training of our people, and we must succeed in our push for high national standards and tests to make sure our students, our schools, and our teachers are doing the job.

Second, we must tackle the tough issue of entitlement reform. We have to make tough choices to strengthen and protect Medicare and Social Security over the long run. They are the two most important social service innovations of the 20th century. This is not simply a matter of fiscal responsibility, it is also a matter of honoring the duties we owe both to our parents and to the next generation.

The balanced budget bill I signed yesterday sets up a bipartisan commission to reform Medicare. This fall, along with the Members of the Congress, I will appoint the members of the commission, and they will get to work. We'll also tackle other issues to strengthen our families, exploring ways to improve child care in America and continuing our efforts to reduce the use of tobacco among our children.

Third, we will grow our economy and create good jobs by continuing to open more foreign markets to our goods and services through tough fair trade agreements. We must continue to reach out to the more than 95 percent of the world's consumers who live beyond our borders. That is why I will ask Congress to give me fast-track authority to negotiate new trade agreements that will extend free and fair trade to keep our economy going.

Fourth, it is obvious that we cannot fulfill our obligations to future generations unless we also deal responsibly with the environmental challenge of global climate change. Growing our economy need not—indeed, it must not—contradict our commitment to protecting the environment. When the nations of the world meet in Kyoto in December, we must all take concrete steps to address this problem. The United States must commit to realistic and binding limits on our emissions of greenhouse gases. The science demands that we act, and again, we owe it to our children.

Finally, let me say, as I did in the State of the Union Address, that one of our most critical pieces of unfinished business remains campaign finance reform. When Congress returns from its vacation, Senators McCain and Feingold have made clear that they will bring campaign finance reform legislation to the floor of the Senate. This will be the time of testing. The special interests and their allies have killed reform year after year, but this year the eyes of America will be on the Senate floor. I will give my strong support to McCain-Feingold, and if the American people will give their strong support, I am determined that we can prevail.

It should not be as easy this year as it has been in each of the 4 previous years to kill campaign finance reform with a Senate filibuster by a minority of the Senate. This year it is very important that every American know where every single elected Federal official in Washington stands on this issue: Are you "yes," or are you "no." It should be clear and unambiguous, and I believe if it is, we have a chance to succeed in passing the bill.

All these challenges will require bipartisan cooperation. Many of them will require difficult decisions. But this balanced budget and the prosperity we are now enjoying gives us a rare opportunity to take these steps for the long-term well-being of our country.

We can meet the challenges of the 21st century. We can have higher educational standards, entitlement reform, campaign finance reform, expanding trade, and a cleaner environment. This budget agreement shows that we can do all these things when we work together to find common ground. We have to carry the spirit into the fall for the hard work ahead.

Now, I'll be happy to take your questions, starting with Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, the United States has avoided nurturing peace for a long time in the Middle East tinderbox. I'm sure that it's a way to go, you feel, but yet, editorially the Washington Post says your choices are—and if you'll permit me to read it—it says, "Up to now, President Clinton has avoided confronting the implications of Mr. Netanyahu's reluctance to bargain territory for a Palestinian settlement. Now he must decide whether to minimize short-run frictions with the Israeli Government or reach for a long-term peace." What do you say to that?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say that the Secretary of State gave a very important speech to the Press Club at noon today. I read the speech last night. I went over it with great

care, and I am in full accord with what she said.

Secondly, in this year alone, the United States helped to broker the Hebron agreement. We have hosted all the leaders from the Middle East here. Dennis Ross has been to the Middle East twice. We have worked very hard on this. Indeed, there is no foreign policy problem to which I have given more of my personal time since I became President in 1993.

But we have to do what we believe will be most effective. The question is not whether the United States or this administration on any given day or week is popular or not in any foreign capital. The question is, are we doing what is most likely to work? And sometimes reasonable people can disagree about that.

Now, I have asked Dennis Ross to go back to the region to primarily discuss security. As Secretary Albright made clear, until the parties trust each other and until the Israelis believe that the Palestinian Authority is making 100 percent effort, which is different from 100 percent results, but making 100 percent effort on security, it is impossible for peace to proceed. If we can resolve that, then the Secretary of State will soon go to the Middle East with the ideas that we have developed for going forward.

Let me make this one final point on this—you may want to ask some followup questions, but I want to make what I hope is a clear distinction.

On the substance of the peace process, the parties still have to make the final decision. But on the process itself—how to get the process going again with some integrity designed to restore confidence in both parties—I think the United States can and should offer its best ideas, and that is exactly what we intend to do, and that's what the Secretary of State's speech was designed to set the stage for today.

Q. Well, the point of friction has been the settlements. And do you think you've been even-handed in that respect?

The President. Well, I think we've made it clear to the Israelis that we don't think anything should be done which undermines the trust of the parties and violates either the spirit or the letter of the Oslo accord and which predetermines the outcome of final settlement issues under Oslo. I think we've made that clear. And I think that the Secretary of State's speech today was quite clear on that.

But let me say there is no parallel between bombs and bulldozers. You cannot draw a parallel. We cannot have an environment in which people believe the way to get what they want is to kill innocent people in a marketplace. Furthermore, I believe the people who are responsible for those terrorist bombs are the enemies of the Palestinian Authority as well, and I think they ought to see that. It is imperative that Mr. Arafat understand that those people are not his friends either. Those people do not want the peace. Their closest allies, in terms of political objectives, may be their most extreme enemies in Israel, who do not believe that peace is possible. The people that murdered all those people, those innocent civilians, are not trying to get a peace that they think is more favorable to the Palestinian or the Arab cause; they are trying to murder the peace process. And as soon as we all understand that and go back to work on it, then I think we have a chance to make progress.

But I also believe that the Government of Israel clearly has a responsibility to try to—to carry its end of the load, too. This has got to be a two-way street: security first; then let's see both sides do what it takes to restore the confidence.

Sonia [Sonia Ross, Associated Press].

Line Item Veto

Q. Mr. President, the tax cut and budget bills that you signed yesterday were criticized by your own Treasury Secretary as heavily laden with special interest provisions. You have the power to use the line item veto to take out some of those special interest tax breaks. Are you planning to exercise that power?

The President. Well, the short answer is that I expect there will be some exercise of that. But let me tell you what we're doing.

First of all, I have asked my staff and relevant Cabinet members to review both the budget bill and the tax bill. I know that all of you know this, but just for the people that you're writing or speaking for, there are three areas in which the President can exercise the line item veto, three sets of legislation. In the tax bill, there are certain limited, and they're quite limited, special tax provisions that are subject to the line item veto. In the budget bill, there are certain special spending programs under the so-called entitlement umbrella that are subject to the line item veto. I must act on either one

of them within 5 days from yesterday, excluding Sunday. That's what the law says. In addition to that, as the annual appropriations are passed they, too—the spending items within the annual appropriations—are subject to the line item veto.

So what I've asked my staff and Cabinet to do is to meet with me, first of all, make sure I am aware of the items that are subject to the veto in the tax bill and in the budget bill that I signed. And then the second thing we have to do is to make absolutely sure that none of these things that we don't think are very good were part of the agreement. That is, this was an agreement entered into in good faith, and I cannot use the line item veto on anything that our negotiators agreed to let go through. I think that's very important. And I want to bend over backwards to make sure there's no misunderstanding on that. Then after that, we'll have a category of items, and I will just go down and evaluate them and decide whether I think that they are sufficiently objectionable that they should be vetoed.

Larry [Larry McQuillan, Reuters].

Balanced Budget Act of 1997

Q. Mr. President, on this deficit reduction that you've just mentioned that has now fallen to $37 billion, doesn't it raise the question that, in fact, the budget could be balanced a lot sooner if you and Congress hadn't enacted $95 billion in tax cuts?

The President. Well, let me say this: If we hadn't done anything, if we had had no tax cuts and no other changes, our estimates are—keep in mind, these tax cuts are over a 5-year period—our estimates are that we would have a deficit which would rise over the next 5 years and stay at about the level of $100 billion. So you can also say that if we hadn't spent $24 billion on children's health care, we could balance the budget. If we abolished spending on education, we could do it. The question is, can we do this in a way that also helps the American people and gives them some of the benefit of the prosperity that has been generated in the last 5 years?

And let me say again, there is a lot of discussion about this tax cut. I want to make two things clear: This tax cut is a small fraction of the size of the tax cut that was adopted in '81 that started us down the road to permanent structural deficits, a small fraction. Number two, 80 percent of this tax cut goes to three things which will benefit the vast majority of Americans: education, the child tax credit, and the initiatives to help isolated and distressed urban and rural communities. That's where 80 percent of this cut goes.

Many people believe that the capital gains cut will also spur economic growth; some people don't. As you know, that was a big priority for the Republicans. I believe that, overall, the tax package is a good and balanced one. I think the fact that we have a plan for a balanced budget and that we are providing these kind of tax cuts that will help people to raise and educate their children will actually contribute to economic growth because they are disciplined, they are limited, and they are part of a comprehensive strategy that ends in balancing the budget now in a surplus. That's what I believe.

Bill [Bill Plante, CBS News].

Q. Mr. President, what makes you believe that future Congresses will continue along the path to keep the—to balance the budget in 2002 or to keep it balanced? And also, sir, in 1994 you referred to extreme Republicans who want tax cuts and spending increases and balanced budgets—"all this ridiculous stuff" quote, unquote—that seems to be what you've got yesterday. I mean, you came here intending to stimulate the economy with Government spending and to get universal health care. Why did you change your mind?

The President. That's not accurate. I also said that we would cut the deficit in half in 4 years. We did better than I said; we cut it by 75 percent in 4 years. But if you—that's a very selective reading of my 1992 campaign. I also said that I would have to eliminate programs, cut the size of Government by at least 100,000, and do more things that we had—that I believed we could reduce the deficit and increase targeted investment.

And let me remind you that in this budget—let me just go through this quickly. When you adjust for inflation, all of these departments with discretionary budgets are going to have to cut spending 10 percent during this budget. There are more entitlement savings in the Medicare program in this budget than ever in any budget since Medicare has been enacted, about $400 billion. There are new, modest fees for home health care in the Medicare premium. So there will be—this is not all increased spending. Some

things will be increased; many things will be decreased. And if we do it, we'll produce growth.

Let me just make one other point. I'm convinced that if we did not pass this plan and did not say to the world and to the investor community, we're going to balance the budget, it would slow economic growth.

Let me answer your final question, why do I think subsequent Congresses will stay with this? Because I think that they have seen what happens if you do this. If you have fiscal responsibility and you're running a balanced budget when you have good economic times, then you get rewarded in the markets, and your economy does well. If you spend a lot of money you shouldn't be spending and you run big deficits in good economic times, the international financial markets will punish the United States. They will drive up interest rates. They will drive down the value of our stock market. They will weaken our economy, and they will make the deficits even worse. So I believe that the markets are sending us a clear signal.

Alison [Alison Mitchell, New York Times] and then David [David Bloom, NBC].

Campaign Financing

Q. Mr. President, you said that the American people should know where every political figure in Washington stands on campaign finance. Yet at the same time that you've called for an end to soft money, you continue to raise it for your party.

The President. I certainly do, and I'm proud of it.

Q. Well, let me ask you——

The President. I do. I plead guilty to that. I don't believe in unilateral disarmament. And I don't think—suppose I said to you, "Advertising is bad, your newspaper should stop advertising while everybody else does it, and trust me to tell everybody what a good newspaper you have. Just stop it. Just say no." You live in a competitive world. We live in a competitive world. And notwithstanding what the image may be, constantly—and you see again in the press today—the Republicans raise more money, raise more big money, and raise more money from noncitizens than the Democrats do. But we have to raise enough to be competitive.

I am doing my best to try to build things like our Women's Leadership Forum, which is the most exciting thing that the Democratic Party has going now in the way of fundraising, people who give modest contributions involving women, smaller businesses, new business people coming in. But I think it would be a grave mistake for us to abandon any attempt to compete. That would only ensure that the Republicans would never pass campaign finance reform.

And I might say—I'm trying to stay in a good humor about this, because if I were sitting at home and I were a Republican Senator with a lot of influence in this, I'd say, "Hot dog, this is the question I have been praying for. We will never be held accountable for this. We can kill it one more time. We've killed it 4 years. Let's go for 5."

And I hope that won't be it. I mean, I think we ought to—I will live under any set of rules that are there. But the lesson that we have learned is there's too much money in this system, but it's because of the cost of communication. It's the cost of communication that's driving this up. And so we have got to get free air time or reduced air time, and we've got to get campaign finance reform. And I hope we can.

Let me just say, look at what we have done just since the first of this year. We want the FCC to deal with the issue of free air time. I have appointed an advisory committee to explore that. I've asked former Vice President Mondale and former Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker to head a national group to get citizens involved in campaign finance reform. I have asked the FEC to reconsider the rules that it made which made soft money possible in the first place. And I'm supporting Kennedy-Kassebaum. I don't know what else I can do.

But I will not, at the same time, bankrupt the Democratic Party and say that I want you to have no money, even though if we do our very best we're still going to be outraised and outspent two to one. I don't think that is a responsible thing to do. I think that would be wrong. This money was given to us by—the people that contributed money to us, by and large, were people that could have made a lot more money contributing to the Republicans, they thought, because they were the party for the capital gains tax, the estate tax relief, and all of that. They did it because they believed in what we were doing. And they gave us a chance to fight for things like this children's health program, this education program, and all

the things we did. I just think we can't afford to just lay down our capacity to compete when what we really have to do is all agree to live under a new set of rules, which I will happily agree to live under.

David.

Medicare and Social Security

Q. Mr. President, you spoke of entitlement reform, but the Medicare commission will not return its recommendations until the spring of 1999, and I'm wondering two things: first of all, in that context, one year before the Presidential elections begin, do you really believe that there will be the political will to do something drastic, vis-a-vis Medicare reform; and number two, on Social Security—you've had a chance to think about this for several years now—can you tell us what your recommendations will be in terms of keeping Social Security from going bankrupt?

The President. Well, first let me deal with the Medicare issue. It was the decision of the Congress to have the commission report back in 1999. And I would have gladly accepted a 1998 reporting date because I believe that we cannot make changes in Social Security or Medicare that are significant unless there is bipartisan support. And I believe if there is strong bipartisan support, you can do it in an election year as well as in a nonelection year. But I think the fact that March of '99 is 18 months before a Presidential election, more or less—I haven't counted the months, maybe a little more—is not dispositive. I think that, first of all, this commission may decide to make interim recommendations, and we may take a series of steps. Secondly, if they make a package recommendation at the end and it has the support of all these appointees—and I can assure you I'm going to work hard to appoint distinguished, good people to this commission that will inspire confidence in our citizens—then I think the Congress will be prepared to act on it.

And I feel the same way about Social Security. I have not yet decided exactly what the timing ought to be on that because we need to work it out with the congressional leadership in both parties in terms of how they're dealing with Medicare.

But let me make the point again: These systems would work for a longer period of time than they otherwise will but for the fact of the baby boom and the fact that all seniors are living longer. Now, that's—as I've said before, that's a high-class problem. People are living longer and living better, and that's what we should want for our society. That's a good thing. But when the baby boomers retire, because of the length of life of senior citizens, there will come a time when there will be almost only two people working, just a few more than two people working, a fraction over two, for every one person on these programs.

And you asked me, do I think that we will take the steps necessary to reform them. I do. And I feel that for a simple reason. Number one—and I'm the oldest of the baby boomers—I don't believe that our generation wants to ask our children to make drastic sacrifices to support us because we wouldn't take modest steps now that don't have to affect the people that are now retired at all. We can deal with this over a longer period of time in ways that don't affect people who are now retired at all or at least in a very minimal fashion. And I think it's an inter-generational obligation, and I expect it to be fulfilled. I'll be surprised if it's not.

Yes, Mike [Mike Frisby, Wall Street Journal].

Future of the Stock Market

Q. Mr. President, the stock market has been soaring in recent months. Are you worried or concerned about whether ordinary Americans understand the risk involved in their investments at this time?

The President. Anything I say is wrong, right? [*Laughter*] If I say yes, the market drops tomorrow. If I say no, someday it will drop, and I'll be a heel. [*Laughter*] Well, let me say this: It is an astonishing fact. I mean, what was the market when I took office? The market was 3,200. So it's gone up at an unprecedented rate to unprecedented heights. But that increase has been accompanied by a very brisk growth in our economy and strong growth in productivity.

And keep in mind, most ordinary citizens who are invested in the stock market are invested through their retirement funds and mutual funds and things of that kind, and the people who are managing those funds are managing huge amounts of money and presumably do have very good judgment about things like that. You know, all markets go up and down at various times, but I think that if you go back over the last 30 years, investments in the stock market held over the long term have panned out pretty well. And there aren't too many people of modest

incomes who put a huge amount of money in the stock market on one day and then have to take it out 4 months from now no matter what. And I think that these mutual funds, these retirement funds, they can mix their investments, and they can do it over a longer period of time. So I think on the whole, what they're doing is betting on the larger American economy, and I think that's a very good bet.

Yes, Elizabeth [Elizabeth Shogren, Los Angeles Times].

Microsoft Corporation

Q. Mr. President, in light of the new alliance between Apple and Microsoft that was announced today, I wondered if you could tell us if you're troubled at all by the phenomenal growth of the Microsoft Corporation and if you or your administration is considering putting any limits on that growth if you—and if not, how this is different from oil and steel and the railroads in the early parts of the century?

The President. Well, first of all, this—I can't comment on this particular announcement today because it just happened today, and its economic effects under our laws have to be analyzed. But there—as you know, Microsoft has been involved in the last—since I've been President in various legal issues relating to its organization and operations. And I think all I can tell you is we will treat them in the same way we would anyone else and make the analysis of law that seems appropriate, and the Justice Department—I have to wait to hear from them about whether there are any antitrust implications to this.

Yes, John [John Donvan, ABC News].

Paula Jones Civil Suit

Q. Mr. President, in a civil suit filed against you, attorneys for the plaintiff have issued a subpoena for an individual who may or may not have worked in the White House. Your staff, when asked to clarify the status of that individual in the past, refuses to answer the question, refers it to an outside attorney. Even for those of us who don't have much appetite for this entire subject, this particular answer in this particular category seems needlessly evasive. My question to you is, is it your wish that it be answered this way and is it consistent with your intention to run an open White House? That's the principle I'm asking about here.

The President. Well, first of all, I think the answer is probably known, but I think that Mr. Bennett and the person in question's lawyers gave the only relevant answers. And there was a request to be left alone and not harassed, and we're just trying to honor it. I don't really have anything to say to add to what Mr. Bennett already said about it.

Yes, Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN].

Line Item Veto

Q. Mr. President, I want to ask a question about the UPS strike, but before I do, I want to just clarify what you meant by the line item veto, that you expect to exercise it. Do you mean between now and Monday you expect to exercise it, or exercise it in the fall when there are appropriations bills?

The President. I mean I expect to exercise it, and I know—I'm anticipating that there will be some things between now and Monday that I would want to exercise it on. But I want to emphasize this: I have not had a briefing on this, and I literally—all I know about this is what I have read in the press, about the list of tax items which are subject to the line item veto. And there has been more scant coverage of the questions in the entitlement part of the budget. But I honestly don't know enough to tell you today, here's something I'm going to veto.

We're going to have a session sometime between now and Saturday—excuse me, sometime between tomorrow and Saturday, about this whole issue of what's in this budget. And until I know for sure that I'm going to veto something, I don't want to say. I'm just—I'm assuming that there will be something in there that was not agreed to by all of us in the budget agreement that seems to me to be a good candidate for it. But I do not know of any specific thing now. As soon as I do, I will tell you. But I believe in the line item veto. I believe it should be used. And of course, as all of you know, it will be tested. As soon as I exercise it one time, somebody is going to file suit against it, and then we'll see what happens.

United Parcel Service Strike

Q. If I could just ask on the UPS strike, there are a lot of small businesses out there that are suffering right now as a result of this, and they see you standing by, encouraging both sides to go back to the bargaining table but

not really doing anything about it. And some of your critics are saying that's because the labor unions supported you and the Democrats so overwhelmingly over these past few years. Is that a fair criticism of why you're standing aside and not getting directly involved in this strike?

The President. No. No. Let me urge you all to do one thing, because I think it would be very helpful to the American people generally to know this. If you compare what I did in the American Airlines strike, which is the only strike I've been involved in recently where I had some authority there— the airlines companies, because they take passengers, are governed by a Federal law which gives the President the power to intervene if there is substantial economic danger or damage to the country. The UPS strike with the Teamsters is not covered by that law. It is covered by the Taft-Hartley act. If you look at the Taft-Hartley act, there has to be a severe damage to the country. The test is very different and very high before the President can intervene.

Now, Mr. Lindsey, as he always does in strikes of large national stakes and high interest, has been involved as sort of our mediator, our talking person dealing with all the parties. And we did bring the Federal Mediation Service into this, and we have—we've done everything we could, both privately as well as publicly, to urge the parties to get back to the table and settle this. I'm very concerned about all the customers and users of UPS and what's happening to them, but I do not believe that it is a fair reading of the Taft-Hartley law, which is the law I have to act under, that the high standard of that law has been met. It's a totally different law from the law that affected the American Airlines case. And I think it's really important that the people understand that.

Go ahead.

District of Columbia Rescue Plan

Q. Mr. President, also put into law yesterday, of course, with the tax and budget provisions was the District of Columbia rescue plan. And there's an extraordinary amount of roiling around and criticism in the city, and I think perhaps around the country, about what's taken to be a trampling of home rule for this Nation's Capital City. As democracy advances in the rest of the world, some folks are worried that it may be receding here, and the fact that Mayor Barry's powers have been reduced to a certain extent, as an unelected control board comes in to make these management reforms and deal with the aid. And there are some that think that this may be an attack on Mr. Barry personally, that this is in the legislation. Are you concerned about this to the extent that you're going to try to do anything to follow up on it, talk to Mrs. Norton? I wonder what your reaction would be.

The President. Well, first of all, we've already been in touch with Congresswoman Norton about this in some detail. Let me back up and say that I think on balance the legislation was very good for the District of Columbia because it will have the effect of injecting about $200 million in cash into the city this year, as the State—the Federal Government pays a higher share of the Medicaid budget of DC, begins to take over the prisons, begins to assume the pension liabilities.

What I was hoping to do was to remove from the District of Columbia the burdens that normally are borne by a State but that this city has had to bear; and then to give the local officials more responsibility for the things that a city must do: run a good school system, keep the streets safe, repair the roads and the highways and the streets, and do the other things that the city has to do. And the Congress, simultaneously, wanted to strengthen the whole reform system that was represented by the control board. And it was a congressional initiative and, if you will, a condition of getting the financial relief that the provisions that you mentioned were adopted, which, among other things, require a joint agreement of new department heads between the Mayor and the head of the control board.

Here's what I've asked Frank Raines to do. Frank Raines, as all of you know, is representing me in our DC negotiations. I've asked him to try to get together with the parties and see if we can find a way to make these appointments consistent with home rule and that, if he finds the situation to be untenable, to come back to me with some suggestions about what we should do then.

Let me just say one other thing. There are some very interesting tax provisions in this bill which are similar to the tax credits that we gave generally around the country for people to hire people off welfare, for people who go into the inner cities and the high poverty areas, and then there is, for the first time ever, a

zero capital gains on people that start trade or businesses in high poverty areas of DC. So we are trying to rebuild the economic infrastructure of the city as well. Director Raines is going to try and work through it for me and come back with a set of recommendations.

President's Advisory Board on Race

Q. Mr. President, there seems to be several issues blowing in the wind that come back to you—the issue of the race initiative. You wanted a dialog on race, and you have a dialog on race right now, the black-white issue, in particular, the issue of an apology for slavery and reparations. Are you hoping that the issue were to go away by giving it to the Race Advisory Board? Because there is word that you would like it to go away.

The President. I don't know that I hope the issue will go away. What I hope the issue—what I hope will happen is that the issue will not dominate all the other things that need to be discussed about the past, the present, and the future. And I gave it to the Advisory Board because I—after all, the Chairman is one of America's most eminent historians and as knowledgeable about this subject as anyone in the country. If I had no Advisory Board, I probably would have called him on the telephone and asked for his opinion when this subject came up. So that's the only reason I asked them to look at it.

But let me say, I think they're doing a good job. We've got our Executive Director in Judy Winston now. We're staffing up. We're going to be moving out around the country. There will be dialog, there will be research and studies done, and there will be policies flowing. And you know, I've already announced the first major policy under this initiative, which is the $250 million program to give people—to defray the costs of college education for people who teach in underserved areas.

Peter [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio].

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, going back to the first question on the Middle East, when this administration calls on the Palestinian Authority to take sustained action to prevent terrorism, what specific steps are you looking for? And secondly, do you personally believe that Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Authority have fulfilled the obligation to prevent terrorism?

The President. Let me answer them in order. Number one, we expect them to resume meaningful, real, consistent security cooperation with the Israeli authorities in the way that they do when they work best. Number two, we expect them to act on the information that they have. You can't hold them to the information that they don't. But they have proven in the past quite effective at rounding up people and arresting them for good cause. And number three, we expect that if there are people there who are really serious threats to the peace and to innocent civilians, that they should be kept behind bars if it is legal to do so. So that's basically it.

Now, in answer to your second question, I would have to say that I could not say that there has been constant, 100 percent effort. That does not mean that we know—by the way, that does not mean that we know for sure, we in the United States know, that these bombs would not have exploded and killed these people if 100 percent effort had been made. I can't say that; I'm not close enough to the situation. But I know that it's been discouraging for the Palestinian Authority. I know they get frustrated. I know that sometimes Mr. Arafat feels like he's caught in the middle between his own population and their discontents and frustration and his frustrations in dealing with the Israeli Government. But none of that can be an excuse for not maintaining security.

If you go back and read Oslo, they promised 100 percent effort on security, number one. Number two, never mind Oslo; you can't have a civilized society if you permit terrorism. And number three, in the end the terrorists are the enemy of moderate, constitutional government among the Palestinians. Those people who murdered those people in the market did not want a better peace deal. They want continued impasse. They want to destroy Israel. And that is not going to happen. There must be a peace process.

Nomination of Governor William Weld

Q. You have repeatedly expressed your admiration and support for Governor Weld, but how far are you willing to go to see him confirmed? Are you willing to make Senator Helms mad? What plans do you have specifically to help him?

The President. I thought maybe I'd go down to Mexico and jump off those cliffs at Acapulco. Have you ever seen them? [*Laughter*] Maybe

that would—well, let me say, first of all, let me have a very serious comment on this. Let's get a few things on the record here. I have had a good and surprisingly constructive relationship overall with Senator Helms, and it has flowed from our being completely straightforward with one another and acting in a candid and open manner. And he certainly has been candid and open about this. But so have I.

Now, I believe that Governor Weld would be a good Ambassador to Mexico and is rather uniquely situated to be a good Ambassador to Mexico because of his background, his experience, his knowledge, because he does know a lot about the drug trafficking. And he's been criticized for that, but let me remind you that President Reagan named Governor Weld head of the Criminal Division of the Justice Department. And just in the last couple of days President Reagan's head of the Drug Enforcement Administration strongly endorsed Governor Weld for Ambassador to Mexico. When I nominated him, one of the reasons I nominated him, ironically, is that I felt that this would build strong, broad, bipartisan support for our relationships with Mexico, which I think are critical.

Now, having said that, I think at least the man ought to get a hearing and ought to get his day in court, if you will, his day before the committee. And I was encouraged to hear Senator Lugar say that. We've got a team organized in the White House to try to help promote his nomination, and we'll do the very best we can, and we'll see what happens. But I believe he ought to be the Ambassador, and I'm going to try to see him confirmed.

Yes, Sarah [Sarah McClendon, McClendon News Service].

Elder Care

Q. Sir, we have a scandal in the country, a quiet scandal and not talked about very much because it concerns a lot of older people who don't even talk to their relatives when they visit them. I'm talking about nursing homes. Apparently, the Federal regulations are not being enforced enough, and in many of the nursing homes owned by corporates, there are very few, small staff, very large number of patients, and the staff are paid very little. Therefore, they take it out on the patients. And some of these patients, many of them are hungry, and they're abused, and they're mistreated. And nationally we ought to do something about it. I'm sure you can.

The President. Well, let me say, there are two issues here, really, in terms of what happens to older people who are not living at home, and to some extent, in home. There is the nursing home situation; there is the—people who are living in institutions that aren't quite nursing homes. And then there are people who are getting home care, and the question of whether the home care they're getting actually is what they contracted for and whether they're being properly paid.

The Department of Health and Human Services is looking at the question of whether we can streamline and make more effective the regulation of nursing homes, and also how we're going to go about getting money—stopping spending money in other forms of support for seniors where the money basically is being ripped off through fraud and abuse. And I hope that over the next few weeks we will have something to say about that that will reassure people and their families who are in nursing homes.

Mara [Mara Liasson, National Public Radio].

Line Item Veto

Q. Mr. President, another line item veto question. You said that some of these candidates for a veto were negotiated in good faith, they're part of the agreement. Could you explain to the American people why a tax cut that benefits 100 or fewer taxpayers is ever in the national interest? It sounds like the very definition of a special interest goody.

The President. Well, it's certainly the definition of a special interest group, but not all special interests are always in conflict with the general interest. If that were true, our country would not have survived for over 200 years.

But I want to look at them and see, because you say that anything that benefits 100 or fewer taxpayers must, by definition, be a special interest, but it could be a sector of the economy where there are fewer than 100 businesses now, where there is a national interest in keeping a certain activity going—alternative—something that's good for the environment, for example. I don't know. I don't want to comment because I have not seen these. But I would think that there are cases—for example, there may be a case where an injustice was done to a taxpayer or a small class of taxpayers, and we're trying to fix that. There may be a—that's the one case

I can think of. The other case is where there would be fewer than 100 firms in a given economic area where we'd want to do something.

Yes, Ann [Ann Compton, ABC News].

Press Secretary Mike McCurry. Tea time. [*Laughter*]

The President. Are you serving? [*Laughter*]

Press Secretary McCurry. That's another way of saying "last question."

1996 Campaign Financing

Q. I'll make it quick. A minute ago in talking about campaign finance reform you said, "I will live under any set of rules that are there." But violations of the rules that are in place—or apparent violations—are exactly why there are Thompson hearings in the Senate, why your own Justice Department has an investigation going. Why don't you appeal to two people who are trying to help you, Charlie Trie and John Huang, to come and tell their story? They've begun to talk to ABC and other media. You make an appeal to them to come and tell what they did and why they did it and help move past the investigations that are there now.

The President. Well, first of all, I have encouraged and I will do it again now—I've said I think everybody ought to work out a way to cooperate with this committee and get all the information out. Secondly, the State Department specifically has tried to work with the congressional committees with regard to anybody who might be out of this country. So I don't know what else we can do on that. I certainly have been fully cooperative and will continue to do so.

But what have we learned in these hearings? We've learned that there were problems. Now, we've learned that both parties had problems. We've learned that a lot of money was raised and a lot of money was spent. And I hope we've also learned that a lot of what was legal—and that was the import of Alison's question earlier—I hope we've also learned that a lot of what is legal would be better off if it didn't happen. We'd be better off if we had ceilings on contributions to the political parties. We'd be better off if somebody couldn't give a million dollars to a political party at one pop.

And that all leads you back to the same place: We either will or we won't pass a credible campaign finance reform bill this year. Some people will be for it, and some people will be against it. If the public is permitted to think for a moment that they're all the same and they're all doing it and nobody really wants it, then that is an absolute, lock-down guarantee that no bill will pass. There must be a clear distinction between those who are for and those who are against. And until there is in the public mind, people won't think they're going to be held accountable for that vote and those who benefit from the present system will do what they can to keep it.

Independent Counsel Statute

Q. Mr. President, the American Bar Association is considering recommendations to limit the independent counsel statute in their annual meeting in San Francisco this week, a series of recommendations including limiting what offices can be investigated and the elimination of the need for a final report. First of all, where do you stand on these recommendations? And second of all, in 1999, if this statute were reauthorized, would you veto it?

The President. Well, I think—let me say, first of all, the American Bar Association has taken a great interest in this and ought to be viewed as a little bit, at least, of a neutral observer here. And they have pointed out some abuses of the law that are general and some abuses of the law that are specific to certain specific independent counsels. And I think that in this case I ought to be like the rest of the country; I ought to wait for their recommendations and study them. I can't comment on their recommendations until I know what they are and what the grounding is. But I'll be eager to hear them.

Thank you.

What did you say? You want me to take one more? Go ahead.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. On tobacco——

Press Secretary McCurry. Quit while you're ahead.

The President. I'm not sure I am ahead. I never know where I'm ahead.

Go ahead.

Tobacco

Q. On tobacco, there were news accounts this week that you plan to take some additional smoking steps pertaining to Federal property. In the coming months and coming year, do you plan to be active on some of the international issues as U.S. companies emphasize sales

abroad—things like the World Health Organization's idea for some standards on labeling, or there have been bills introduced in Congress that would prohibit U.S. employees from promoting the export of tobacco products?

The President. Well, I think that there may be some multilateral actions that we would want to be a part of. And to be honest with you, I haven't had a great deal of time to think about it. I know that sales have been declining in the United States and in Latin America and going up in Asia and in Eastern Europe and that it's natural to expect that companies will try to accelerate the growing markets and, if they're dangerous to children here, they're dangerous to children there.

What I'm focused on now is completing my evaluation of this proposed settlement, protecting the jurisdiction of the FDA and the victories we've already won, and continuing to advance the health interests of the American people. But it is inevitable; it is as inevitable as the Sun coming out today that international institutions will be called upon and nations will be called upon to responsibly deal with this.

Yes, I'll take one question over here from the front.

India

Q. Next week, India will celebrate 50 years of independence, and you have been invited by New Delhi and also by the Indian community in Washington to attend the functions. Are you going to one of the functions? Also, how do you view the last 50 years of U.S. and India relations, the world's largest two democracies, under your administration?

The President. Well, first, I hope to do something here in Washington to recognize the beginning of what will be a yearlong celebration of Indian independence. And also, as you know, at some time there will be some overlap in when Pakistan will be celebrating its 50th year of independence, and I think the United States should also be—its presence should be heavily felt in South Asia because of the long relationship we've had with India, to be specific to India, because it's been a democracy all the time, but also because of the enormous potential of South Asia for good if things go well and for ill if things don't.

You know, it's not a very hot issue here in the United States, but it's a source of continuing concern to me that the people of Pakistan and the people of India have not been able to work through their differences, because if they could do so, I am convinced that they could quickly begin to enjoy economic growth rates at the level of the highest East Asian communities and be our best partner for the future. So I'm hoping that not only can we observe India's anniversary but that we can be an even better friend in the next 50 years and a more constructive supporter of resolving these difficulties in the near term.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 150th news conference began at 2:02 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Carl T.C. Gutierrez of Guam; Ambassador Dennis Ross, Special Middle East Coordinator; Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel; Yasser Arafat, Chairman, Palestinian Authority; the President's attorney, Robert S. Bennett; Deputy Counsel to the President Bruce Lindsey; and Mayor Marion S. Barry, Jr., of the District of Columbia. A reporter referred to Kathleen E. Willey, former White House volunteer who was subpoenaed in the Paula Jones civil suit.

Remarks to the Democratic Business Council

August 7, 1997

Thank you very much. Governor Romer, Tom, thank you. Thank you, Alan Solomont. I want to thank all the members of the administration who came to be with us tonight, and I thank all of you for your presence here and for your support.

I was—a little insight on Presidential decision-making; here are the notes my staff gave me. Here are the notes I made at dinner. [*Laughter*] You can have either speech. Which one do you like? [*Laughter*] Two, two!

I'd like to talk to you a little bit about how I think you fit into all this and what we've been trying to do and where we're going. When I ran for President, first, beginning in 1991, I was obsessed with the idea that we had to prepare this country for a new century and a completely different economy and a whole different way of living and relating to each other and the rest of the world and that we didn't have any strategy to do it. And I believed that if we were going to succeed we had to create a country where, as you've heard me say a thousand times, there was opportunity for everyone responsible enough to work for it, where we were coming together instead of being driven apart, and where we maintained our world leadership for peace and prosperity and freedom.

I thought to do that it would be necessary to save progressive Government and to save the progressive political party, to be vital forces as part of that future. I thought it was necessary to break through a lot of these dichotomies that seem to me to be false: that you were either for growing the economy or preserving the environment—if you have to choose, we're in trouble; that you couldn't be pro-business and pro-labor—if you have to choose, I think in the end the country loses; that you couldn't be tough on crime where it was appropriate and still be smart and compassionate where it made sense and where it was the right thing to do; that you couldn't be for respecting our diversity and still believe the most important thing is that we wind up being one America. I just think a lot of these dichotomies that have always been set up for us to argue about and take sides over are choices that we would never make in our own lives and that we should not make in the life of our Nation.

And you heard Tom talking about a little of it and Roy talking about a little of it. It seemed to me that the right thing to do for our country also in the end would wind up being the right thing to do for the progressive cause in America and for the Democratic Party, the progressive party in America. We almost had to save ourselves from a legacy in some ways that was not entirely of the Democrats' own making. It was obvious to me that if we didn't do something about the deficit there would be no more progressives in America because the middle class would always be completely insecure.

We had a meeting today at the White House, and my distinguished Treasury Secretary from New York City, Mr. Rubin, was making a comment about how people viewed a certain economic situation. And Erskine Bowles said—did I say North Carolina? I meant New York. Erskine Bowles is from North Carolina. So Erskine Bowles says, "Mr. President, tell Bob that that's like the farmer in Louisiana with three hogs." And Bob Rubin doesn't know many farmers from Louisiana. [*Laughter*] So I told him—some of you may have heard me tell this story before, but when Huey Long was Governor of Louisiana in the middle of the Depression, he was out on a country crossroads one day making a speech to all of these farmers. And he was railing against people that had too much and how it ought to be spread around. And he saw a farmer in overalls, and he said, "Now, Farmer Jones, if you had a million dollars, wouldn't you give up about a third of it and go out here on these crossroads and spread that money around so all the little kids could have plenty to eat and people would have a roof over their heads at night?" He said, "Of course I would." And he said, "If you had a brand-new Cadillac car, wouldn't you ride up and down these roads and take the old folks to the hospital and the young people to school that couldn't afford to get there themselves?" He said, "You bet I would." He said, "And farmer, if you had three hogs—" And he said, "Now, wait a minute, Governor. I've got three hogs." [*Laughter*]

It seemed to me that we had to restore some economic discipline to this country so that people would know that their three hogs would be all right, so that people would know that at least they would not be robbed of the benefits of their own labor by the defects of the system in which they lived.

And so I proposed what, at the time, was a controversial and very difficult budget in 1993, that only members of our party voted for, that was predicted to drive us into a recession. And instead in 4½ years it cut the deficit by 80 percent—before this last budget even passed. And I'm proud of that. But no one doubts the ability of Democrats to manage the economy now.

I fought for expanded trade, and we had 200 trade agreements, and a lot of it was controversial, even within our own party. But it is clear from all the economic analysis that 25 percent of the growth that we have enjoyed in the United States in the last 4½ years has come from expanded trade, selling more American

products and services around the world. It is also clear that we have, on matters of principle, always kept a more open market so we don't continue to open other people's markets who are just going to take advantage of us.

It was clear to me that if people felt insecure on their streets, in their homes and their schools, that we would never feel fully free and prosperous even if the economy returned. So we tried to join what was already a developing movement toward community policing and other proven strategies to fight crime.

And I determined that ours would be the first administration that would ever take on the issue of the irresponsible use of handguns in this country. And I come from a State where more than half the people have a hunting or a fishing license or both, and I figured if I can't take this one and talk to people and talk sense to people, who can? And so we did the Brady bill, we did the assault weapons ban. I still want trigger locks on these guns that children can get their hands on. I think that these are responsible things.

But we've had a drop in serious crime in every single year, and last year we had the biggest drop in violent crime in 35 years. And the American people are safer, and they know it. And no one seriously doubts the ability of our party to be a responsible partner in keeping our streets safer and giving our children a more secure future. And I think that's important.

I had to fight a very difficult battle on welfare. I did not want the welfare reform bill to be an excuse to hurt children, and I vetoed two bills that I thought were. But it seemed to me that since there was already no uniform national benefit, that the States were already in effective control over what the size of a welfare check was, but they didn't have any real responsibility because the authority was divided between the States and the Federal Government. And it seemed to me the responsible thing to do was to set up a uniform set of standards about how we thought the welfare program ought to work, to put guidelines and limits on people who could go to work if there were jobs available and required them to do so or to be in education and training programs but to take better care of the children with adequate child care and other supports and nutrition and medical care.

And that's what the welfare reform bill was all about. There were a lot of things in it I didn't like—cutting benefits to legal immigrants—but as you see, we've largely restored all the things that we didn't like. And we now have a bill that is contributing to by far the largest drop in the welfare rolls this country has ever seen. And we now have the smallest percentage of Americans receiving public assistance since 1970—smallest percentage since 1970. Now, I thought that was important.

I thought it was important that we prove that we can conduct the defense and the foreign policy operations of this country. I no longer think that's open to serious doubt. This country is stronger, more secure, and is helping to build the world of the 21st century in the aftermath of the cold war. And I feel good about that.

I also wanted to do things to increase people's sense of obligation to serve. That's what the AmeriCorps program was about. That's what the Presidents' service summit was all about.

And finally, let me say, in the Democratic Party what I tried to do is to bring in people who had previously not been active before. And the most important things we've done in our party are the Women's Leadership Forum, the Saxophone Club, and your group—your group, because we want people in this party to feel that they have a home, they have a role, and they have a contribution to make, and that their voices will be heard.

Now, we've had a very good first 7 months of this year. The budget is a good budget, and it is a progressive one. The tax cuts are confined. Some of us have received some criticism from people who believe that I should not have signed the tax bill because it had a capital gains tax cut, an increase in the estate tax. But let me just remind you that Republicans are still in the majority in the Congress. I hope it won't be so after '98, but they are now. But 80 percent of that tax bill went to the children's tax credit, to education, and to a whole array of urban and poor rural redevelopment initiatives designed to bring the areas that are still isolated from our prosperity into the mainstream—80 percent.

Secondly, there are strict caps on how much money can be spent in the first 5 years and in the second 5 years of this tax program. And even with the little we added on to the size of the tax package, it's still about one-eighth—one-eighth—the size of the tax bill adopted in 1981, which led to these permanent deficits. We did not go off in some sort of tax-cutting

binge designed to erode the future stability of this country. And we now estimate with conservative estimates that this budget will produce a surplus by 2002 at the latest and a surplus for several years thereafter.

So we are doing the right things, and we've had a good fall. We've also invited the first new members to join NATO. We've established alliance with Russia and Ukraine. We have worked very hard to get the country, for the very first time, to embrace national education standards. And I hope all of you will help us get every State in the country to do that.

We had the Summit of Service that I mentioned, and I launched a very important initiative on race relations which will last for at least a year, as we examine for the first time in a noncrisis way not only what the unfinished business is in America between the white majority and African-Americans or Hispanic-Americans but an equally, perhaps even more important question over the long run, which is what are we going to be like as a nation in 30 years when, unless something happens, there will be no majority race in America, and we will become the world's first truly great multiracial, multiethnic democracy. And unlike—there are many ethnic groups, for example, in a nation like Russia, but most of them live in discreet parts of the country. In our country, we're going to have 150—actually, more than 150 different racial and ethnic groups largely sharing the future together.

So it's been an exciting time. In the fall, we have a lot of other agendas coming up. And let me just mention some of the things that I hope to get done in the remainder of this year. I think it's important that we continue our work to expand trade. This year we have already concluded an agreement on information technology and telecommunications services that will amount to a $5 billion tax reduction on American products in these areas sold around the world, that will open up 90 percent of the world markets to American products in an area where we lead the world and we are creating very good jobs. We need more of this.

I know there's going to be a great controversy over this trade debate, but let me put it to you this way: We have 4 percent of the world's population. We have 20 percent of the world's wealth. The rest of the world's economy, even though it's on a lower base, is growing at 3 times the rate of the American economy—even under the astute management of our administration—[*laughter*]—because if you start from a lower base, you grow faster.

Now, if you want your children to live in a country that may have even less than 4 percent of the world's population and still around 20 percent of the world's wealth because of how hard we work and our skills and our ability, there are only two things we can do. The first is to go into our cities and our isolated rural areas and make markets and taxpayers and successful employers and employees and business people out of the people that haven't been reached in our own country, number one. And the second is to sell to the other 96 percent of the people in the world. This is not rocket science. We don't have an option. And the things that we sell by and large are higher value-added products that create good jobs in America.

Are there issues of trade fairness? Of course there are. We have relatively more open markets than other countries. We have done it for years as a matter of responsibility to try to help poor countries lift themselves up; also keeps us on our toes more and makes us more competitive, and that's one reason we're in the shape we're in today.

Should we fight for a fair deal for our workers? Of course we should. Should we fight to improve the global environment as we increase trade? Of course we should. But we can't walk away from this.

I'm going to Latin America in the fall. About a year after I took office, we had this great Summit of the Americas. And all the countries in the Americas said, "We want to have a free trade area that America and that Canada are a part of. We want our future to be with you." There will soon be a billion people in Latin America, second fastest growing area of the world. When I go down there, I want them to believe America is still leading the way toward greater prosperity. The rest of the world economy is on a fast track. The only question is whether we're going to be leading it or dragging up the rear. And I hope we can prevail upon the Congress to work through this in a way that is as satisfactory as possible to the people who have legitimate concerns about the disruptions that the global economy can cause.

The second thing we're going to try to do is pass the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill. Now, the good news from my point

of view—it's not such good news for you; we can still have the Democratic Business Council with its price of entry under McCain-Feingold. [*Laughter*] But it will eliminate most of the serious questions people have about the campaign finance system at present, and it will put more pressure on both the Democrats and the Republicans to go out and get more people to contribute, to make more people feel like they're a part of the system, and that will be a very good thing. It will require us to involve more and more and more people.

But let me finally say—this is very important—if it's going to work, we have to lower the cost of campaigns. And the only way you can lower the cost of modern campaigns is to provide free air time or drastically reduced air time, which is why I have also worked so hard on that.

We're going to try to pass the juvenile justice bill, modeled on what has happened in a number of cities, but especially in Boston where—this may surprise you if you don't live in Boston—it has been almost 2 full years since a single child has lost his or her life to a handgun—almost 2 full years. And again, it's not rocket science. They have good community policing. They have good neighborhood block watch groups. The neighbors and the police work together. The police and the probation officers work together. They make house calls in Boston, just like doctors used to. The kids in trouble, they go to the child's home and they sit on the couch in the living room and they talk to the parents. And unbelievably enough, they have a 70 percent compliance rate with probation orders. There's no city in the country that's even close to that. Why? Old-fashioned, human contact in an organized, disciplined way, doing what is smart as well as being tough. We want to do that everywhere.

We want to begin the work of dealing with entitlement reform. And people say, "Well, there's not an emergency now. Social Security is all right until 2029. You just put another decade on the Medicare Trust Fund." That's true. But when the baby boomers retire, there will be just about two people working for one person in his or her retirement years. A lot of us will work longer, by choice. But the ratio will be awesome.

By making modest changes now, we can avoid imposing severe changes that will have to be made by our children. And for those of us that are part of that baby boom generation, which is basically everybody between the ages of 34 and 50, it seems to me that we owe it to our children and to the strength and long-term health of our economy and our society to deal with the long-term entitlement issues now, when by making modest changes we can avoid more severe changes later.

We're going to have to deal with the issue of climate change in a responsible way. No one seriously questions anymore that the climate is warming and that it is going to have some adverse consequences. The question is, how do you do that and grow the economy. Is there a way to do it? Of course there is. If we would change our habits tomorrow, just some of our habits, we could with no extra charge, no cost at all on society, get rid of 20 percent of the greenhouse gases with presently available technology—tomorrow. So what we have to do is to try to find a way to organize ourselves, increase our awareness, and do this in a way that doesn't cripple the economy. I think we can do that.

Finally, the First Lady and I are going to have a conference on child care in late October. It is still the number one concern of many, many, many working people who believe that they cannot afford or find or have access to quality, affordable child care.

Now, those are the things we're going to be doing. In addition to that, Eli Segal, who's here tonight, heads my national organization where we are mobilizing employers who will agree to hire people from welfare to work. Next week we're going to St. Louis to announce several hundred businesses that have joined us in that endeavor.

We've still got a long way to go. We only have about 22 percent of the schoolchildren in the country committed, whose leaders have committed to take the national test, fourth-grade reading test, the eighth-grade math test, by 1999. We're going to keep working on that.

But the point I want to make is, every single one of these things is something that I hope you are proud of, that is part of a dynamic mainstream political movement in America, that your contributions and your support have made possible. And this is a better country because of it. It's a better country because we're not out there trying to split everybody all up and divide people every day and keep people full

of hot air instead of trying to get people together and keep working forward and moving forward. And that's what I'm trying to build for the future and what I want you to be a part of.

Let me just say this in closing. Every day I try to imagine what I hope the country will be like 30 years from now. And if that guides a President and you work back from there, you'll be amazed how much easier that makes the decisionmaking process. And when I think of the young people that are here tonight, all these fine young people that are working for the Democratic Party and did all the work to make this possible tonight—what will determine what kind of America they live in?

Number one, will we succeed in being a truly multiracial, multiethnic democracy, where we not only respect but celebrate our diversity and still say the most important thing is we're one America? Number two, will we stop making excuses for ourselves and finally embrace the idea that all children can learn, and we're going to see that they learn at internationally accepted levels of excellence? Number three, will we reach into the areas that have not been touched by our prosperity and figure out a way to hook them into the future? Number four, will we figure out a way to grow the economy while enhancing the environment? And finally, will we continue to do what it takes to lead the world when it comes to peace and freedom and prosperity?

If we do those things, the best days of this country are still ahead. And when we are all much older we can look back on this moment and say, because we were here then and because we did what we did, we did prepare our country for the 21st century. We saved progressive Government for its higher purposes, and we revitalized America's progressive party to make it go on.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:35 p.m. in the Colonial Room at the Mayflower Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado, general chair, and Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee; C. Thomas Hendrickson, chair, Democratic Business Council; and Eli J. Segal, president and chief executive officer, Welfare to Work Partnership.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner
August 7, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Governor. Thank you, Alan. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for being here. Mostly what I want to do is have a conversation tonight, but I would like to just briefly comment on the events of the last couple of days, in the context of what's happened for the last 4½ years.

When I came to Washington after our campaign in '92, I had a very clear idea of what I was trying to do. It seemed to me that the country had to make a number of changes if we were going to go into the next century with the American dream alive for everyone, leading the world in all the ways that are so important, and giving our children the future they deserve. And I felt, among other things, that our party, which has historically been the progressive party, had to advocate changes that would move beyond the old divisions between growing the economy, preserving the environment, helping business, helping labor, being tough on crime, being compassionate and smart—all those what I have always thought were kind of false choices. And that we ought to have a simple strategy that asks, will this create opportunity for people who are responsible enough to work for it? Will this bring us together, rather than drive us apart? Will this preserve our leadership for peace and freedom and prosperity? That's what we've tried to do.

Before I signed the new budget law, we had reduced the deficit by 80 percent, we had a historic drop in welfare rolls, we have the smallest percentage of people on welfare we've had since 1970 now. We had dramatic drops in crime—last year, the biggest drop in crime in 35 years and a number of other very positive things happening.

Now, this budget I believe will be very good for the economy because it will continue the downward trend of the deficit. It will bring us into balance. It will produce a surplus. And it will also sustain itself over the years ahead. There are tax cuts in the budget. We've been criticized in many quarters for them, but I would like to make a couple of points.

Number one, the capital gains and the estate tax relief, which the Republicans wanted, have gotten a lot of publicity. But it's important to note that 80 percent of the tax relief went to the children's tax credit for middle income people, to the education tax credits to open the doors of college education to all who are willing to work for it, and to the initiatives primarily directed at urban America, to the areas which have not participated in our recovery—80 percent.

Number two, perhaps even more importantly in the larger economic sense, in the aggregate, these tax cuts are about one-eighth the size of the tax cuts in 1981 that led to the permanent structural deficits. And it's very important that the American people understand that. We did not just—this Congress did not just sort of take the lid off the Treasury in a kind of a political orgy. This was a very disciplined, limited thing.

Of course, the budget also has the biggest increase in investment for education in over 30 years, the biggest increase in investment for children's health since Medicaid was established in 1965. It is an historic, positive, progressive budget that will be pro-economic growth and good for the people of this country. So I feel good about that.

I feel good about a lot of the things that have happened in foreign policy, our expansion of NATO, our working with Russia in that regard. I feel good about the Presidents' Summit of Service we had in Philadelphia. I'm very committed to this initiative on examining and improving race relations, which I think is absolutely critical to our future. All these things have been started this year.

Perhaps most important over the long run, I'm committed to seeing this effort to establish national educational standards of excellence in our schools for the first time in history. We cannot back up on that, and I hope you will help me get all the people in your respective States on that bandwagon.

We're coming into the fall. There are a lot of other exciting issues that we'll have to deal with, and I'll just mention them very quickly and then sit down and we'll have a conversation. But in the remaining months of this year, I am hoping that we can secure fast-track authority from Congress so I can continue to expand trade for America. Our economic analyses are that one full fourth, 25 percent of the economic growth this country has had in the last 4½ years, which is now 13 million new jobs, a fourth came directly from the efforts to open markets to American products and services. So I think that's important.

I think it's important that we pass the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill. It's finally coming to a vote in the Senate. For some of you, it will save you a lot of money if it passes. It will be a good thing. But it would be a good thing for both parties because we'll have to go out and find more contributors and more people to participate and distribute the responsibility, and that will be a very good thing.

But, finally, let me say this whole campaign finance reform effort will never succeed unless we reduce the cost of campaigns, which will only happen if we get free air time or drastically reduced air time for the candidates. That is an absolutely critical thing. Unless we change the cost environment, no matter how you work with, manipulate, or change the contribution rules, there will still be the costs out there and they will flow somehow, because people will have to communicate with the voters and will have to be able to reach the voters with a message.

The third thing I want to mention is coming up, that I hope all of you will take an interest in, is the climate change debate. In December in Japan, the advanced nations of the world—and we hope all the others—will be called upon to make commitments to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions of our economy so that we can reduce the rate at which the planet is warming up. This is a big deal. If we have just a few degrees of warming of the planet over the next hundred years, it could lead to rises in the sea levels which could, for example, flood the entire Florida Everglades. It could change the whole economic structure of American agriculture. So we have to find a way to grow the economy and improve the environment.

We are going to begin dealing this fall and over the next year and a few months with the whole question of entitlement reform, which, simply put, is what is the best way to preserve

the integrity of Social Security and Medicare in the 21st century when the baby boomers retire. That's really the issue. Social Security right now is secure through 2029. We just added 10 more years to the Medicare Trust Fund. The issue is, how can we preserve the integrity of these programs and the benefits they bring in a century when people are going to be living longer and when the baby boomers will retire and there will be just barely more than two people working for every person retired. We've never dealt with an issue like this without a crisis before, but the bottom line is, if we make modest changes now, we can avoid imposing drastic changes that our children will have to make later. I think the responsible thing to do is to deal with the modest changes now. So I hope we will do that.

And finally, in October the First Lady and I are going to have a big conference on child care. I am still—I think "obsessed" is not too strong a word—with the challenges so many Americans face succeeding in raising their children and succeeding at work. And there is still not a systematic network of child care out there. We have gotten a lot of help from the Congress in establishing child care networks for people who will be moving from welfare to work, and that's good. But there are a lot of people who have never been on welfare who work for modest wages, whose children simply do not have access to quality, affordable child care. And I think that's one of the next big frontiers in our efforts to bring America together.

So I hope you will help us with that, and I hope you will follow it. And I hope you will be proud of the fact that you have supported us and you have made possible the best economy we've had in a generation and progress on all these social issues and progress abroad as well as at home. That's what the political process is supposed to do. And if we can keep going and do this flatout for 3 more years, I think we can watch our country move into a new century and a new millennium, confident that the best days of America are still ahead. And that is our obligation as citizens and as human beings.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:09 p.m. in the East Room at the Mayflower Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado, general chair, and Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee.

Remarks on Diabetes Initiatives

August 8, 1997

Thank you very much. I would like to thank Dr. Wiesel and all the people here at the Georgetown Medical Center for hosting us. I want to thank Mary Delaney and Chief Joyce Dugan and Sandra Puczynski for their speeches and for their example. As you might imagine, over the course of my tenure I have had occasion to come to quite a number of ceremonies like this. I don't believe I have ever heard three people back to back speak so powerfully, so clearly, so eloquently about a matter of great national concern. And I think we should give them all another hand. [*Applause*]

I'd like to thank all of the people who are here today, diabetes patients, families, activists, and advocates. Especially I'd like to acknowledge the people on the platform: Stephen Satalino, the chair of the American Diabetes Association. Joan Beaubaire, the former head of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, is also here. Her son works for me at the White House, so I get a little extra prodding on this from time to time. [*Laughter*]

I'd like to say a special word of thanks to Mary Tyler Moore, who has awakened the conscience of our Nation and indeed the entire world about this issue, for her long and tireless and selfless efforts. Thank you, Mary.

I want to thank Dr. Phillip Gorden, the head of diabetes research at NIH. He's here with us today. And the NIH will play a major role in the work that we are discussing here.

None of us could write the history of the century that is about to end without a big chapter on the miracles modern medicine and science have wrought in our lives. Polio, mumps,

diphtheria, the diseases that robbed so many families of beloved infants and toddlers for centuries have been virtually eradicated. Premature babies who just a decade ago would not have had a chance at life beyond the intensive care unit are growing into happy and healthy children. Powerful treatments are prolonging the lives and improving the quality of lives of people with HIV and AIDS all across our country, raising new hopes for people living with the disease.

But there are still frontiers to conquer and still too many among us whose lives and futures are dimmed by disease and illness, as we have heard so powerfully today. Diabetes is the seventh leading cause of death in our country and perhaps equally profoundly affects the lives of millions and millions of people who have it every day.

The historic balanced budget legislation I signed on Tuesday is about more than balancing the books; it also honors our values, increases our chances of keeping the American dream alive in the 21st century, and improves the lives of every American. There are some little-known but very important provisions in this new balanced budget that will take us a tremendous step forward in our fight against diabetes. These investments total more than $2 billion over the next 5 years. They will strengthen our efforts to find a cure, to help our most vulnerable citizens better manage the disease, to prevent some of its most traumatic, costly, and life-threatening complications.

These investments represented the committed efforts of many Members of Congress and our administration. But I must recognize especially two: first, Congresswoman Elizabeth Furse, whose daughter is here and who has diabetes, led the bipartisan congressional diabetes caucus in an absolutely tireless fight to include the Medicare investments that are in this bill. And I thank her. She has done magnificently. Thank you.

And I must tell you, I wish very much that the Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, could be with us today. When we have a disagreement, it is normally well publicized—[*laughter*]—and widely understood. [*Laughter*] But I wish the American people could see the numerous private conversations that we have had together in quiet rooms about diabetes.

He watched his mother-in-law live with diabetes and became a great champion for people struggling with it, a tireless advocate for greater investments in research, prevention, and care, and one of the very first people who ever spoke to me not only about the human dimensions of the disease but the enormous percentage of our public funds in Medicare and, to a lesser extent, in Medicaid, that could be devoted to other purposes were it not for the crushing burden of diabetes-related problems directly resultant from our failure to invest as we begin to invest today. I know he played a leading role in making these new initiatives a part of the budget, and I appreciate both what he and Elizabeth and others have done.

Now, this new legislation will do three things. It expands Medicare benefits for the more than 3 million senior citizens diagnosed with diabetes. Mary talked about that. We all know that early investments in prevention can save us millions in expensive treatments down the line. If left untreated, diabetes can lead to devastating complications such as blindness, amputations, and kidney disease. This new benefit will make testing strips and other methods of monitoring blood glucose levels, as well as instructions on how best to manage the complicated disease, available to all Medicare beneficiaries with diabetes. It will empower Medicare patients to take better care of themselves at home and to avoid complications that can lead to costly hospital stays and destroy health.

Second, the new legislation will enable Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala to boost funding for Type I or juvenile diabetes research by $150 million over the next 5 years. Nearly one million Americans have Type I diabetes, and as many as half of them are children. Even when the disease is managed carefully, the patients almost always experience further complications. That's why we cannot rest until we find a cure that will free our children from this disease. And this unprecedented grant will help us to do that.

Third, we will provide a 5-year, $150 million grant to the Indian Health Service for diabetes prevention, research, and treatment in our Native American communities. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Senator Domenici of New Mexico for his special efforts on this project.

As Chief Dugan has made it clear, Native Americans are 3 times as likely as white Americans to have this disease; far less likely to find adequate treatment for it. Too many Native

Americans are suffering from the grimmest complications of diabetes. This grant will bring public health services, schools, and nutrition programs together to reach children and families living on reservations and to provide them with the information and tools to prevent and manage diabetes.

And I might say, I told Chief Dugan before I came up here that my grandmother's grandmother was a Cherokee who would be very proud that there is a woman chief who is doing such a magnificent job. [*Applause*] Thank you.

Next month our scientists at NIH will be hosting a workshop to bring researchers from all across the country to share ideas and discuss the most promising avenues of diabetes research. And we will establish a new and unprecedented public-private partnership to bring our Nation's leading health care providers, purchasers, and consumers together to develop uniform guidelines for diabetes care. Through the guidelines, we can ensure that all doctors provide their patients with thorough and vigilant care, such as regular eye and foot exams, to stay as healthy as possible.

Taken together, these initiatives can make life-changing differences for millions of Americans. I was very heartened to hear the American Diabetes Association say that these new investments in diabetes are as important for people with diabetes as the discovery of insulin in 1921. Let us pray that it will be so.

Let me finally say that discussing this in rather clinical terms cannot possibly convey the human impact that Sandra did in talking about her child. On the way over here today, I was remembering that 23 years ago plus, now, when I began my career in political life, the first chairman of my campaign was only a year older than me and was already a bank president at the age of 28 or 29, but he died a few years ago from complications from diabetes. When I lived in Arkansas, I used to sing in a church choir with a man who had to quit singing because of complications from diabetes, and I have these vivid memories every Sunday of standing there looking at him sitting in the church with the pain on his face of not being able to do it anymore.

This morning I got a note from a friend of mine I'd like to read to you. "For the last 17 years my son has gone to sleep scared, scared that his blood sugar would drop and his body would be ripped apart with a diabetic seizure. Every day for the last 17 years, my son and his family have worried about the opposite effects of having his blood sugar remain at too high a level and thereby causing the early onset of blindness, heart failure, and loss of limb. Until today, there simply wasn't enough money available for scientific research to have a real hope to find a cure. Now there is."

It is easy to say that in the last 50 years we experienced in science the age of physics, the age of space travel, and the beginning of genetic research but that in the next 50 years, the 21st century in science will be an age of biology. The important thing is that for people and their families with diabetes, it can be an age of longer, happier, richer lives.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:27 a.m. in the auditorium at Georgetown University Medical Center. In his remarks, he referred to Sam W. Wiesel, executive vice president for health sciences, Georgetown University Medical Center; Mary Delaney, a local resident who suffers from diabetes; Chief Joyce Dugan of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians; Sandra Puczynski of Ohio, whose daughter suffers from diabetes; David Beaubaire, White House Special Assistant to the Cabinet Secretary and Director of Surrogate Scheduling; and actress Mary Tyler Moore, international chairman, Juvenile Diabetes Foundation International.

The President's Radio Address
August 9, 1997

The President. Good morning. Vice President Gore has joined me today to talk to you about what we're doing to reduce smoking, especially by young people, and to protect Americans from the potential threat of secondhand tobacco smoke.

Cigarette smoking is the most single significant public health problem facing our people today. Every year, more Americans die from smoking-related diseases than from AIDS, car accidents, murders, suicides, and fires combined, taking a terrible human toll and putting great financial burdens on our health care system and on businesses all across America.

Last year we took bold action to shield our children from tobacco, telling the tobacco companies: Market and sell your products to adults if you wish, but you must draw the line at children. And we launched a comprehensive plan that prohibits retailers from selling tobacco to minors and requires clerks to check I.D.'s before selling cigarettes to the young people. These regulations are critical to our goal of keeping tobacco out of our children's lives, but they must be enforced. I requested $34 million for enforcement in my 1998 budget, but Congress has cut that funding. I urge the Congress to do the right thing and restore the full $34 million when they return in September. We need to do more to cut off our children's access to tobacco, and this is no time to cut corners.

This week I signed historic legislation that balances the budget in a way that protects our values, invests in our people, and prepares us for the 21st century. Our balanced budget includes a 15-cents-a-pack cigarette tax to help States provide health care for up to 5 million uninsured children and helps to prevent many young people from taking up smoking in the first place.

But we must do more to protect all Americans from the dangers of smoking. One of the most important things we can do is to protect those who don't use tobacco from the threat of secondhand smoke. And I'd like to ask the Vice President to say just a few words about what that threat means to our families and children.

[*At this point, Vice President Gore made brief remarks.*]

The President. Thank you. Today I am signing an Executive order that takes the next step and bans smoking in all Federal facilities under the control of our administration. A year from today, every Federal agency and office building, every visitors center at every national park, every facility owned or leased by the executive branch must be smoke-free.

Now, this order does allow agencies to designate smoking areas for their employees who smoke, as long as these areas are ventilated to the outside and nonsmoking employees do not have to enter them. Our Federal workers and the thousands of people who visit Federal facilities will now be protected from the risk of secondhand smoke.

This fall, I hope we'll begin an important national debate on additional measures we can enact to reduce smoking, especially by children. I applaud the State attorneys general and public health advocates for providing us an extraordinary opportunity to engage in this debate and to build on the progress we've already made. I'm particularly pleased their plan includes a proposal, based on a bill by Representative Henry Waxman, to protect all Americans from secondhand smoke. And I look forward to working together in the months ahead to meet this challenge.

Americans who have made the choice not to use tobacco products should not be put at risk by those who choose to smoke. With this step we're taking today, millions of Americans will be able to breathe just a little easier.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks on Signing Line Item Vetoes of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 and an Exchange With Reporters

August 11, 1997

The President. Last week we took historic action to put America's economic house in order when I signed into law the first balanced budget in a generation, one that honors our values, invests in our people, prepares our Nation for the 21st century.

It includes the largest increase in college aid since the GI bill, the largest increase in children's health since the creation of Medicaid over 30 years ago, tax cuts that are the equivalent of a $1,000 raise in take-home pay for the average family with two children, and much more that is good for America.

The new balanced budget law also offers the first opportunity to use a powerful new tool to protect taxpayers, the line item veto, a tool designed to fight against waste and unjustifiable expenditures, to ensure Government works for the public interests, not the private interests.

In the past, good legislation could be cluttered up with unjustifiable or wasteful spending or tax provisions, leaving the President no choice but to sign or veto the overall legislation. With the line item veto, the President can sign an overall bill into law, but cancel a particular spending project or a particular tax break that benefits only a handful of individuals or companies.

Forty-three Governors throughout our Nation already have the line item veto power. Last year I signed the Federal line item veto into law. Last month the United States Supreme Court, on procedural grounds, rejected a challenge to this authority. Today, for the first time in the history of our country, the President will use the line item veto to protect taxpayers and to ensure that national interests prevail over narrow interests.

In reaching agreement with Congress on how to balance the budget, we worked very hard to be fair to all Americans and to avoid wasting our citizens' tax dollars. For the same reason, I've asked the members of my administration to work carefully over the final legislation to identify any specific spending or tax provisions that I should consider canceling. Here's what I told the budget team.

First, any provision I cancel must be one that was not included—and let me emphasize—not included—as a part of the balanced budget agreement process with Congress. Our agreement was entered into in good faith, and I will keep it. Second, any provision I cancel must be one that benefits just a few individuals, corporations, or States at the expense of the general interest. Finally, any provision I cancel must be one that is inconsistent with good public policy. Just because something benefits a small number of people doesn't necessarily mean that it hurts the public interest or the American people at large.

After careful scrutiny and numerous meetings with my staff and Cabinet members, we have found three provisions that meet those criteria. In a few moments I will use the power of the line item veto to cancel a provision that would allow financial service companies to shelter income in foreign tax havens to avoid all U.S. taxation.

I will also cancel a provision that singles out New York by allowing it to tap into the Federal Treasury to reduce its State expenditures through the use of health provider tax to match Federal Medicaid dollars that are impermissible in every other State in the country and actually in existence now in several other States. No other State in the Nation would be given this provision, and it is unfair to the rest of our Nation's taxpayers to ask them to subsidize it.

Finally, I will cancel a provision that, though well-intended, is poorly designed. This provision would have allowed a very limited number of agribusinesses to avoid paying capital gains taxes, possibly forever, on the sales of certain assets to farmers' cooperatives. And it could have benefited not only traditional farm co-ops but giant organizations which do not need and should not trigger the law's benefits. Because I strongly support family farmers, farm cooperatives, and the acquisition of production facilities by co-ops, this was a very difficult decision for me. And I intend to work with Congressmen Stenholm and Hulshof and Senators Daschle, Dorgan, and Conrad and other interested Members of the Congress to redesign this effort so that it is better targeted and not susceptible to abuse.

The actions I take today will save the American people hundreds of millions of dollars over the next 10 years and send a signal that the Washington rules have changed for good and for the good of the American people. From now on, Presidents will be able to say no to wasteful spending or tax loopholes, even as they say yes to vital legislation. Special interests will not be able to play the old game of slipping a provision into a massive bill in the hope that no one will notice. For the first time, the President is exercising the power to prevent that from happening. The first balanced budget in a generation is now also the first budget in American history to be strengthened by the line item veto. And that will strengthen our country.

And now I want to go and sign these provisions.

[*The President signed the cancellation letters.*]

Q. Mr. President, is that the only pork you can find in that budget?

The President. I think that my staff is going to brief you about it, but let me say that they have—the relevant Cabinet and staff members have gone over this quite extensively. Keep in mind, the primary use of the line item veto overwhelmingly was meant to be in the appropriations process, which is not even started yet. I don't have the first appropriations bill.

There are only a few spending items in this balanced budget that are part of the so-called entitlements process, so that—for example, you had the New York Medicaid provision there on provider taxes. With regard to the taxes, there were some 79 items certified to me, but that was only because of their size, that is, the number of people affected by it. Of those 79, 30 or more were actually recommendations by the Treasury Department to fix flaws in the present laws or to ease the transitions in the tax laws. And another dozen or more were put in by Congress by agreement with the Treasury Department to fix procedural problems in the law. Then there were a number of others that I agreed were good policy. So these are the ones that I think—and then there were several others that I might have line-item-vetoed, but they were plainly part of the understandings reached with Congress as a part of the budget process. So these seemed to me to be the ones, after being briefed by my staff, that both involved significant amounts of money and met the three criteria that I mentioned. And I believe it was the appropriate thing to do.

Q. May I ask another way, sir, the last question another way? Were these the most glaring examples of why you were given this power and, therefore, they might hold up better in a court challenge?

The President. Well, I wouldn't say that. I expect the most glaring examples to come up in the appropriations process, at least if the past is any prolog. Now, it may be that the use of the line item veto here will mean that it won't have to be used as much in the appropriations process, and that would please me greatly. But I think it's important that the American people understand that when the line item veto was given to the President, the primary assumption was that it would take out special projects that were typically funded in big bills, and those are those big appropriations bills, none of which have come to me yet.

But I do believe that this should withstand court challenge because the process by which the matters were reviewed at least was a very careful, exhaustive process, and I received input from people all over the country that had interests in it, through my Cabinet and staff members. But we worked very hard on this, and—well, since I told you after my press conference on Thursday that I would be meeting with my staff. And I had meetings and conversations each day since then before finally making these decisions.

Claire [Claire Shipman, CNN].

Q. Mr. President, it sounds as though, given the deliberations among your staff and the talk about the court challenge and the difficulty finding items in this particular tax and spending legislation, that you decided to act now largely for symbolic reasons instead of——

The President. No, I wouldn't say that. I think these three things are appropriate. But I just want to point out that I think that when the Congress certified, for example, 79 tax items to me, people said, "Well, maybe you ought to veto 76 of them." And I think it's important to recognize that there really never were 79 candidates for a line item veto there. The Congress is required—the Joint Tax Committee is required by law to certify to the President all the tax items that benefit fewer than 100 people, and there were—the vast majority of those were either put in by the Treasury Department or by the congressional committees with the support of the Treasury Department to actually clean up procedural problems in the law so that the numbers were smaller.

Then there were a number of things that, as I said, I might well have line-item-vetoed, but they were part of the overall budget process and that did a lot of good for the American people. And I have to honor the agreements that were made and the process of it.

So these things I hope will be both real and symbolic in the sense that I'm hopeful that this will work out pretty much the way it did when I was Governor; that is, when you know the President is prepared to use the line item veto, that tends to operate as a deterrent against the most egregious kinds of projects that would otherwise not be funded. So it would suit me if,

after a while, the use of the veto became quite rare because there was a disciplined agreement not to have projects that ought not be funded in the first place.

Q. Sir, can you tell me where in the Constitution the President is given this kind of power that hasn't been exerted until now?

The President. Well, the power is given by legislation. The real question is, does the Constitution permit or forbid the Congress to give the President this kind of power. I believe that since—if you look at the fact that 43 States have this power for the Governor, and it has been upheld in State after State after State, the provisions of most State constitutions are similar to the provisions of the Federal Constitution in the general allocation of executive authority and legislative authority.

So I think it is an implicit thing. As long as the legislature has the right to override the executive, then for the legislature to allow the executive to make reasoned judgments about particular items in these omnibus bills, I do not believe is an unconstitutional delegation of the legislature's authority to the President.

So keep in mind, they can override this. If they decide that they think I'm wrong and two-thirds of them agree, they can override this.

Q. Do you welcome a challenge?

Q. Mr. President, Senator McCain sent you a note last week saying you ought to consider putting off a line item veto until you get the appropriations bills, on the grounds that it might be a blow to the spirit of cooperation that produced the tax cut and the balanced budget bills in the first place. Did you give that any consideration?

The President. Absolutely. And when Senator McCain came to see me about the campaign finance issue and our common support for his legislation, we talked about it a little bit. As I've already said to you, that one of the reasons that we have decided on a relatively small number is I didn't want to touch anything that I thought where there was even a question that it might have been part of the negotiating process and a cooperative spirit with Congress.

If you look at these three things, they present three entirely different problems, but I think all three are outside the scope of the budget negotiating process and all three are the kinds of things that the line item veto was meant for: the first, the avoidance of Federal taxation in an inappropriate way; the second, giving a break to one State in a way that would immediately disadvantage several others and potentially disadvantage all the other States; and the third, as I said, I believe a very worthy goal, having incentives for farmers' co-ops to integrate with production facilities in a way that is overbroad and could lead to the total avoidance of taxation under circumstances which are inappropriate, which would require a more disciplined fix. I think those are the kinds of things that the line item veto was meant to deal with in these contexts.

Now, when you get to the appropriations process it will be somewhat more straightforward: Should this project be built or not; should this road be built or not; should this money be given to this agency or not for this program? And I think that those are the things where typically it's in use at the State level. But in the context of taxes and the entitlements, I thought each of these three things presented a representative case where the veto was intended to be used.

Q. Are you running out of travel money, sir? [*Laughter*]

The President. I hope not; I'm trying to go on holiday. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:30 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. The cancellations affected Public Law 105–33, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, and Public Law 105–34, the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, both approved August 5. The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on August 12.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Line Item Veto of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997

August 11, 1997

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

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel one item of new direct spending, as specified in the attached report, contained in the "Balanced Budget Act of 1997" (Public Law 105–33; H.R. 2015). I have determined that this cancellation will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachment, constitutes a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The report detailing the cancellation was published in the *Federal Register* on August 12.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting Line Item Vetoes of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997

August 11, 1997

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

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel two limited tax benefits, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the "Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997" (Public Law 105–34; H.R. 2014). I have determined that each of these cancellations will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachments, constitutes a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on August 12.

Remarks at Midwest Technology Corporation of St. Louis in St. Louis, Missouri

August 12, 1997

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm glad to see you all here. I'm sorry it's so hot. I want to say to my longtime friend and former colleague as a Governor, Senator Kit Bond, that I was very glad to cross party lines and follow your lead to take my coat off. [*Laughter*] And now you owe me one, and I will call you next time there's a vote that's real important to me in Congress. [*Laughter*] Actually, you don't have to be suffering like this. The truth is this building is very well air-conditioned, but Barry Corona is such an entrepreneur, he thought there might be a market in St. Louis for a large sauna, and that's what we're testing out today. [*Laughter*]

I'm delighted to be here. I want to, first of all, say my thanks to my good friend Governor Carnahan, to my friend, our minority leader,

Dick Gephardt, to Kit Bond, and to Mayor Harmon, who have spoken here today. I thank the other State officials who are here. The speaker of the house, Steve Gaw, is here. Senator Ehlmann, the senate minority leader, is here. Congressman Clay could not be here today, but we're glad Senator Clay is here with his most important possession. Thank you for coming. I thank State Treasurer Holden and Secretary of State Cooke for being here.

I want to say a special word of thanks—and I'll say more about them later—to the CEO of Monsanto, Bob Shapiro, and to my good friend Eli Segal, the president of the Welfare to Work Partnership, and to all the others who are here. And thanks again to Mid Tec for hosting us.

It's great to be back in St. Louis, even on a hot August day. This city is very much alive. You can see it in the revived area and your record job growth, your commitment to education reform and now to welfare reform. And I want to talk about finishing the job of welfare reform, moving people from welfare to work.

If we expect to be the country we want to be in the next century, we have to provide opportunity for everyone who's willing to work for it, we have to require responsibility from everyone who's capable of providing it, and we have to find a way to come together across all the lines that divide us to make one America.

Fixing our broken welfare system is an important part of that because it means more opportunity, more responsibility, and a stronger, more united community. It's been a priority of my Presidency. You've heard others mention—I think the Governor talked about it—that shortly after I took office we began giving people waivers from Federal rules that undermined their reform experiments, so they could try new and innovative ways that would work perhaps in one community but not another, perhaps in one State but not another, to facilitate the movement of people from welfare to work.

Then a year ago next week, I signed the welfare reform legislation, which really did end welfare as we know it. It was designed to make welfare a second chance, not a way of life. It gave the States far more responsibilities and opportunities to create new programs to move people from welfare to work. It guaranteed children their nutritional and health care benefits and provided several billion dollars more money to pay for child care for parents who otherwise could not afford to take jobs at entry levels if those were the only jobs they could get.

Now, a lot of people said that welfare reform would never work because the private economy wouldn't do its part or the Government wouldn't do its part or we couldn't figure out how to get people from welfare to work or—you know, I heard all the reasons that people said it wouldn't work. But a year later, I think it's fair to say the debate is over. We know now that welfare reform works.

Today I am proud to announce that just since I signed the law a year ago, there are now 1.4 million fewer people on welfare in the last year alone. In the 4 years and 7 months or so, almost 8 now, since I took office, the welfare rolls have declined by 3.4 million, 24 percent, the biggest decline in history. We now have the smallest percentage of Americans living on public assistance we have had since 1970. We can make this work if we all work together.

I come here to St. Louis and to this fine place and to these programs—and let me again thank all of you who are part of all these programs—to say that the job is not over. And the law requires us to do more, because the law says that able-bodied people, people who are able physically and mentally to do work, should be on welfare continuously no more than 2 years and no more than 5 years in a lifetime. Now, if you say that to someone and you don't want to be cruel to them or their children, then you must acknowledge that we, the rest of us, have a moral obligation to make sure there is a job there and that if they need training, that they have the training they need for the job.

The National Government is determined to do its part. Last week when I signed the first balanced budget law in a generation into law, we—[*applause*]—thank you—we had two provisions that I want to especially emphasize: one, $3 billion in a welfare-to-work challenge fund to help communities with higher unemployment rates move long-term welfare recipients into the work force; and two, an expanded and carefully targeted work opportunity tax credit which gives a significant incentive to private employers, including small-business people who need to be brought into this equation, to move people from welfare to work.

And in that connection, let me say that we are committed to doing everything we can. As evidence of that, I would like to acknowledge the presence here today of the Secretary of

Health and Human Services, Donna Shalala; the Secretary of Labor, Alexis Herman; the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Aida Alvarez. They're here working with St. Louis, working with Missouri. We're going to do this with every major community in every State in our community. We want to do our part to help you meet the goals of the welfare reform law. And I thank you all for being here.

I have also asked the Vice President to head two other initiatives for me: One, to bring civic and business groups together to mentor new employees. I had a friend from the Midwest call me the other day, and he said, "You know, I just want you to know I really am trying to do what you asked me to do. I run a small business"—and we've been friends for many years—and he said, "I'm trying to hire people from welfare to work, but because the economy is going so well, most of the people who can easily move into the work force already have. And the people I'm trying to hire, they're really having a hard time because they've actually never had to do this before. They've never even had to show up before at the same time. They don't understand how to find—how to handle conflict in the work force. If they run up against something they can't do, they're uncomfortable asking how to do it."

We forget that if we're going to go all the way, we have a lot of work to do to make some of these folks believe in their own capacities and understand them and understand that, hey, we all mess up at work. You know that. Read my polls, right? [*Laughter*] I mean, sometimes we all mess up at work. And we've got a lot of work to do to get people in the right frame of mind to understand that having a job and keeping a job is a continuous learning and growth experience. So we know we need to do that. We're trying to do our part with that.

And finally, the Vice President is leading our effort to have the Federal Government, even in a time when we've downsized the overall Government, fill as many new openings as possible with welfare recipients until we hire 10,000 welfare recipients on our part over the next couple of years.

Now, we know that the States, the communities, the private sector also have to do an awful lot. Believe it or not, 48 of the 50 States have seen their caseloads decline dramatically. Missouri has done better than the national average, at 27 percent decline in the last 4 years. Thirty-five States have now followed Missouri's lead. Missouri asked for one of these welfare waivers, so that in certain parts of the State you could authorize employers to receive the welfare check as a hiring and training supplement for a period of time—which I thought was a great idea, a legitimate idea, particularly with people who are harder to place—to give employers a premium to really work with those employees and train them and help them become full-time volunteers.

Since I came here first in 1994 to Missouri to announce welfare reform efforts, then in 1996 to talk about getting the private sector involved, you might be interested to know that now 35 other States have allowed Missouri to show them that this is a good reform, and they are also doing it. I hope all the rest of them will, too.

The most important thing we can do is get the private sector to hire people. That's why Barry and Chairman Shapiro are so important to us, because we've got to have the private sector hiring people. That's why the AmeriCorps project that I just visited downstairs, training young people for private sector jobs, is so important.

And last year when I came to Missouri, we announced that there would be a national effort, involving in the beginning a number of Missouri corporations and five corporations nationally, to organize businesses of all sizes to commit to hire people from welfare to work. Since Monsanto and Sprint and Burger King and UPS and United Airlines agreed to start that effort, the Welfare to Work Partnership, which was founded by my good friend Eli Segal—who also, by the way, was the first head of our national service program, AmeriCorps, which has done a fabulous job, I believe, for young people in our country—but since we started, we now have over 800 companies of all sizes signed up to promise to hire people from welfare to work. What you should be proud of is that 300 of them have locations here in St. Louis. And you should be very proud of that.

Now, I want to challenge every employer in America to join this crusade. And we have a toll-free number, it's 1–888–USA–JOB1—1–888–USA–JOB1. I want the employers in this country who get this number to call it and help a welfare recipient find a job. And again, I'd like to thank Sprint for donating this number. This is quite a considerable financial investment

to help people move from welfare to work, and I appreciate their doing it. Remember that. I feel like I'm hawking something on one of those channels on television—[*laughter*]—1–888–USA–JOB1—I can do this.

Let me close by putting a personal face on this. There's a woman on stage with us today who is an example of what someone who once was on welfare, with serious obstacles to overcome, can do to become a valuable and successful employee. Felicia Booker's success took courage, responsibility, and a dream that she could make a better life for her young children, ages 2 and 6. It also took an employer, A.G. Edwards, willing to take a chance on her, and people along the way who wanted to help her realize that dream. Felicia Booker has been working at A.G. Edwards for nearly a year and a half now. She's a computer programmer, and she's already been promoted once. I'd like for her to stand and be recognized. Felicia? [*Applause*]

Again let me say, if this is really going to be a country where everyone has an opportunity, then we have to prove that the young women I just met in that job-training program downstairs are going to be given the opportunity to make the most of their own lives. Ultimately, that's what welfare reform is about. It's not primarily about saving the Government money; we're going to balance the budget regardless. It's about empowering every single person in this country to be a part of this country in a new century, in a new era.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:25 a.m. on the factory floor. In his remarks, he referred to Barry Corona, chairman of the board, Midwest Technology Corporation of St. Louis (Mid Tec); Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri; Mayor Clarence Harmon of St. Louis; State Representative Steve Gaw, speaker of the house, and State Senator Steve Ehlmann, senate minority leader, Missouri General Assembly; State Senator William Clay, father of U.S. Representative William (Bill) Clay; State Treasurer Bob Holden; and Missouri Secretary of State Bekki Cooke.

Remarks to the Democratic Business Council in St. Louis

August 12, 1997

Thank you. Thank you very much. First let me say a thank you to all of our Missouri hosts: Governor Carnahan and Congressman Gephardt; Mayor Harmon, thank you for making me feel so welcome to be back in St. Louis; Treasurer Holden; your State chair, Joe Carmichael; I saw Attorney General—I mean, Senator Jay Nixon here a minute ago—[*laughter*]—wherever he is. I'd like to acknowledge the presence here of the distinguished Democratic Senator from Illinois, Dick Durbin, who is here somewhere, I think. He was here earlier; I don't know if he's still here. He may have left. He's heard me give this speech before. [*Laughter*]

This is, I think, my first opportunity to say a profound thank you to the people of Missouri for voting for Bill Clinton and Al Gore both in 1992 and in 1996, and I thank you for that and for giving us a chance to serve.

Dick Gephardt already told you some of the good results that are happening in our country. You know these things, of course. I think what I'd like to talk to you about today is why I think your contributions are important, why I'm glad you're helping our congressional campaign committee, what we hope to achieve in the coming months, and more importantly, what we hope to achieve in the years ahead.

When I ran for President in 1992, as merely—to put it in my distinguished predecessor's phrase—merely the Governor of a small Southern State, one of the things that it seemed to me was that this was a country full of wonderful people, great businesses, hard-working people, people who knew what was going on in the world, and people who were anxious to take advantage of the changes, and that we were actually being disabled and limited by the way our political system worked, that we didn't have a clear driving vision about what we wanted to look like in the 21st century and we didn't have a strategy for getting there. And I had a pretty clear, if simple, idea about what I

thought America should look like when my daughter is my age. I still have that simple idea.

I want this to be a country where everybody, without regard to where they start in life, has a chance to live up to the fullest of their God-given capacities if they're willing to work for it. I want this to be a country that is coming together, not being driven apart by its diversity. And I want our country to be a place that still leads the world for peace and freedom and prosperity.

And if you want that, it's pretty easy to ask what strategy should you follow. You should do those things which create opportunity, which reinforce responsibility, which bring people together in a community of one America, not divided, and which support our world leadership in productive ways. This has not been rocket science. There has been a lot of hard work, and I've been willing to work with our friends on the Republican side when they would work with us. And when they wouldn't, as in 1993, when Dick Gephardt and I and a few others were all alone and we had no help in starting the work of reducing the deficit and getting it 80 percent done before this last budget was passed, we've been willing to do that.

But I want to make this simple point: There is always first a vision, and then there is a strategy. And people either spend their time working to implement the strategy and build something positive, or playing politics as usual. And I think the record of the last 4½ years shows that it is always better to build than to tear down; it is always better to unite rather than to divide; it is always better to look to the future rather than to bring people back kicking and screaming to a past that can no longer be maintained.

And that is why these meetings and others like them we'll be having around the country are so important. Believe you me, if you look at this budget we just passed—which had the biggest increase in funds for child health care since Medicaid was passed in 1965, the biggest increase in Federal support for education since 1965, the biggest increase in helping middle class families educate their children in 50 years, since the GI bill was passed for college education—none of that would have been possible if we didn't have so many members of our party in the Congress. That was our contribution to this budget. Cleaning up 500 toxic waste dumps, that was our contribution to this budget. Making sure that the hardest working families in this country, the first-year police officers and nurses, firefighters with two or three kids, could take full advantage of the children's tax credit, those were our contributions to this budget. None of it would have happened if it hadn't been for the clear knowledge I had that there were people who literally viewed the world the way I do and were willing to fight for it and stand up for it and speak for it.

We are within sight of winning back our majority in the House. We know that they will have more money than we will, from all sources—maybe a lot more. But my experience in this business has been, it's okay if they have more, but you have to have enough. You have to have enough to get your message out. You have to have enough to give people a sense of who you are. You have to have enough to be able to answer if attacked in a way you consider to be unfair or inaccurate. And if you do, and if you work hard and if you have the right vision and the right strategy and good candidates, you can win.

And I want to say again, we are very close now to starting a new century in a new millennium. And yes, we have made dramatic progress. I'm glad we've got the best economy we've had in a generation. I'm glad we've got the lowest unemployment we've had in 23 years and the lowest inflation in 30 years and the highest rate of new business starts in history. I'm glad we had the biggest drop in violent crime in 35 years. I'm glad we had the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history. I'm glad now we've got the smallest percentage of people on welfare we've had since 1970. I am very proud of all of that.

Does anyone seriously believe that this country is at this moment meeting your standards of what you want it to be like when we start the new century, what you want it to be like when your children or your grandchildren are your age? The answer to that is no. We can do better, and we have to do better. We have to do better. We have to have, among other things, a country that says whether a child is a poor immigrant child in St. Louis or a farmer's child in North Dakota or a child in a wonderful private school in New England, they all should meet the same standards of international excellence in what they learn when they're in school. And until we do that, we will not be where we need to be in education.

We need to say that in the poorest neighborhoods of this country, people still have a chance to start a business, free enterprise still has a chance to take hold, people still have a chance to build a framework of community. And if we can't do that when the economy is strong, when can we do it? We have to do that.

We have to be able to prove that we can grow the economy and preserve the environment. We have to prove that we can continue to reach out to the rest of the world with economic and political and security partnerships. We are still not where we would like to be in our heart of hearts as we move into this new century.

And finally, let me say I think very few people have thought about just how rapidly we are changing. Now, you know, I come from not very far south of here, and I can tell you, I don't know many people I grew up with who wouldn't be surprised if I told them that unless something dramatic happens within 30 to 40 years, there will be no majority race in America. But that's the truth. Today, in our country, Hawaii is the only State where there is no racial group in the majority. Americans of European descent and Americans of Japanese descent are about 30 percent of the population, Americans of Filipino descent and native Pacific Islanders are about 16 to 18 percent, and everybody else makes up the rest. But within 5 years, there will be no majority race in California, our largest State with 13 percent of our people. Within 30 to 40 years, unless something dramatic happens, Americans of European descent will not be a majority race in the United States for the first time since its founding. Now, we always say, you know, we're a country founded on ideas and values, not race and place. We're about to find out. We're about to find out. And we need to be thinking about that.

And I can tell you—we just had a delegation come back from Africa—the largest number of Africans in the world outside Africa live in the United States. And Mr. Gephardt will tell you, we have great bipartisan support now in the Congress for our Africa trade initiative. Why? Because there are almost a billion people in sub-Saharan Africa, and only 7 percent of their imports come from the United States.

So this is an economic issue, but at a deeper level it is a human issue. What occupies the President's time in the world today? You pick up the paper this morning, you see us worrying about Bosnia or the Middle East or Northern Ireland. Everywhere somebody is fighting over their racial, their ethnic, or their religious differences. We are the country with the largest number of people from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds. And if we prove we can live together and work together and succeed together, that is the single biggest asset we will carry for world leadership, for prosperity, and for peace of mind into the next century.

So I ask you to think about that. Yes, if crime is not an issue, if welfare is not an issue, if the budget is going to be balanced, and all you have to think about is what you want your country to look like in the future, then ask yourself which party is more likely to deal with the fact that 20 percent of our kids are still living in poverty; which party is more likely to deal with the fact that even though crime is down, our streets are too violent and too many of our kids have nothing to say yes to; which party is more likely to deal with the fact that we must have a national standard of excellence in education and stop making excuses for not giving that kind of opportunity to our poor children; which party is more likely to passionately care about reconciling the economy and the environment so that we don't have to give up our children's natural heritage to make a living today; which party is more likely to pull this country together across all the lines that threaten to divide us? I think the answers are easy and straightforward. But keep in mind, if you believe that, there has to be an opportunity to exercise that. I could not have accomplished anything in Congress—with Congress, anything that required congressional action, and most of what I have done with executive action could have been undone by Congress, had it not been for the support I had from the members of my party there.

Now, we have worked hard. We have a record that commends itself to the American people, and we have a chance to win their confidence in the congressional elections of 1998 if you will be there for our leaders and our cause. And if you think about the big issues, what you want this country to look like when your children are your age, I think it will justify your presence here today and keep you working right through November of next year.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:45 p.m. at the Windows on Washington restaurant. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri; Mayor Clarence Harmon of St. Louis; and State Treasurer Bob Holden.

Remarks at a National Conference of Democratic Mayors Dinner
August 12, 1997

Thank you. Give the Vice President a hand. [*Applause*] You know, if he keeps practicing, he's going to get good at this. [*Laughter*] I'd forgotten we did half of that stuff. [*Laughter*]

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, for your remarks and for the historically unprecedented partnership that we have enjoyed. I was sitting there thinking as Al Gore was talking that when I asked him to join the ticket back in the summer of—or the late spring of 1992, it violated all convention. We were the same age. We were from the same part of the country. We both spoke without an accent. [*Laughter*] It didn't make any sense. It violated all the conventional ideas. The thing that I thought made sense about it was that I believed we needed to change the country, we needed to change the direction and the way politics works in Washington, we needed to change the way the Federal Government was organized, and we needed to change in some ways not the values or the aspirations but the approach of our own party. And so I thought I would do something unconventional and pick someone I thought could be the best possible full partner. And that's what we've done.

And I hope that, frankly, it will be a model for future administrations of both parties, because it seems to me rather foolish to not make the most of the incredible potential that you now know the office of the Vice President has because of the way that Vice President Gore has filled it. He's headed our reinventing Government program. He's done a masterful job of working with the mayors and with Secretary Cuomo and Secretary Cisneros before him and working with the empowerment zone program and the enterprise communities. He's basically led our efforts in telecommunications policy, our efforts to put computers in our schools. And by the way, we've got some money for that in our budget, so we'll be able to help your cities hook all your classrooms and libraries up by the year 2000. He has headed a special commission with the Prime Minister of Russia and a special commission with Mr. Mbeki of South Africa and taking a leading role in every single foreign policy and defense decision of this administration.

There is really no precedent for this in the history of the country, but I hope that we have set a precedent, because this is a better country because of the work that Al Gore has been able to do this last 4½ years. And I hope others will see that and in future administrations this model will be followed.

I want to thank Steve Grossman and Alan Solomont as well for being here and all the other people from the Democratic Party. I thank all the mayors who are here. I looked at you stand up, and I bet I've spent more time in more cities, in more different kinds of neighborhoods than any President ever has. And I'm not bragging, I'm thanking you, because I never learn anything when I'm up here talking, I only learn something when I'm out there looking and listening, and you have helped me.

Keep in mind, I was born in a town of 6,000 people, and I grew up in a town of 35,000 people, and between, I lived out in the country where we had a lot more animals than people. [*Laughter*] And my State had 2.3 million people and only 4 Members of Congress. But I've always loved and been fascinated by cities of all sizes, and I think that the central reason is that in cities people know that they have to work together to get anything done and they understand that their own individual and family well-being depends upon other people being able to do well at the same time, side by side with them.

And in a way, that is ultimately the value that I hope will distinguish our party as we move ahead, that we stand for the future, not the past; that we stand for unity, not division;

that we believe that everyone should have opportunity; that everyone should be held to a standard of responsibility; and that everyone should be a part of our American community. And I think the cities, just to function and certainly to make any progress, have to follow those precepts day-in and day-out.

And I am gratified—actually, one or two—Mayor Archer—one or two Republican mayors have actually whispered that to me that they've been to the White House more since I've been there than they did under my Republican predecessors. I wish they said that when I was being criticized in the press for who was coming to the White House. [*Laughter*] They could have been very helpful to me if they had been more timely and public in that. But I like to have people around who define politics not by hot air and hot rhetoric and their ability to divide people but instead by their ability to bring people together and get things done.

And so, to all of you mayors, let me thank you. And to you, Dennis Archer, thank you for this wonderful idea. Dennis Archer is actually another one of the gifts I got from my wife, because when they were active in the American Bar Association together—back when she was making more money than me and he had a real job as a lawyer and a judge—and I got to know Dennis then. And I was elated when he ran for mayor of Detroit. And I must say, I had high expectations, and he has far exceeded those. So it's been a great friendship, and I thank you for what you have done.

The Vice President talked about a lot of the specific issues, a lot of the things that were in the budget, a lot of the things we're trying to do. And I know you've had a good day, and I want to thank the members of my administration who were here—Secretary Riley, Secretary Slater; I think Mr. Barram is here; there may be others who are still here, and those who were here and are now gone—because I was in St. Louis today, but Hillary watched a lot of this on CSPAN and said that our folks did a pretty good job. I hope they did. She's a pretty good critic, and she says they did a good job and that you all seemed to enjoy it.

So you've heard a lot of the specifics here. I would just like to ask you to take just a minute to think about the big picture, first as a citizen and then second as a mayor and only third as a member of our party—and not everybody here is a Democrat, but most of you are. So if you're a Republican, think about it. Think about it, fourth, if you're a Republican. [*Laughter*] But I want you to stop and just think about what all this amounts to, what's really going on now. I mean, here we are, it's 1997, we're a couple years away from a new century and a whole new millennium, in a world that is changing dramatically. Just think how differently people work and live and relate to each other and the rest of the world than they did just a few years ago.

I'll just take Detroit. You know what Detroit symbolized when I was a boy? It was a place where poor Arkansas dirt farmers, whether white or black, could give up living on the farm and killing themselves and go get a job in the car plant and get a good middle class job. They could have a house. They could have a car. They could take a vacation. They would have a retirement. And they could afford to send their kids to college. And then when they got good and done, they could then come home to Arkansas and buy cheap farmland and tell all the rest of us we made a mistake by not going. That's what we thought about Detroit. Dennis will tell you, there is a little town outside Detroit; it's populated almost entirely by people from Arkansas. And there are other States.

You know what the story of Detroit is now? Then in the eighties, there was all this business about how the auto industry was dead and the UAW was dead and all this stuff was terrible and it couldn't be revived. Well, now America is the number one auto producer again, the number one seller around the world again of automobiles. And Wayne County, Michigan, is not just a place of white ethnics and expatriate white and black southerners. There are now people from over 145 different racial and ethnic groups in Wayne County, and it had the biggest increase in exports of any urban county in America from 1992 to 1996.

That's just one example. A lot of you could tell the same sort of story about your hometown and your county. The point I'm trying to make is you are living in a time that is incredibly dynamic, and all of you know that. And the question is, how can we take advantage of change, make it our friend, and help fulfill a shared vision of the 21st century?

I have been working every day since I got here on a simple idea: When my child is my age, I want this country to be a place where every person who is responsible has a chance

to live out their God-given abilities and their dreams. I want this country to lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity for another 50 years, because I see no constructive alternative on the horizon, and even though the nuclear cloud is fading and the cold war is fading, there are plenty of problems out there in this old world. And thirdly, I want us to prove that people from different racial, ethnic, religious backgrounds can not only tolerate, not only respect, but in fact celebrate each other's diversity and still be one America. All this stuff about me is important, my particulars, but I'm also, and most importantly, an American. And what we have in common is more important than what we have that is different among us.

That's what I want. When my child becomes 50 years old, when she has children, that's what I want this country to look like. And if it looks like that, everything else is going to be all right. And everything I have tried to do, all the things the Vice President mentioned, I have tried to do to create a Government and a climate in this country that would bring people together, create opportunity, and summon people to higher levels of responsibility. That's what I've tried to do to achieve that agenda.

And if you look ahead, ask yourselves, okay, we're going to balance the budget and the crime rate is coming down and we have the lowest welfare rolls as a percentage of our population since 1970 and a historic drop—3.4 million people since '92—and we have the smallest Government since Kennedy was President and, as a percentage of the Federal work force, it's the smallest since Roosevelt took office before the New Deal, and now what? Now what are we going to do? What are the choices?

I had an interesting morning coffee about 2 weeks ago with one of your colleagues, Mayor White and Mayor Archer and others, the rather droll mayor of Houston, Texas, Bob Lanier, who said that now that he had become 72 years old, he could say whatever he pleased. So I asked him what he thought about the balanced budget agreement. He said, "I like it." I said, "Bob, how did you ever get reelected with over 80 percent of the vote, if that's all you ever say?" He never says very much, you know. He said, "Because all other politicians talk too much." [*Laughter*] He's a funny man, you know. And—but he said a trenchant thing. He said, "Think about it, if we have a healthy economy, a responsible fiscal policy, a crime policy that works, a welfare policy that works, a sensible foreign policy, and a strong defense, all the other policy choices ahead of us favor the sensible progressive party and the sensible progressive approach." And so we talked about it for half an hour.

You think about it. The economy works well, but 20 percent of the kids in this country are living in poverty. If we can't bring the benefits of free enterprise to the inner cities and the isolated rural areas now when the economy is strong, when can we do it? When can we do it? When can we do it? One.

Two, all over the world, we know now that we have common environmental challenges. I've got a big challenge just to convince the American people I think that this whole climate change issue is a big issue. But in December, the nations of the world will gather in Japan and will commit, I hope, to specific binding targets to reduce our emissions of greenhouse gases. Why? Because it's not going to be very pleasant if we're all rich in 50 years but we're wearing oxygen masks, and because it's not necessary, and because we know that the technology is there to grow the economy and preserve the environment. But that is a delicate matter. How are we going to do that? The second problem.

Third, you cannot possibly have a country in which there is opportunity for all unless we do a much better job of educating young children. Now, I believe the historic legacy of this budget we just signed will be that it has the biggest expansion in opportunities for people throughout their lifetime to go to college, 2-year, 4-year, graduate school, you name it—we do more to help them than any time since the passage of the GI bill 50 years ago. But in spite of all that, we're still not educating the children in our cities to international levels of excellence.

Mayor White told me he heard an educator say in his city not very long ago, it was because the kids couldn't learn. After all, they're poor; they live in crime-infested, drug-infested, gang-infested neighborhoods; they have single-parent households—you know, the whole litany. That's not true. It's not true that they can't learn. And we have to stand up against that, those of us who believe in our cities, those of us who live in our cities, those of us who live around these kids, those of us who understand these terrible conflicts they live with. It is not true.

This year, for the first time since international exams started being given back in the 1980's

that the U.S. participated in, a representative sample of American children by race, by region, and by income in the fourth grade scored way above the international average in math and science. That's the good news—first time it ever happened, putting the lie to the fact that Americans cannot compete in school because of our racial, our ethnic, our income differences, and our social problems. That's the good news.

The not-so-good news is that the eighth graders were still below the international average. And not surprising, is it, because that's when a lot of problems hit kids, in adolescence. And a lot of our middle schools are still organized for those Ozzie and Harriet days that are long gone. A lot of them are just too big and unwieldy to do right by the kids.

But that's the third big challenge. After bringing economic opportunity to distressed areas and reconciling our commitment to the environment with the commitment to economic group and saying we're going to make the environment better, the third thing is, we have to stop making excuses for ourselves for failing these children and making excuses for them for not learning. I don't want to embarrass anybody here, but if we were making excuses for kids that grew up in tough times, Rodney Slater would not be the Transportation Secretary today. And Mike White would not be the mayor of Cleveland today. And there are lots of other people who could stand up and say the same thing.

Now, if you think it's true for you, why in God's name would you not think it's true for all those kids that are out there in these city schools that are not getting a good education? This is wrong. And we will never have an America that we want until we say to every one of those kids, "You have a mind. God gave it to you. You have a responsibility to develop it. We're going to expect you to do well, and we're going to stay with you until you do it." And that's what we ought to be standing for. And every city ought to say, I'm going to make my schools something to be proud of, not something to drive around as I try to develop my community.

And the last thing, I just want to say again, and the Vice President already talked about it, is this: We have no idea, until we go someplace and see it with our own eyes, what America at its best can still mean to people. Jesse Jackson and Secretary Slater just headed an American delegation to Africa, to Zimbabwe, to an economic summit. We have the largest group of expatriate Africans—African-Americans here as anyplace in the world, and we only sell 7 percent of Africa's total imports. Several African countries grew at greater than 7 percent last year. They want us to be involved with them. Are we going to change—are we going to have a destiny that is paired with theirs? And are we going to be the kind of country that makes them want to be a part of our future and us to be a part of theirs because of the way we treat each other?

When I was in Romania, there were over 100,000 people in the streets in a country that I had just disappointed by saying I don't think they're ready to join NATO. And I came, and over 100,000 showed up anyway. Why? People were telling me in the streets, "You know, in the dark days of communism, we used to dream that the Americans would someday come and free us. We had no access to news; we didn't know that you really couldn't do it. Now we understand it's better that we did it ourselves. But we have to be a part of your future, and you have to be a part of our future, because we have a long way to go." Those people didn't come to see me; they came to see America, their idea of it.

This gentleman just said he was in Copenhagen when I was there. The Prime Minister said it was the biggest crowd they've had in the streets since the end of World War II. They did not come to see me; they came to see the United States of America.

And if we can have a country that literally has now, in the Nation as a whole, upwards of 190 different racial and ethnic groups in it, living together, working together, getting along, just by our daily living a rebuke to those among us who would divide us and a shining example to people from Bosnia to the Middle East and Northern Ireland, to the tribal wars in Africa that we can—there is a better way—there is a better way—then our dreams for our children and our grandchildren will come true, and we will do our job.

But I want all of you to understand, I think being a mayor now is a great gift. I think being a Governor is a great gift. I think being President is a great gift now. I think serving in the Cabinet now is a great gift, because this country is going through these historic changes with terrific opportunities to create the kind of America I talked about.

And if we can make opportunity real for everybody, if we can protect the environment and grow the economy, if we can have genuine excellence in the development of our children's minds, and if we can learn to live together as one America when there is no longer one majority race in America—and it won't be that long, about the time my daughter is my age—if all the demographic projections are right, people of European descent will no longer be a majority race in America, and we'll all have to learn to get along then, for sure—if we can do these things, we will leave a legacy that will be worthy of any previous generation of Americans. And the best days of this country are still ahead. That is what this whole thing is about.

So when you think about the empowerment zones, the community development financial institutions, cleaning up those brownfields, getting rid of those toxic dumps, adhering to national standards in school, any of the specific things, try to remember what I try to remember every single day when I walk in the Oval Office and thank God I was given the chance to serve at this moment in history: This is our responsibility, and if we fulfill it, the best days of this country are still ahead.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:37 p.m. at the Mayflower Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin of Russia; Executive Deputy President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa; Steve Grossman, national chair, and Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee; Mayor Dennis Archer of Detroit, MI, president, National Conference of Democratic Mayors; and Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen of Denmark.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Narcotics Traffickers Centered in Colombia

August 12, 1997

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

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my report of October 21, 1996, concerning the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

1. On October 21, 1995, I signed Executive Order 12978, "Blocking Assets and Prohibiting Transactions with Significant Narcotics Traffickers" (the "Order") (60 *Fed. Reg.* 54579, October 24, 1995). The Order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of four significant foreign narcotics traffickers, one of whom is now deceased, who were principals in the so-called Cali drug cartel centered in Colombia. These persons are listed in the Annex to the Order. The Order also blocks the property and interests in property of foreign persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, (a) to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia or (b) to materially assist in or provide financial or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the narcotics trafficking activities of persons designated in or pursuant to the Order. In addition the Order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, persons designated in or pursuant to the Order (collectively "Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers" or SDNTs).

The Order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDNTs, and any transaction that evades or avoids, has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, the prohibitions contained in the Order.

Designations of foreign persons blocked pursuant to the Order are effective upon the date of determination by the Director of the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the *Federal Register*, or upon prior actual notice.

2. On October 24, 1995, the Department of the Treasury issued a notice containing 76 additional names of persons determined to meet the criteria set forth in Executive Order 12978 (60 *Fed. Reg.* 54582–84, October 24, 1995).

The Department of the Treasury issued another notice adding the names of one additional entity and three additional individuals, as well as expanded information regarding addresses and pseudonyms, to the list of SDNTs on November 29, 1995 (60 *Fed. Reg.* 61288–89).

On March 8, 1996, OFAC published a notice in the *Federal Register* adding the names of 138 additional individuals and 60 entities designated pursuant to the Order, and revising information for 8 individuals on the list of blocked persons contained in the notices published on November 29, 1995, and October 24, 1995 (61 *Fed. Reg.* 9523–28).

3. On January 21, 1997, OFAC published a notice in the *Federal Register* adding the names of 57 individuals and 21 entities designated pursuant to the Order, and revising information for 58 individuals and 1 entity (62 *Fed. Reg.* 2903–09). In addition, the name of one individual specially designated narcotics trafficker was removed from the list. These changes were effective January 15, 1997. A copy of the notice is attached to this report.

These 78 new names brought the total list of SDNTs to 359. Each of the 78 newly designated entities and individuals has been determined to be owned or controlled or to act for or on behalf of the Cali cartel's Helmer "Pacho" Herrera Buitrago organization. The newly identified SDNTs include several large poultry processing plants and farms, investment and import/export firms, real estate businesses, a consulting firm, a lumber distributor, and a construction company, all located in Colombia.

The additional name and address information includes one previously designated company controlled by the Herrera Buitrago family and 58 previously designated individuals from either the Herrera Buitrago or the Rodriguez Orejuela organizations of the Cali cartel. The OFAC, in coordination with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, is continuing to expand the list of SDNTs, including both organizations and individuals, as additional information is developed.

Effective February 28, 1997, OFAC issued the Narcotics Trafficking Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations" or NTSR), 31 C.F.R. Part 536, to further implement my declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia (62 *Fed. Reg.* 9959–68, March 5, 1997). A copy of the Regulations is attached to this report.

4. The OFAC has disseminated and routinely updated details of this program to the financial, securities, and international trade communities by both electronic and conventional media. In addition to bulletins to banking institutions via the Federal Reserve System and the Clearing House Interbank Payments System, individual notices were provided to all State and Federal regulatory agencies, automated clearinghouses, and State and independent banking associations across the country. OFAC contacted all major securities industry associations and regulators. It posted electronic notices on the Internet and over 10 computer bulletin boards and 2 fax-on-demand services, and provided the same material to the U.S. Embassy in Bogota for distribution to U.S. companies operating in Colombia.

5. As of March 4, 1997, OFAC had issued five specific licenses pursuant to Executive Order 12978. These licenses were issued in accordance with established Treasury policy authorizing the completion of presanctions transactions and the provision of legal services to and payment of fees for representation of SDNTs in proceedings within the United States arising from the imposition of sanctions.

6. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from October 21, 1996, through April 20, 1997, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers are estimated at approximately $1.1 million. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and

the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of Justice, and the Department of State.

7. Executive Order 12978 provides this Administration with a new tool for combatting the actions of significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia, and the unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm that they cause in the United States and abroad. The Order is designed to deny these traffickers the benefit of any assets subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and to prevent United States persons from engaging in any commercial dealings with them, their front companies, and their agents. Executive Order 12978 demonstrates the U.S. commitment to end the scourge that such traffickers have wrought upon society in the United States and abroad.

The magnitude and the dimension of the problem in Colombia—perhaps the most pivotal country of all in terms of the world's cocaine trade—is extremely grave. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers and their violent and corrupting activities as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on August 13.

Remarks Announcing Action on the Safe and Effective Use of Medications To Treat Children

August 13, 1997

You know, one of the most important rules about being President is to never go on after the star of the show. [*Laughter*] I would like to thank all of you for being here today. The Vice President, the First Lady, and Secretary Shalala have spoken about what we're trying to do and acknowledged the work of many individuals and groups. But I want to thank Dr. David Kessler, who as the Vice President said, used to work at the FDA; Dr. Friedman, the Acting Commissioner of the FDA. I also want to thank Dr. Koop, who wrote us a letter in support yesterday. And Hillary mentioned our good friend Elizabeth Glaser. I got a wonderful letter today from her husband, Paul, about how much this would mean to their son, Jake. And so, all of you who have been in this situation, I thank you for helping this day come to pass. And I thank Regan Ralph for her eloquent speech under some duress. [*Laughter*] I thank her spouse for doing what I think is a noble duty there. [*Laughter*] And next time we'll let you give the speech, and the rest of us will handle Sam. [*Laughter*]

I'm glad Sam came up here today and showed us what childhood should be like. It's what kids that are 1½ year old should be doing, and they should be able to do it. They should be able to do it. And according to the American Academy of Pediatrics, more than 50 percent of the medicines that have proved helpful for children have not been adequately tested for children's use. That is not acceptable.

The executive action that I take today simply is designed to ensure that parents and pediatricians have the safety information they need. Doctors have known for a long time that children respond differently than adults to many drugs. In cases—many cases, children can only tolerate vastly scaled-down doses. In some cases, their bodies simply haven't developed enough to take any dosage of a medicine that has been perfectly safe for adults.

Moreover, we still don't even have good information about medication for some of the most common childhood illnesses that Hillary mentioned, like asthma, allergic reactions, ear infections. And we certainly don't know enough about medications for treating life-threatening diseases. Less than half the drugs used to help the estimated 12,000 children with HIV infection in our country have been tested for use

in children. Information is especially sparse for children under 2, the time when the medication may be most needed.

Without clear guidance, pediatricians sometimes decide not to prescribe for children drugs used successfully by adults, and this means that the children may well be being deprived of what may be the very best treatment available. And as the Vice President said, the pediatrician's other alternative is to guess, with potentially grave consequences. Some time ago, for example, doctors gave infants small doses of a crucial antibiotic commonly used by adults, but it turned out that the infants were unable to clear the drug from their bodies and large amounts built up in their livers, and because of needed dosage studies which had not been done, 23 infants died.

The rule I announce today will put an end to this guesswork. It will require manufacturers of all medicines needed by children to study the drugs' effects on children. The results will then be displayed on drug labels to help pediatricians and other health care professionals make good decisions about how to treat their young patients. Groups representing patients, physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and drug manufacturers all have indicated their willingness to help us implement this new rule, and we appreciate their willingness to do so.

I also want to applaud Senators Dodd and DeWine and Congressman Greenwood and Congressman Waxman, all of whom have introduced legislation that would provide additional incentives for drug manufacturers to perform the needed dosage studies in children. Their approach is compatible with the rule we're announcing today, and I look forward to working with them on this issue as Congress continues our bipartisan efforts to pass comprehensive FDA reform this fall.

And I know Congressman Greenwood and his children are here; I'd like to ask him to stand. Thank you, sir, for being here. We appreciate your work. In your new position in the Congress, you may have many more controversial issues to deal with but few that will do more good. And we thank you for your leadership.

Today we take one more significant step toward assuring quality health care for our children, building on our historic commitment in the balanced budget to extend health care coverage to 5 million of them who don't have it today.

Again let me say, when something like this happens the President gets to give a speech, but the credit goes to all the people who worked on it, to all the parents, to those who kept working for this even after their children suffered terrible injury and sometimes even death, to all the members of the professional groups. You deserve the credit. And I am very grateful to you for bringing this matter to my attention and giving me the power to use what the law has given me as President to do what you know and to do what you have long known is the right thing to do. This is your day.

As the First Lady has often said, children are not rugged individuals; they depend upon us to give them love and guidance, discipline, and the benefit of good medical care. Today their dependence has been justified. Their future and ours depends upon how well we continue to do this important work.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:19 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Paul Michael Glaser, widower of Pediatric AIDS Foundation founder Elizabeth Glaser; and Regan Ralph, whose son, Sam, was treated for asthma with drugs not labeled specifically for children.

Statement on Signing the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act

August 13, 1997

Today, I signed into law H.R. 1585, the "Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act." This legislation requires the U.S. Postal Service to establish a special rate of postage for first-class mail that patrons may use voluntarily to contribute to funding for breast cancer research. Special postal stamps will be made available for this purpose.

Research and the prompt application of research results are the strongest weapons we have against breast cancer. Today, breast cancer remains the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women. It affects one in eight women in their lifetimes and has touched the families of nearly every American, including my own. But we are making great strides in the study of this disease. Our goal must be to find a cure and a way to prevent breast cancer in the near future.

The bill I am signing into law today builds on this Administration's long history of support for breast cancer research and prevention. Between 1993 and 1997, funding for breast cancer research at NIH increased 75 percent. We will work to ensure that the new funds from this legislation are not used as a replacement for our current commitment. It creates another way for Americans to further support the important research that will make a difference in the lives of millions of families.

NOTE: H.R. 1585, approved August 13, was assigned Public Law No. 105–41.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to the Lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979

August 13, 1997

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

On August 19, 1994, in light of the expiration of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*), I issued Executive Order 12924 declaring a national emergency and continuing the system of export regulation under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*). Under section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), the national emergency terminates on the anniversary date of its declaration unless the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice of its continuation.

I am hereby advising the Congress that I have extended the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12924. Attached is a copy of the notice of extension.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
August 13, 1997.

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The notice is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks in Support of the Oklahoma City Memorial

August 13, 1997

Thank your very much. Thank you, Mayor, and thank you for your extraordinary leadership in a very difficult time. I thank you, Robert Johnson, for taking on this project and seeing it through with such care and ability and love. Governor, Kathy, thank you for being here. Councilman Schwartz, Madam Attorney General, I would like to thank you and, through you and Mr. Young, all the people who worked so hard on this from the Federal Government in the days and months and for a long time afterward. And Toby, thank you for the sapling. I will take good care of it. I have already been advised by the people who run the grounds here that I cannot run out and plant it—[*laughter*]—in the hot Washington summer but that we can keep it in our greenhouse, and then in October we will plant it alongside the dogwood on the

White House lawn. It is a great gift to the American people. It comes from what is a true tree of life, and that tree will always remind us of the city, the people who bent but did not break.

Hillary and I will never forget what happened on April 19, 1995, or our trips there afterward, the losses people endured, the heroism of the rescue workers, the compassion of the neighbors and the friends from around America. And I think we now know that, in spite of everything, you did not lose America. And America, I think, is very proud of the people of Oklahoma City and the entire State of Oklahoma. I think there is not a citizen in our country that didn't identify with the people in that awful moment and in the days afterward. Every one of us who ever came there and saw you wearing the pictures of your loved ones, we saw our children and our parents and our sisters and our brothers.

We owe you an enormous debt because you have given us a gift, too, of reminding us of what is truly important. I have talked to Governor Keating about this at times. You know, we went to college together, and we sort of weren't in the same political party back then either—[*laughter*]—and the issues that we deal with now make the ones we dealt with then seem small. But the truth is, here in this town where we do a lot of things that are very important and we argue and we debate and we ferociously struggle over things that in that awful moment were stripped of all their pretense and significance and we were reminded once again, as we are today, about the things which really count in life, the things which God has given to all of us, the things which no one can take away, and the things that perhaps we'll do a better job of never forgetting in the pressure of our daily lives when we sometimes are fooled into thinking that what we're doing now will be of some lasting benefit, more profound than the simple gift of life and the human spirit that we have been given and that it is our charge to preserve as best we can for all of our fellow citizens—that was a gift that the people of Oklahoma City gave to me, that your dignity and generosity, and yours, Mayor, and all the people gave to me, and I'm very grateful to you for it. And I think that maybe it makes all of us who were so moved by it a little more effective and a little more human day-in and day-out than we otherwise might have been. And for those of you who endured terrible losses, perhaps at least you can know that your loved ones and what they gave up live on in all of us trying just a little harder every day to be better people and to do the right thing than we might have otherwise done.

I want to also say that I have been terrifically impressed by the design for this memorial. It is elegant. It is symbolic. It manages to focus on this act of unconscionable violence and still honor the valor of the people of the community and the lives of the victims in a setting of reflection and peace that should leave people, when they go through it, feeling stronger rather than weaker. And that is no small task. So I'm glad, Hans and Torrey, you're here, and I wish Mr. Berg was here. This is an inspired effort, and you too will give, over time, millions of people a gift that is truly priceless.

Let me say, too—Mr. Johnson talked about this, but I want to compliment the process. I have no doubt that the totally open and democratic nature of this process, the reaching out to the family members and the survivors every step of the way, was absolutely indispensable to the healing of the people who were affected by what happened. I also have no doubt that it gave you a better memorial, a more powerful, more profound, more lasting memory. I also understand that there are several people here who have made substantial financial contributions to make it possible for the groundbreaking to occur next April, and I want to thank all of them. And having been involved in matters like this in the past, I want to encourage others to help them until the full cost is met.

Let me say that there's something we should do at the national level as well. We all know that the Oklahoma City bombing was an attack not just on the people, a city, a State but the Nation and, as the mayor said, on what we stand for, how we govern ourselves, and the values we live by. The Congress is now considering legislation to make all three components of the Oklahoma City Memorial a national monument and part of our national park system. I strongly support that goal. The tragedy was a national one, and the memorial should be recognized and embraced and supported by the Nation. Thanks to the Oklahoma City Memorial Foundation and the family members and the survivors, we have now reached another crucial stage in our recovery, and we have now a memorial that

I hope will be part of our national park system—a memorial of true power and amazing grace.

I'm grateful to all of you. I look forward to the success of the legislation. And again I say, you have helped our Nation, and for that we are very grateful.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:09 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Ronald J. Norick of Oklahoma City; Robert M. Johnson, chairman, Oklahoma City Memorial Foundation; Gov. Frank Keating of Oklahoma; Kathleen Treanor and Toby Thompson, relatives of bombing victims; Oklahoma City Councilman Mark Schwartz; R.L. (Buddy) Young, Region VI Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency; and memorial architects Hans-Ekkehard Butzer, Torrey Butzer, and Sven Berg.

Remarks Announcing Guidelines on Religious Exercise and Religious Expression in the Federal Workplace

August 14, 1997

Thank you. Thank you very much. To all the members of the coalition who are here and to those of you who brought your families, thank you very much for bringing them. Congressman Cardin, thank you for coming and for your steadfast support of this cause.

Secretary Riley, thank you for being willing to take on this difficult issue 2 years ago when a lot of people thought it was a no-win issue for you. And you did a superb job. And congratulations on persuading your wife to stay with you for 40 years. [*Laughter*] Someone suggested this morning that she should be nominated for the Presidential Medal of Freedom for that great endeavor. [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, you all know that we are here to announce the issuance of guidelines on freedom of religious expression in the Federal workplace. Our devotion to religious freedom has shaped our identity from the beginning, as the Vice President said.

Thomas Jefferson wrote, "We have solved the great and interesting question whether freedom of religion is compatible with order in Government and obedience to the laws. And we have experienced the quiet, as well as the comfort which results from leaving everyone to profess freely and openly those principles of religion which are the inductions of his own reason and the serious convictions of his own inquiries." The Founders understood that religious freedom is a two-sided coin, and therefore our Constitution protects the free exercise of religion while at the same time prohibiting the establishment of religion by the state. This careful balance is the genius, the enduring genius of the first amendment.

Indeed, because we are free to worship or not, according to our own conscience, as the Vice President said, Americans worship deeply and in very great numbers. Throughout our history, men and women have come to America to escape religious persecution elsewhere and secure religious freedom here.

Over time, we'd all have to admit that our own history on this has not been free from error, but over time, we have continued to do better, and more and more and more people of many different faiths have been able to put down roots and pursue their beliefs freely here. And the churches, the synagogues, the mosques, the other institutions of worship they have built not only have been their own houses of worship, they have also quite frequently become centers of service, compassion, and community life and, in so doing, have made our entire Nation stronger.

Our own experience in America has led the United States to become a leader in promoting religious rights throughout the world, as we see through the establishment last year of the Secretary of State's advisory committee on religious freedom as well as our willingness to press for religious freedom at the United Nations and in our bilateral relations with other countries across the globe. Last month, Secretary Albright released a report that underscores our commitment to helping people of all faiths worship

freely and live free of persecution as a birthright. Our commitment to religious liberty is, therefore, and it must remain, a key part of America's human rights policy and an important focus of our diplomacy.

We also continue to find work that we have to do here at home. In the 4½ years I have served as President, nothing has given me greater satisfaction than the efforts of our administration, working with a broad coalition of individuals and organizations from practically every faith, to support religious freedom here. Again let me thank all the members of the coalition for your support and for your guidance. And let me thank the Vice President for his shared conviction here. I especially want to thank Steve McFarland, Marc Stern, Eliot Mincberg, Buzz Thomas, and Rabbi David Saperstein for the particular work they have done to make today's announcement possible.

You and the other members of the coalition are the living embodiment of what I mean when I talk about one America, people coming together across the lines of faith and political conviction and race to protect the religious liberties we all cherish. You stood with us in 1993 when I was proud to sign the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. I was disappointed that the Supreme Court struck down parts of the act in June but pleased that its provisions still apply to Federal agencies, entities, and institutions. You stood with us in '95 with Secretary Riley when we issued the guidelines reaffirming that our young people did not have to leave their religious beliefs at the schoolhouse door. And we clarified the limits of religious expression permitted in our schools. I still say what I said then: No one can seriously question that it strengthens our young people to be able to pursue their own religious convictions and thereby gain values and strength, hope and reassurance that come with faith.

Today you stand with us again as we issue these guidelines to clarify and reinforce the right of religious expression in the Federal workplace. These guidelines will ensure that Federal employees and employers will respect the rights of those who engage in religious speech as well as those who do not. They do three things. First, they clarify that Federal employees may engage in personal religious expression to the greatest extent possible, consistent with workplace efficiency and the requirements of law. Second, they clarify that Federal employers may not discriminate in employment on the basis of religion. Third and finally, they clarify that an agency must reasonably accommodate employees' religious practices.

Today I'm instructing the Office of Personnel Management to distribute these guidelines to all civilian branch agencies and officials. And we expect all employees to follow them carefully. What we accomplish here together today shows what can be done to protect religious freedom within the bounds of our Constitution, when people of good will and faith come together.

My own faith, rooted in the assurance of things hoped for and the convictions of things unseen, calls those of us who share it to a lifelong effort not only to deepen the understanding of the soul but to bring our actions, thoughts, and feelings into harmony with God's will. On that journey, as I have said many times in the past, I have been immeasurably enriched by the power of the Torah, the beauty of the Koran, the piercing insights of the religions of East and South Asia and of our own Native Americans, the joyful energy that I have felt in black and Pentecostal churches, and yes, even the probing questions of the skeptics. That is America at its best.

My great hope is that we can enter this new century and this new millennium as the most successful multiracial, multiethnic, multireligious democracy the world has ever known. We will get there through efforts like this, men, women from all walks of life coming together to respect and celebrate our differences while uniting around the ideals that bind us together, more importantly, as one America.

Religious freedom is at the heart of what it means to be an American and at the heart of our journey to become truly one America. Let us pledge always to honor it and, today, to make these guidelines the source of harmony and strength as we guarantee to all of our people our precious liberty.

Thank you. God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m. in Room 450 in the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley's wife, Ann; Steven T. McFarland, director, Center for Law and Religious Freedom, Christian Legal Society; Marc Stern, legal counsel, American Jewish Congress; Eliot

Mincberg, general counsel and legal director, People for the American Way; Buzz Thomas, special counsel, National Council of Churches; and David Saperstein, director, Religious Action Center and Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Memorandum on Religious Exercise and Religious Expression in the Federal Workplace

August 14, 1997

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Religious Exercise and Religious Expression in the Federal Workplace

Religious freedom is central to the American system of liberty. Our Nation's founders erected the twin pillars of this freedom, guaranteeing the free exercise of religion and prohibiting the establishment of religion by the state, in the very First Amendment to the Constitution. Throughout our history, men and women have come to this Nation to escape religious persecution and secure this precious freedom. They and others have built a Nation in which religious practices and religious institutions have thrived—exactly because each individual has been able to choose for himself or herself whether and, if so, how to worship.

In the four and one-half years I have served as President, I have been proud of the efforts of my Administration, in tandem with a broad coalition of individuals and organizations, to support freedom of religion. In 1993, I was proud to reaffirm the rightful and historic place of religion throughout our society when I signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which continues to protect the exercise of religion from being inappropriately burdened by Federal agencies, entities, and institutions. In 1995, I was similarly proud to support the protection of appropriate religious expression in the public schools when I directed the Secretary of Education to issue guidance to public school districts on the extent of permissible prayer and other speech of a religious character.

Today, I focus on the Federal workplace, directing the heads of executive departments and agencies ("agencies") to comply with the *Guidelines on Religious Exercise and Religious Expression in the Federal Workplace* to be distributed today by the Office of Personnel Management. All civilian executive branch agencies, officials, and employees must follow these Guidelines carefully. Strict adherence to these Guidelines will ensure that agencies will respect the rights of those who engage in religious practices or espouse religious beliefs, as well as those who reject religion altogether. In particular, the Guidelines establish the following principles:

First, agencies shall permit employees to engage in personal religious expression (as they must permit other constitutionally valued expression) to the greatest extent possible, consistent with interests in workplace efficiency and requirements of law. Of course, the workplace is for work, and an agency may restrict any speech that truly interferes with its ability to perform public services. In addition, an agency may have a legal obligation to restrict certain forms of speech that intrude unduly on the legitimate rights of others. But when an agency allows nonreligious speech, because that speech does not impinge on these interests, an agency also usually must allow otherwise similar speech of a religious nature. The one exception to this principle of neutrality—an exception mandated by the Establishment Clause—is when religious speech would lead a reasonable observer to conclude that the Government is endorsing religion. Subject to this exception, an agency may not typically subject religious speech to greater restrictions than other speech entitled to full constitutional protection, and therefore should allow much of this speech to go forward.

Second, the Federal Government may not discriminate in employment on the basis of religion. This means that an agency may not hire or refuse to hire, promote or refuse to promote, or otherwise favor or disfavor a potential, current, or former employee because of his or her religion or religious beliefs. This means that an agency, or any supervisor within an agency, may

not coerce an employee to participate in religious activities (or to refrain from participating in otherwise permissible religious activities) by offering better (or threatening worse) employment conditions. And this means that an agency shall prevent any supervisor or any employee from engaging in religious harassment or creating, through the use of intimidation or pervasive or severe ridicule or insult, a religiously hostile environment.

Third, agencies must reasonably accommodate employees' religious practices. The need for accommodation arises in many circumstances—for example, when work schedules interfere with Sabbath or other religious holiday observances or when work rules prevent an employee from wearing religiously compelled dress. Once again, governmental interests in workplace efficiency may be at stake in such cases. But an agency, as specified in greater detail in the Guidelines, must always accommodate an employee's religious practice in the absence of nonspeculative costs and may need to accommodate such practice even when doing so will impose some hardship on the agency's operations.

All of these principles are related. All are but variants or applications of a single rule of neutrality and fairness—that agencies shall treat employees with the same respect and consideration, regardless of their religious beliefs. Whether by allowing religious speech, preventing religious coercion or harassment, or making accommodations to religious practice, the Federal Government must act to ensure that the Federal workplace is generous to followers of all religions, as well as to followers of none. The Guidelines will advance this goal. Although they doubtless will leave unresolved many difficult questions arising from specific factual contexts and circumstances, they will clarify the obligations and appropriate commitments of the Federal Government, acting as an employer, to protect and enhance religious freedoms.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Statement on Child Safety Locks for Handguns

August 14, 1997

This week, Smith and Wesson, the world's largest manufacturer of handguns, announced that it is forging a partnership with the Master Lock Co. to provide a child safety lock with every handgun sold for commercial use. I applaud both of these companies for their efforts to promote gun safety.

I particularly want to commend Smith and Wesson for taking an important and responsible step for children's safety. Child safety locks are the right thing to do. In 1994, 185 children were killed by accidental gunshot wounds. That is why my anti-gang and youth violence legislation would require that all federally licensed gun dealers provide such safety devices with every handgun sold. And that is why on March 3d I ordered all Federal agencies to provide child safety locks with the thousands of handguns they issue to Federal law enforcement officers.

Child safety locks have garnered the wide support of law enforcement, the medical community, many local governments, and now a part of the firearms manufacturing industry. This fall the full Senate considers the anti-juvenile crime legislation. I hope they will include the child safety lock as part of the legislation.

Remarks at the National Archives and Records Administration Announcing the White House Millennium Program

August 15, 1997

Thank you very much. Governor Carlin, thank you for hosting us here in this wonderful place, in the shadow of our most important historical documents. I thank the British and Australian

Ambassadors for joining us, along with representatives of the Embassies of Brazil, France, Iceland, and Germany. I'm glad we have so many people from our Cabinet here today, Secretaries Shalala, Riley, Slater; General McCaffrey; Dr. Varmus from the NIH; Joe Duffey, Director of the USIA; Senator Harris Wofford, the head of our national service efforts; Dr. John Brademas; Robert Stanton; and others who are here.

We have a number of citizens who've come from—some from quite a distance: the mayor of Beverly Hills, California, MeraLee Goldman is here; Mr. Pete Homer, the vice president of the National Indian Business Association; Mr. Leland Swenson, the president of the National Farmers Union, is here. And I want to make particular note of the Director of our initiative on race, Judy Winston, because that's going to be a very important part of what will happen as we prepare for the millennium.

As the First Lady said, this gives us a remarkable opportunity to honor the past and to imagine the future, and to connect the two in our own minds and for our fellow Americans. The 20th century has been called the American Century. Through wars and depression and industrial revolution and now an information revolution, our American spirit of discovery, innovation, and faith in the future have carried us forward and inspired billions of people around the world.

Now we have come to a milestone, nearing the end of an exhilarating decade that has seen the fall of communism and the rise of democracy around the world; the mapping of the mysteries of the human body and the exploration of the terrain of Mars; the creation of new American ideas and art. Now we have begun the most important exploration of all, I believe, rediscovering and reaffirming our common identity as a people in a very new and different time and coming together as one America.

Still early in our journey, we find ourselves at the turn of our first millennium as a nation. For centuries, people have wondered what this millennium would bring—would it signal an apocalypse or herald a new world, mark a time of decline or a time of renewal. Whatever the prophecies and forecasts—and there will be more and more and more coming out over the next couple of years—whatever the hopes and fears, the millennium is no longer a distant possibility. It has arrived. We are present at the future, a moment we must now define for ourselves and for our children.

As the year 2000 draws near, we must ask ourselves, what will it take to meet that challenge, to define that future, to prepare ourselves for a new century and a new millennium? What of our values and heritage will we carry with us? And what gifts shall we give to the future?

All over the world, nations and communities are preparing to observe the millennium with a wide variety of efforts. The United Kingdom will build bridges, museums, new parks, and a new university. Germany will hold Expo 2000, the first world's fair to mark a millennium. Today I am pleased to accept Chancellor Kohl's invitation for the United States to participate in Expo 2000, joining 143 other organizations and nations. Australia will host the 2000 Summer Olympics. Iceland will celebrate the 1000th anniversary of Leif Erikson's voyage to the New World.

The White House Millennium Program will guide and direct America's celebration of the millennium by showcasing the achievements that define us as a nation, our culture, our scholarship, our scientific exploration. I appreciate the interest that the First Lady has shown in this endeavor, and I'm pleased she will play a leading role in our ongoing efforts. I also appreciate the work that she and her staff have done already to bring us to this point today. And I want to thank Ellen McCulloch-Lovell, formerly Director of the President's Committee on Arts and Humanities, for agreeing to direct the White House Millennium Program Office. Thank you, Ellen.

Today I want to talk about what we are already doing to prepare ourselves for the 21st century and to make this new millennium our own. First and most important, we are making education our children's first priority. They will, after all, live out most of their lives in this new millennium and the new century. This month I signed historic legislation that balanced the budget but also includes the largest investment in education in a generation, from early childhood to college and beyond. In the coming months, I will continue to fight to finally establish high and measurable national standards of academic excellence.

By the year 2000, we have set a goal of connecting every single classroom and library in the entire United States to the Internet. I thank the Congress for funding that endeavor and the

private sector for helping us, so far, to stay slightly ahead of schedule. We must redouble our efforts to make sure that every one of our fellow citizens has the tools to succeed in the new century.

Second, we have to continue the path that has restored optimism and expansiveness to our economy but now to ensure that all Americans have a chance to benefit from it.

Third, we have to ensure that our unique and vibrant cultural life flourishes in the new century and that our rich history is treasured and preserved. I am pleased that the National Endowment for the Humanities will sponsor a nationally televised series of "Millennium Minutes" that spotlight 1,000 years of important people, events, and achievements. The National Endowment for the Arts leadership project for the millennium will tell America's stories through the arts and initiate projects such as new boys choirs modeled after the acclaimed Boys Choir of Harlem. The NEA will also send teams of photographers across the country to capture their vision of America at the turn of a new century. And the President's Committee on Arts and the Humanities will launch its worthy ancestors program, bringing together commercial, creative, and nonprofit sectors to save significant cultural materials from folk, popular, and classical traditions.

Fourth, we must take steps to make sure that the documents of our democracy are safe for the ages, for the millions of Americans and new immigrants and foreign visitors who view them every year. Believe it or not, the documents—the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence—are seriously threatened by the wear of time and the elements, unless we act in the next 3 years to save them. That is why I am very pleased that the National Archives, under Governor Carlin's leadership, has a 3-year plan to ensure that they will also survive into the next millennium.

The highest project for the millennium at the Smithsonian is to save our Star-Spangled Banner by 2001, the very flag that flew over Fort McHenry and inspired Francis Scott Key to write the poem that became our national anthem.

Fifth, we must continue to push the limits of science and technology and to continue to explore the universe. The July 4th landing of the *Sojourner* Mars probe transfixed the world. It is inspiring a new generation, and I hope very much that it has convinced a majority of Americans to continue to support our exploration of space. NASA will launch new robotic missions to Mars in 1998, 2001, and 2003.

The National Science Foundation will be 50 years old in the year 2000. To celebrate its anniversary and encourage young people to pursue careers in science, the Foundation will launch its National Science Foundation 2000 program, a national campaign on the importance of science, engineering, and mathematics.

Now, as the millennium turns, as we have all seen from countless press reports, so do the dates on our computers. Experts are concerned that many of our information systems will not differentiate between dates in the 20th and the 21st century. I want to assure the American people that the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local government and the private sector, is taking steps to prevent any interruption in Government services that rely on the proper functioning of Federal computer systems. We can't have the American people looking to a new century and a new millennium with their computers, the very symbol of modernity and the modern age, holding them back, and we're determined to see that it doesn't happen.

Sixth, we must make sure that the land God has given us is preserved for generations to come. At the beginning of the 20th century, Theodore Roosevelt said, "We are not building this country of ours for a day. It is to last through the ages." As we enter the new century, we have a moral obligation to continue that charge. We've already acted to protect some of our most treasured places, from Lake Tahoe to the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument to the Florida Everglades. And we are working to address the very real problem of climate change for the next century.

Next we must do everything we can to revive the spirit of citizen service in the new century. Every American ought to have the chance to serve. And I am very pleased that AmeriCorps, our national service program, has set a goal of doubling the number of full-time AmeriCorps volunteers by 2000. I'm also pleased that the Peace Corps will build on its legacy of service by setting a goal of tripling the size of its global learning partnership, World Wise Schools, by the new millennium. This program connects

Peace Corps volunteers with teachers and students right here in America to promote international and intercultural understanding.

And finally, we must continue to come together as one America. As Walt Whitman once said, "We are a nation of nations." It is our diversity, alive in our democracy, that is the source of our creativity, our inventiveness, our ability to communicate all around the world. That is why last June I called upon all of our fellow Americans to begin a great national conversation on race and reconciliation to help to carry us into a new millennium.

Now, these are just a few of the ways we are planning to celebrate the new millennium and make it our own. Ultimately, every American must decide what gifts he or she will give to the future, but each has a responsibility for our common destiny. So let me urge every citizen, every family, every community to think of ways to celebrate and commemorate the millennium, from rebuilding and rejuvenating your local schools to restoring historic monuments to recording oral histories of family members.

Already, cities all across America are planning celebrations of their own. Over the next 3 years, the First Lady and I will work with Governors, mayors, community leaders, to make the millennium a truly national celebration of gifts to the future. I invite you to share your ideas with us by visiting our new White House Millennium Program website at www.whitehouse.gov. I decided that I have a future giving out 800 numbers and websites. [*Laughter*] We only can hope to equal the number of hits that Governor Carlin has already said the Archives have.

This is a serious thing. We want the best ideas we can to commemorate, to energize, and to drive the largest possible number of Americans to work together to make contributions to the future. And technology can help us do it. We want people of all ages and all walks of life to give us their ideas through the website. Over the next 3 years the site will give us a chance also to tell the American people about what we're planning. We will award the best local projects with the honorary title "Millennium Communities." And we'll post those stories on our websites for other communities to read about and learn from.

Other nations are keenly interested in what we're doing to mark the millennium and today, therefore, the Voice of America is broadcasting this event around the world. The Voice of America is also launching its own project, a series of special broadcasts about how we are celebrating the millennium.

We mark our own lives by milestones and anniversaries. We mark the timeline of our Nation with commemorations: the bicentennial of our independence, the 50th anniversary of D-Day, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in the Pacific, next month the 40th anniversary of the Supreme Court's historic order to integrate Little Rock Central High School. Each of our major turning points was an affirmation of our values, and as we recall them, we renew those values and gain new energy from them.

With the millennium, we must now decide how to think about our commitment to the future. Thomas Paine said a long time ago, "We have it in our power to begin the world over again." We have always believed that in this country, and we must now take it upon ourselves to take stock as we approach this new millennium to commit ourselves to begin the world over again for our children, our children's children, for people who will live in a new century. It is to the people of that new century that we must all offer our very best gifts. It is for them that we will celebrate the millennium.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:43 a.m. in the Rotunda. In his remarks, he referred to John Carlin, Archivist of the United States; Sir John Cerr, British Ambassador to the United States; Andrew Peacock, Australian Ambassador to the United States; John Brademas, Chair, President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities; and Robert Stanton, Director, National Park Service.

Statement on Signing the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act
August 15, 1997

I am pleased today to sign into law H.R. 408, the "International Dolphin Conservation Program Act". This Act is the product of a bipartisan effort by the Congress, my Administration, and a number of major environmental groups and U.S. fishermen. The Act will ensure that one of the best international programs to conserve marine resources will be strengthened and continued.

The protection of dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, where these marine mammals swim together with schools of yellowfin tuna, has long been a high priority for the United States. Strengthening the International Dolphin Conservation Program through this legislation is a major victory for strong international efforts to protect dolphins caught during tuna fishing in this region.

The Act recognizes that ongoing international efforts have been a tremendous success—dolphin mortalities have been reduced by more than 98 percent from previous levels. Foreign nations, whose fishing fleets have contributed to this success, will no longer face U.S. embargoes on their tuna products if they continue to participate effectively in this international program.

One of the major provisions of this Act is the change in the definition of the standard for the "dolphin-safe" label affixed to canned tuna sold in the United States. The definition of dolphin-safe will be changed to mean that no dolphins were killed or seriously injured during harvesting of the tuna. The label change will take effect in March 1999 unless the Secretary of Commerce determines that tuna fishing by encircling dolphins has a significant adverse impact on dolphin stocks. United States policy on this question has been and will continue to be based on the best available scientific information.

Unfortunately, H.R. 408 also contains provisions that could be construed to direct how the Nation's foreign affairs should be conducted. The Constitution vests the President with special authority to conduct the Nation's foreign affairs, and this authority necessarily entails the exercise of discretion. Thus, section 4(e), that portion of section 6(c) that amends section 302 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and section 7(c) will be construed to be advisory within the executive branch.

In approving H.R. 408, I would like to recognize Congressmen Gilchrest, Cunningham, Saxton, Cardin, and Green and Senators Breaux, Stevens, McCain, Kerry, Snowe, and Hollings for their efforts in the passage of this legislation.

The strictly enforced dolphin protection regime that this Act endorses is a model of effective international cooperation on an important environmental matter, and I am pleased to sign it.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
August 15, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 408, approved August 15, was assigned Public Law No. 105–42.

The President's Radio Address
August 16, 1997

Good morning. As families across America start to prepare for the new school year, I'd like to talk about how students and parents can make the most of the historic higher education opportunities in our new balanced budget.

The balanced budget I signed into law last week meets the Nation's obligation to offer opportunity to every American who's willing to work for it. It opens the doors to college to a new generation, with the largest investment in higher education since the GI bill 50 years ago. We have achieved a truly remarkable goal: For the first time ever, all children in America who study hard will have the opportunity to

go on to college. Let me tell you just a few of the ways our budget will make that possible.

First, the budget offers HOPE scholarships, a tax credit of up to $1,500, as much as the average community college tuition, that will help to make the first 2 years of college as universal as 4 years of high school are today.

Second, the budget creates a new lifetime learning credit targeted at college juniors and seniors, graduate students, and adults who want to enhance their skills. Under this initiative, for example, a homemaker who wants to return to school full time to become a teacher can get a 20 percent tax credit on the first $5,000 of her tuition bill. By the year 2003, that credit will grow even larger, applying to up to $10,000 in tuition and fees.

Third, beginning this January, parents and grandparents can withdraw money from their individual retirement accounts, without any penalty, to pay for higher education expenses. They can also open up brandnew education IRA's which will allow them to invest $500 per child every year to build up money, tax-free, for college.

Fourth, our budget agreement provides the largest increase in Pell grants in two decades and gives about 350,000 more students the scholarships they deserve. These new initiatives will greatly expand educational opportunity for American families.

But there is another crucial part of the college equation, and that is responsibility, the responsibility of every student and every parent to prepare for the future. As Hillary and I have learned, parents can't wait to plan for college until their children are in their junior or senior years of high school. In fact, education experts say it's essential that parents sit down with their kids as early as the sixth grade to start charting a course toward college. In the crucial middle school years, parents must encourage their children to take challenging classes. Research shows, for example, that students who take algebra and geometry by the end of the ninth grade are much more likely to go on to college than those who don't.

In the new economy of the 21st century, what our children earn will depend more than ever on what they can learn. Almost 90 percent of the new jobs being created today require more than a high school level of literacy and math skills. Yet more than half of the people entering the work force are not prepared with these skills. So we still have a lot of work to do.

Throughout the fall, my administration will work very hard to make sure that parents and students learn how to take advantage of the new higher education opportunities they now have. As a first step, Education Secretary Dick Riley and his staff have prepared an extremely useful guide for parents of children in middle school, junior high, and high school. It's called "Getting Ready for College Early." You can get a free copy by calling the Department of Education at 1–800–USA–LEARN, 1–800–USA–LEARN.

From the day I took office I have been working on a simple idea: When my child is my age, I want our country to be a place where every person who works hard has a chance to live out his or her God-given abilities and dreams. With the education opportunities contained in our historic balanced budget, we have taken a large step toward that goal.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 1:21 p.m. on August 15 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on August 16.

Remarks on the United Parcel Service Strike

August 17, 1997

I have just had a conversation with Secretary Herman and with Bruce Lindsey. It's clear that they're making progress in the talks between UPS and the Teamsters, and I just want to urge them to redouble their efforts. This strike is beginning to hurt not only the company but its employees and the people who depend on it. And I think they ought to redouble their efforts to settle this strike, and they ought to do it today. And that's my encouragement to them. I'm pleased by the progress that's been

made, and I hope they'll just stay there and settle it today.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 1 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to his departure for Block Island, Rhode Island. In his remarks he referred to Bruce Lindsay, Deputy Counsel to the President.

Remarks Upon Arrival in Block Island, Rhode Island
August 17, 1997

Thank you. Well, first of all, let me say that Hillary and Chelsea and I are delighted to be here. We want to thank the Senator for coming over with us and thank the first warden for coming out to meet us. It took me a little—a moment to realize that the first warden was the highest elected official on the island. I thought maybe I was about to be arrested for something. [*Laughter*]

And let me say I was stunned to see this crowd when we were coming down in the helicopter. But this is the first opportunity I have had to thank the people of Rhode Island for giving the Vice President and me the enormous vote of confidence we got here last November. And I'm very grateful to you. Thank you so much.

Let me also say I'm just anxious to be here and have some fun. And I want to go through the crowd and shake hands. I want to have a picture taken with the students there from the Block Island School.

And I hope that all of you will always be committed to preserving this beautiful island. I was so impressed when I came down, and Senator Reed was telling me a little about the conservation efforts. We have, all of us, a great responsibility to future generations to figure out how to keep growing this economy. I'm very grateful for the economic success that our Nation has had, for the millions of new jobs we have, for the lowest unemployment and inflation rates in decades. But we have to do it in a way that preserves the natural heritage that God has given us. I can see you're committed to that here, and I hope you will help to spread that to people all across New England and, indeed, all across the United States.

Again, thanks for having us here. We're delighted. And I want to get out and say hello to a few people.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:32 p.m. at Block Island Airport. In his remarks, he referred to First Warden Kimberly H. Gaffett.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Implementation of the Defense Exports Monitoring Program
August 18, 1997

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

As required by section 40A of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2785), I transmit herewith the first annual report on the implementation of a comprehensive program to monitor the end-use of defense articles and services, and to prevent the diversion of technology incorporated in defense articles, sold, leased, or exported under the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 *et seq.*).

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives,

and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on August 19.

Remarks on the Tentative Settlement of the United Parcel Service Strike and an Exchange With Reporters in Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts

August 19, 1997

The President. Good afternoon. I would like to compliment UPS and the Teamsters on resolving their differences and agreeing to a new contract. I think it is very much in the interest not only of the company and its employees but also of all of the people it serves and of the United States, and I'm very pleased about it.

I also want to say a special word of thanks and appreciation to Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman, who I believe did a very fine job in working with the parties, trying to keep them working together and getting back together. I know that she deserves and will get some much-needed rest today. But I think it's a good thing for the country, and I'm very pleased it's resolved.

Q. Mr. President, can you walk through your own evolution in this? The first 2 weeks were sort of hands off, and then on Saturday you gave them a little bit of a nudge, and then by the time you reached Martha's Vineyard, it seemed a little more like a push. Why, specifically, did you choose to engage at those two moments?

The President. Well, first of all, the Secretary of Labor had been involved with this almost from the beginning. But I thought it was important to give the parties a chance to work out their differences. And obviously, I was getting reports about where they were. I just wanted to—when it was obvious that they were quite close—it's been my observation, not just from them but sometimes in our negotiations with Congress, for example—sometimes you get very close, and you've got 95 percent of the issues or 99 percent of the issues resolved, and maybe just a little nudge in the right direction helps you go over the top. And I was just hoping to do that.

They did the work, and they deserve the credit. They resolved their differences in a way that I think will be good for the company and good for the employees.

Q. Mr. President, is this an outright victory for the labor movement?

The President. I think it's a victory for the proposition that you can have a profitable, highly competitive company with good, solid labor relations providing good jobs and good benefits for the employees. That's what I think it's a victory for. It's not an outright victory if you mean it's also a defeat for UPS; I wouldn't characterize it that way. I think this company will go forward. It will do real well, and the workers will do well. And they've made some important agreements around the side about how they're going to work together to be even more productive and competitive, so I would say that it is a victory for the proposition that you can have good, strong labor relations and treat your employees well and make money in this economy of ours. That's what I wanted to prove from the time I became President, so I was very pleased by it.

Q. Mr. President, how much of an economic threat would there have been if this strike had not been resolved when it was, if it had gone on much longer?

The President. It's hard to say. That would depend upon something we'll never know, which is how quickly others could have absorbed the capacity. But it could have been very difficult for both the company and for its employees. So I think they were both advantaged by making the agreement they did before any irreparable harm was done to both sides. And that may well have been something they were thinking of.

The President's Birthday

Q. On a more personal note, sir, how does it feel to be another year older?

The President. Well, it feels good today. I've had a wonderful time here. I had a good day yesterday on the golf course, and this morning I got up and Chelsea and I went jogging. That's

the longest I've been able to go since I hurt myself. And the three of us are just going to spend the day reading and playing games and having fun with each other, and then we're going to go to a party tonight. So I feel very blessed, and I'm very fortunate to be here. And as far as I know, I'm in good health, and the country's doing well. That's the most important thing of all. So I'm very happy today, and I have a lot to be thankful for.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:43 p.m. at the Richard Friedman residence.

Statement on the Tentative Settlement of the United Parcel Service Strike

August 19, 1997

We have learned tonight that UPS and the Teamsters have reached a tentative settlement in their contract negotiations. I am pleased that the parties negotiated in good faith. Today's agreement represents their hard work and determination to reconcile their differences for the good of the company, its employees, and the customers they serve. The issues that were at the heart of their negotiations are important to our Nation's economic strength and to all Americans.

I want to especially thank my Secretary of Labor, Alexis Herman, who worked tirelessly with both sides to enable them to reach this tentative agreement.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Prohibiting Certain Transactions With Respect to Iran

August 19, 1997

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

On March 15, 1995, I reported to the Congress that, pursuant to section 203(a) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702(a)) ("IEEPA") and section 201(a) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1621(a)) ("NEA"), I had exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency to respond to the actions and policies of the Government of Iran and to issue Executive Order 12957, which prohibited United States persons from entering into contracts for the financing or the overall management or supervision of the development of petroleum resources located in Iran or over which Iran claims jurisdiction. On May 6, 1995, I exercised my authority under these statutes and under section 505(a) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 (22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(a)) ("ISDCA") to issue Executive Order 12959, which imposed additional measures to respond to Iran's intensified efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction and to its continuing support for international terrorism, including support for acts that undermine the Middle East peace process. Executive Order 12959 imposed a comprehensive trade and investment embargo on Iran.

Following the imposition of these restrictions, Iran has continued to engage in activities that represent a threat to the peace and security of all nations. I have found it necessary to take additional measures to confirm that the embargo on Iran prohibits all trade and investment activities by United States persons, wherever located, and to consolidate in one order the various prohibitions previously imposed to deal with the national emergency declared on March 15, 1995. I have issued a new Executive order and hereby report to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)), section 301 of the NEA (50 U.S.C. 1631), and section 505(c) of the ISDCA (22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c)).

The new order I have issued with respect to Iran confirms the prohibition of the following transactions:

— importation into the United States of any goods or services of Iranian origin or owned or controlled by the Government of Iran, except information or informational material;
— exportation, reexportation, sale, or supply from the United States or by a United States person, wherever located, of goods, technology, or services to Iran or the Government of Iran, including knowing transfers to a third country for direct or indirect supply, transshipment, or reexportation to Iran or the Government of Iran, or specifically for use in the production of, commingling with, or incorporation into goods, technology, or services to be supplied, transshipped, or reexported exclusively or predominantly to Iran or the Government of Iran;
— reexportation from a third country by a person other than a United States person of certain U.S. origin goods, services, or technology that are subject to export license application requirements under any United States regulations imposed independently of this embargo;
— purchase, sale, transport, swap, brokerage, approval, financing, facilitation, guarantee, or other transactions or dealings by United States persons, wherever located, related to direct or indirect trade with Iran or the Government of Iran or to goods or services of Iranian origin or owned or controlled by the Government of Iran;
— new investment by United States persons in Iran or in property or entities owned or controlled by the Government of Iran, making clear that the applicable dates under the prior orders continue to govern for purposes of defining "new" investments;
— approval, financing, facilitation, or guarantee by a United States person of any transaction by a foreign person that a United States person would be prohibited from performing under the embargo; and
— any evasion, avoidance, or attempt to violate a prohibition under the order.

By confirming that United States persons are prohibited from engaging in any trade- or investment-related activities with Iran, I want to make clear that this means all direct or indirect involvement in such activities wherever those activities occur.

This new Executive order provides that the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. There are certain transactions subject to prohibition under this order that I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to authorize through licensing, including transactions by United States persons related to the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal in The Hague, established pursuant to the Algiers Accords, and other international obligations and U.S. Government functions. In addition, under appropriate conditions, United States persons may be licensed to participate in market-based swaps of crude oil from the Caspian Sea area for Iranian crude oil in support of energy projects in Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, and Kazakstan.

The new Executive order takes effect at 12:01 a.m. eastern daylight time on August 20, 1997. Revocation of corresponding provisions in prior Executive orders does not affect the applicability of those provisions, or of regulations, licenses or other administrative actions taken pursuant to those provisions, with respect to any transaction or violation occurring before the new Executive order takes effect. Specific licenses issued pursuant to prior Executive orders continue in effect, unless revoked or amended by the Secretary of the Treasury. General licenses, regulations, orders, and directives issued pursuant to prior orders continue in effect, except to the extent inconsistent with this order or otherwise revoked or modified by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The declaration of national emergency made by Executive Order 12957 remains in effect and is not affected by this order.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

The President's Radio Address
August 23, 1997

Good morning. Today I want to talk about the tools we need to keep our economy growing in a way that helps all our people to prosper and advances America's leadership in the world as we move into the 21st century.

For nearly 5 years now, we have pursued a new economic course for America, with three parts: eliminate the deficit, invest in education and training, and open new markets abroad for America's products and services. It is working. The American people are enjoying the longest period of sustained economic growth in a generation, with 12 million new jobs, unemployment below 5 percent, core inflation at a 30-year low. Once again America is the world's number one exporter, the world's largest producer of semiconductors, the world's largest producer of automobiles. Our Nation has been ranked the world's most competitive economy for the last 5 years.

With a strong and prosperous America moving into the 21st century, we must continue our successful economic strategy. In 1993 we passed an economic plan that cut the deficit 75 percent in 4 years. And now we have a balanced budget with an historic focus on education and incentives to bring jobs to people and places that still don't have them.

But to keep America growing, to keep America leading, we have to continue to create high-wage jobs, and to do that, we must continue to expand American exports. After all, 95 percent of the world's consumers live beyond our borders. Already, over the last 4 years, more than 25 percent of our economic growth has come from overseas trade. Now, that's a big reason more than half our new jobs in the last 2 years have paid above average wages, because export-related jobs pay, on average, about 15 percent more than nonexport jobs. And today, our exports support more than 11 million good, high-paying American jobs, including one in five of our manufacturing jobs.

To keep our economy growing and to create these good jobs, we must keep tearing down foreign barriers to American goods and services. That's why next month I will ask Congress to renew Presidential fast-track authority to negotiate tough new trade agreements. This is authority that every President from both parties has had since 1974. I will use it to negotiate trade agreements that will keep us competitive, boost our exports, create more good jobs, and raise our standard of living.

This fast-track authority will do three things. First, it gives the President the flexibility I need to forge strong agreements in sectors where our Nation is most competitive, such as agriculture, information technology, medical equipment, and environmental technology. Second, it will strengthen my ability to get worldwide agreements, especially for our Nation's farmers, tearing down barriers in the world agricultural market. It will also help to ensure that American companies and workers compete in the global economy in a contest that is open, with a level playing field, with rules that are fair and enforced. Third, it will help me to negotiate more open markets with specific countries, especially in Latin America and Asia. In the coming century, these emerging markets in Latin America and Asia are expected to grow 3 times as fast as our own, and their demand for United States goods and services is already taking off. If we don't seize these new opportunities our competitors surely will. Already, since 1992, in Latin America and Asia alone, our competitors have negotiated 20 trade agreements that do not include the United States.

To make sure all our people share the fruits of increased prosperity and commerce, I also will continue to promote worker rights and responsible environmental policies with our trading partners. And I'll keep working to strengthen retraining and educational opportunities for workers here. We have to pull together, not apart, to compete and win in the global economy.

For more than two decades now, on a bipartisan basis, Congress has consistently supported initiatives to open markets and create jobs, including the President's authority to break down trade barriers around the world. Our workers and our businesses are the best in the world, but they can't compete in the slow lane. I look forward to working closely with Congress to keep American prosperity on the fast track.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 7 p.m. on August 22 at a private residence in Martha's Vineyard, MA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on August 23.

Memorandum on Law Enforcement in Indian Country
August 25, 1997

Memorandum for the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior

Subject: Law Enforcement in Indian Country

I am proud of my Administration's progress in reducing violent crime and improving public safety for our Nation's citizens. Our efforts are making an important difference. Nationwide, the violent crime rate has dropped approximately 17 percent since 1992, and the homicide rate has declined about 22 percent.

Unfortunately, during the same time period life has become more violent for the 1.2 million Indian citizens who live on or near reservations. Homicide rates, for example, have increased to levels that often surpass those in large American cities. Numbers alone, however, cannot convey the tragic impact of such violence on Indian families and their communities.

This and other information you have provided to me make clear that we need to refocus on this growing problem. While some tribal governments have developed strong law enforcement programs, many others have encountered significant difficulty in doing so. Many Indian citizens receive police, investigative, and detention services that lag far behind even this country's poorest jurisdictions.

The Federal Government has taken steps to address this problem. My Administration has sought increased Department of the Interior funding and tribal control of law enforcement programs on Indian lands. This year, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) established an Office of Indian Country Investigations in its Violent Crimes Section, allocating additional agents to Indian Country. The FBI also initiated a nationwide outreach training program for Indian Country law enforcement officers. We have created additional tribal liaison positions in the United States Attorney's Offices in Indian Country, intended to improve our ability to bring offenders to justice. Through our Community Oriented Policing Services Program, we have assisted tribal law enforcement agencies in hiring officers in Indian Country.

Yet, law enforcement in Indian Country remains a serious problem. For these reasons, consistent with the spirit of my 1994 memorandum on government-to-government relations and tribal self governance, I hereby request that you work with tribal leaders to analyze law enforcement problems on Indian lands. By December 31, 1997, you should provide options to me for improving public safety and criminal justice in Indian Country. To the extent that these options might affect the Departments' budgets, they should be included in your fiscal year 1999 budget submissions and should be consistent with the funding targets of the Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Message on the Observance of Labor Day, 1997
August 29, 1997

Warm greetings to all Americans as we commemorate our nation's 103rd Labor Day holiday.

This year, we have cause to celebrate on behalf of the men and women who toil to help secure our country's economic well-being, because on this Labor Day the minimum wage increases to $5.15 per hour. This raise will help nearly 10 million hard-working Americans build a better future. Thomas Jefferson once said, "In matters of principle, stand like a rock." This increase in the minimum wage affirms our commitment to "stand like a rock" for our working

families and their right to jobs that provide fair compensation.

As we celebrate Labor Day, we should also give thanks to those who came before us and who strived to improve working conditions and create fair labor laws. Many risked their livelihoods and often their very lives to ensure that children, who once worked in mines and factories, could go to school; that laborers could work without risking injury; and that Americans who toiled throughout the week would be rewarded with a decent living and time to raise their families. These reformers brought dignity to the workplace and integrity to our society.

Workers are the heart and soul of our nation. Yet, we will only see wages grow and the number of jobs steadily increase for those workers if we emphasize education and training, partnership between labor and management, and responsibility by all for improving the quality of the goods and services we produce. In the twilight of this century, it is our responsibility to prepare our workers for the challenges of the next. As we pause today to celebrate the many contributions of the American worker, let us rededicate ourselves to this important effort.

Best wishes to all for a memorable Labor Day.

BILL CLINTON

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting an Alternative Plan for Federal Civilian Employee Pay Adjustments

August 29, 1997

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

I am transmitting an alternative plan for Federal civilian employee pay adjustments, to take effect in January 1998.

Under title 5, United States Code, Federal civilian employees would receive a two-part pay raise in January 1998: (1) a 2.8 percent base salary raise linked to the part of the Employment Cost Index (ECI) that deals with changes in the wages and salaries of private industry workers; and (2) a locality pay raise, based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics' salary surveys of nonfederal employers in local pay areas, costing about 7.2 percent of payroll. Thus, on a cost-of-payroll basis, the total Federal employee pay increase would be about 10 percent in 1998.

But, for each part of the two-part pay increase, title 5 gives me the authority to implement an alternative pay adjustment plan if I view the adjustment that would otherwise take effect as inappropriate due to "national emergency or serious economic conditions affecting the general welfare." Over the past 20 years, Presidents have used this or similar authority for most annual Federal pay raises.

In evaluating "an economic condition affecting the general welfare," the law directs me to consider such economic measures as the Index of Leading Economic Indicators, the Gross National Product, the unemployment rate, the budget deficit, the Consumer Price Index, the Producer Price Index, the Employment Cost Index, and the Implicit Price Deflator for Personal Consumption Expenditures.

In assessing Federal civilian pay increases for 1998, I reviewed the indicators cited above as well as other pertinent economic and budgetary factors—including the compatibility of pay increases with the limits on Federal discretionary spending under the Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement.

The Budget Agreement continues the spending discipline that my Administration initiated in 1993 and that has contributed to sustained economic growth, low inflation and unemployment, and a sharp cut in the budget deficit. Full statutory civilian pay increases of 10 percent in 1998 are inconsistent with the task of reaching balance by 2002. They would cost about $7.9 billion in 1998 alone—$5.7 billion more than the 2.8 percent increase I proposed in my fiscal 1998 Budget—and would build in later years. Such cost increases either would threaten our achieving balance by 2002, or force deep cuts in discretionary spending or Federal employment to stay within spending targets. Neither outcome is acceptable for maintaining the economic prosperity of the American people.

Therefore, I have determined that my proposal for a total civilian raise of 2.8 percent

remains appropriate. This raise matches the 2.8 percent basic pay increase that I proposed for military members in my fiscal 1998 Budget, and that the Congress will likely include in the 1998 defense authorization bill.

Because many Federal civilian employees do not receive locality pay, I will put the bulk of the 2.8 percent adjustment into the general increase under section 5303, thus giving all employees a meaningful raise. I will apply the remainder to increasing the locality-based comparability payments under section 5304.

Accordingly, I have determined that:

(1) Under the authority of section 5303(b) of title 5, United States Code, the pay rates for each statutory pay system shall be increased by 2.3 percent, effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1998.

(2) Under the authority of section 5304a of title 5, United States Code, locality-based comparability payments in the amounts set forth on the attached table shall be effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1998. When compared with the payments now in effect, these comparability payments will increase the General Schedule payroll by about 0.5 percent.

Finally, the law requires that I include in this report an assessment of the impact of my decisions on the Government's ability to recruit and retain well-qualified employees. While I regret that our fiscal situation does not permit granting Federal employees a larger pay increase, I do not believe that it will materially affect our ability to continue to attract and retain a quality Federal work force.

Due to our continuing efforts to reinvent Government, creating a Government that works better and costs less, the number of Federal employees continues to fall; consequently, hiring and attrition are low. In addition, should the need arise, the Government has many tools, such as recruitment bonuses, retention allowances, and special salary rates, to maintain the high quality work force that serves our Nation so very well.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

The President's Radio Address
August 30, 1997

Good morning. This week a record number of American children will be heading back to school, reminding us of our greatest obligation, to prepare our children for the 21st century. We can't do that without a commitment to educational excellence for all those children, expecting them to meet high standards and testing to see if they do.

In my State of the Union Address, I challenged every State to adopt high national standards of academic excellence, defining what every child should learn, and by 1999, to join in a national test for all fourth graders in reading and all eighth graders in math, to ensure they have mastered these basics.

We know that challenging our students to achieve excellence works. This week the College Board announced that SAT math scores continue to rise; and today the National Assessment for Education Progress, the organization that issues what we call the Nation's report card, announced that in recent years we have improved math and science performance at every age level. Most exciting, more high schoolers are taking challenging courses and college-level courses.

Still, we all know we have more to do to improve our schools and to raise learning levels for all of our students. I've been working to improve education for nearly 20 years now, and I am convinced we can give our children the education they need to thrive in the 21st century only by setting high standards and by challenging students, teachers, parents, and principals to meet them. National standards will help us to upgrade curricula, improve teaching, and target students and schools who need assistance.

I'm pleased that Governors and mayors from all over the country, business leaders, and educators from States and cities, big and small, people of both parties, are joining in this effort. We're working to make sure this doesn't become a partisan issue.

Some people worry that the Federal Government would play too large a role in developing the test. To meet that concern, I have instructed my staff to rewrite our proposal to make sure these tests are developed not by the Department of Education but by an independent bipartisan board created by Congress many years ago. This will make sure these tests measure what they should, nothing more, nothing less.

Still, there are some in Congress who, even as our children are heading back to school, are working to undermine the very progress in education our children are counting on. They have proposed an amendment that would prevent us from developing a common test for math and reading and, therefore, would prevent your school district or your State or your child from choosing to take the test. That means you won't be able to find out if your child's school is meeting world-class standards.

The arguments they're using are the very same ones we've heard for years now. They amount to a determination to avoid accountability. Some say we shouldn't pay for test development even though it's being done by an independent body. Some say the test will be misused, even though participation is voluntary and is clearly designed to show how students and schools are doing and to show the way toward improving them. Some say it's unfair to poor kids and kids of immigrant parents, even though many big-city school districts, including those in six of seven of our largest cities, say they want to be a part of the test and the national standards movement even if their States don't.

The fact is high standards are essential to providing our children the best education in the world, and I intend to do whatever is necessary to make sure we move forward.

The 21st century will be a time of remarkable opportunity. With high national education standards, we can make sure all our children have the education they need to seize these opportunities. Without them, our children will continue to pay for our own low expectations and our own limited vision for them. Our children, our schools, our future are far too important to be anything less than world class. Let us move forward into the 21st century with high standards and make sure we meet them.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6:04 p.m. on August 29 at a private residence in Martha's Vineyard, MA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on August 30.

Remarks in a Telephone Conversation From Martha's Vineyard With the WNBA Champion Houston Comets

August 30, 1997

Coach Van Chancellor. Mr. President?

The President. Coach, congratulations.

Coach Chancellor. Well, thank you very much. You know, we're from neighboring States. I'm a Mississippi boy.

The President. You are?

Coach Chancellor. Yes, I am.

The President. Well, double congratulations.

Coach Chancellor. Well, thank you very much.

The President. I'll tell you what, I've followed the season this year. I've watched several games on television. I've really enjoyed it, and I had a chance to get to know some of the players in the league when I went running with the women's Olympic team a couple of years ago, and I think it's just been a great thing. I hope it'll be a success and go forward. And you had a great season and a great team, and you had a good game tonight.

Coach Chancellor. Well, thank you very much. I do appreciate you taking the time to call our locker room. That means a lot to the women of this team and to this coaching staff.

The President. Can you hear me?

Coach Chancellor. Yes, I can hear you.

The President. We're on a cell phone, but I think we're doing all right. I can hear you fine.

Coach Chancellor. Yes. I do appreciate your support of women's athletics in general.

The President. Well, I'm strongly supportive of it, and I hope that—like I said, I want you to stay with it, and I'll be supporting you all the way, and congratulate the players for me.

Coach Chancellor. I will. They're all in the dressing room, and they will be honored that you have called us.

The President. Cynthia had a great game, and any of us who has ever been through a childbirth were awful impressed when Sheryl Swoopes came back to play so quickly.

Coach Chancellor. Yes. I'm amazed that she was able to have a child and come back and play for us. Cynthia's had some great games. This has just been a total team effort for us.

The President. Yes. Well, give them my best, and I hope to see you up here someday pretty soon.

Coach Chancellor. Okay. I would love to come up there.

The President. Thank you, Van.

Coach Chancellor. And thank you very much for calling us. I'm very honored.

The President. Bye-bye.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:50 p.m. from a private residence to the game site at The Summit in Houston, TX. In his remarks, he referred to Houston Comets players Cynthia Cooper and Sheryl Swoopes.

Remarks in a Telephone Conversation From Martha's Vineyard With the WNBA Second Place New York Liberty

August 30, 1997

The President. Hello?

Maureen Coyle. We have a couple of people here who want to say hi to you.

The President. Oh, great. Congratulations on your season.

Team members. Thank you!

The President. I can't believe you're all there.

Ms. Coyle. Our head coach, Nancy Darsch, wanted to say hey to you.

The President. Great.

Coach Nancy Darsch. Hey, Mr. President, how are you?

The President. I'm fine, Coach. Congratulations on your season.

Coach Darsch. Well, thank you. We met this past fall at Ohio State, and I'm glad to say that I've moved on, taken this team to the WNBA championships, and I'm jealous of you being on Martha's Vineyard, my home State.

The President. Well, it's beautiful up here, and I tell you, I was really pleased with the way your first season worked out. I saw a lot of the games on television and tried to keep up with you, and I hope that there's a bright future ahead for it. I'm really enthusiastic about it, and I'm very pleased about all that you and all your players have done to keep it going.

Coach Darsch. Well, thank you very much. We're very happy that you've followed us and very pleased that you have been able to reach us here tonight.

The President. What are you doing? Are you having a party somewhere?

Team members. Yes!

Coach Darsch. We are having a celebration of our season. We're very proud of the way that we've played this season and of the WNBA inaugural season and also the fact that we all kind of separate here in the near future. So we're having a little get-together, and probably someone here that you are very well familiar with, Teresa Weatherspoon, as well as Rebecca Lobo, would like to say hello to you.

The President. Yes, I know them both. [*Laughter*]

Teresa Weatherspoon. What's happening, Mr. President? [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, I wish——

Ms. Weatherspoon. This is Teresa Weatherspoon talking to you.

The President. I wish I were there with you. How are you doing?

Ms. Weatherspoon. I'm doing fine. We're doing much better. We're enjoying ourselves and just happy to be able to say hello to you.

The President. Well, I'm proud of your season. I know that you're feeling good, and I think that you've really got the interest of the country going.

Ms. Weatherspoon. We're trying. We're trying to be positive role models for young ladies, even for the younger guys. Hopefully we've done some positive things to somehow, someway have younger girls to want to be like one of us.

The President. I think you have. And you've taught a lot of people a lot about defense. [*Laughter*] I'll tell you, the next time——

Kym Hampton. Mr. President, I'm Kym Hampton, the other president, and you've been doing your homework, haven't you? [*Laughter*]

The President. I watch you all on television. I watch you on television.

Ms. Hampton. Okay. Well, you know, I can teach them a little bit about defense; you just continue to defend our little country here there, you know?

The President. I'll do it. You've got a deal.

Ms. Hampton. Well, I appreciate talking to you. Here's Rebecca Lobo.

The President. Thanks, Kym.

Rebecca Lobo. Hello, Mr. President.

The President. Hey, Rebecca. How are you?

Ms. Lobo. Great. How are you doing?

The President. I'm okay.

Ms. Lobo. Thank you very much for taking time out to speak with us.

The President. Well, I'm really pleased. I hope you're pleased with your first season, and I hope it continues, because I thought it was great. I watched several of the games on television from the White House, and I thought they were exciting and good, and I think you've got a real future.

Ms. Lobo. Thank you very much. We appreciate it.

Ms. Weatherspoon. Can I say one more thing?

The President. Sure.

Ms. Weatherspoon. Even though we didn't win it all and, you know, normally the winners get the visitation there at your place, can we still come? [*Laughter*]

The President. Yes. You bet. If you want——

Ms. Weatherspoon. Because in our own right we're still champions.

The President. [*Inaudible*]—if you want to come down here and have a tour, I'd be glad to have you down here.

Ms. Weatherspoon. We're coming! [*Laughter*]

The President. All right.

Team member. You are one of a kind, aren't you, honey? [*Laughter*]

Ms. Coyle. Mr. President, this is Maureen Coyle again. I'm actually going to hold your scheduling people to that.

The President. All right. We'll do it. We'll set up a tour.

Ms. Coyle. Thank you very much.

Team members. Thank you.

The President. Goodbye. Thanks.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:53 p.m. from a private residence to the game site at The Summit in Houston, TX. New York Liberty director of public relations Maureen Coyle and players Teresa Weatherspoon, Kym Hampton, and Rebecca Lobo participated in the conversation.

Remarks on the Death of Princess Diana and an Exchange With Reporters in Martha's Vineyard

August 31, 1997

The President. Good morning. Let me say again how very sad Hillary and I are about the terrible accident that has taken the life of Princess Diana and the others who were with her. We liked her very much. We admired her work for children, for people with AIDS, for the cause of ending the scourge of landmines in the world, and for her love for her children, William and Harry.

I know that this is a very difficult time for millions of people in the United Kingdom who are deeply shocked and grieving, and the American people send their condolences to all of them. We value their friendship, and we understand this great and painful experience.

For myself, I will always be glad that I knew the Princess and always think of her in very strong and positive terms, as will Hillary, and we can only hope that her work will go forward and that everyone who can, will support her two fine sons and help them to have the life and the future that she would want.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, you yourself on this vacation have been subject to intrusive photographers. Is there a lesson in this tragedy for the press? Should we back off?

The President. I think it is better right now if we let a little time pass and let this event and the people involved be honored and grieved, and then we'll have time to think about that and maybe make a better judgment. I think it's better for me not to say anything until this moment has received its due respect.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:20 a.m. at the Richard Friedman residence.

Remarks at Oak Bluffs School in Oak Bluffs, Massachusetts
September 3, 1997

The President. Thank you very much, Dr. Cash, Mr. Binney, all the teachers who are here. I am delighted to have this chance to come by and visit with you. I know I'm on vacation, but when school starts, if I don't participate in some start-of-school event—[*laughter*]—I begin to have a nervous twitch, and I—[*laughter*]—and I was delighted to be invited to come by and spend a few moments with you.

Let me begin by saying, as you know, our family has been on vacation here now for a little over 2 weeks, and we have until the end of this week. This is the longest time we've been away together in a very long time, and it's been a wonderful opportunity for us. We love it here. And it's especially important this year because this is the last family vacation we'll have before our daughter begins her next big educational adventure. So it's been great.

You know, every start of a school year is special because, as you well know, teachers come together with a new sense of dedication and energy and students show up wide-eyed in anticipation and parents pour all their hopes into what they hope will come out of the next year, that they're all truly wonderful. And I think they reflect the central premise of what you do for a living, and that is that our most important common enterprise as a people is clearly education. It's necessary not only for young people to grow up and be able to earn a good living but, perhaps more importantly, to be good citizens and even beyond that to live their own lives to the fullest, with a high degree of self-awareness and an ability to learn and absorb and grow throughout a lifetime. So it's always important.

But this year I think it's especially important. For one thing, we have the largest class of students in America, ever. We finally now have a student body, in the whole, in America of over 52 million, bigger than the largest years of the baby boom, which is a great burden for all of us aging baby boomers to have on our shoulders. [*Laughter*]

For another, we have the most diverse student body we have ever had. We now have 5 school districts in America that have children from over 100 different racial and ethnic groups. And within a couple of years, we'll have a dozen school districts that have children—but as you know, here in Martha's Vineyard, we're also diverse in other ways. We have massively huge school districts and we have very, very small school districts. And somehow, someway, we expect you, all of you—you and your counterparts throughout the country—to work with our children and give them a world-class education and give them a shot to make the most of their own lives.

We also know that as we move closer and closer to the turn of the century and to the beginning of a whole new millennium, we're super-attuned to the fact that we're living increasingly in a global society as well as a global economy, where children in the smallest school on Martha's Vineyard, either now or someday soon, will be able to hook onto the Internet

and do research in libraries in Australia or Asia, or talk to schoolchildren in Africa. And that's going to change the way we live and our perspective, and we have to be prepared for that.

It also means, frankly, that educational excellence at world-class standards is now more important than ever before. I can see a lot of very young teachers out there and then some of you who may be almost as old as I am, and those of you who have been teaching for a long time know very well that about 15 years ago, with the issuance of the "A Nation At Risk" report in 1983, our country began a serious national effort to reexamine the premises of public education and what needed to be done to make education better in our country.

And it's really been quite a moving thing for me both to observe and to participate in, even more when I was Governor than now as President, because the States of our country have constitutional responsibility for our public schools. But I have seen the recommendations of that report back in 1983 slowly but surely and steadily making their way into the lives of schools all across America. Our schools are offering broader and deeper curricula now; our students are taking more challenging courses now; our schools, by and large, are much better run now. There tends to be more participation and cooperation between principals and teachers. More of our school districts are pushing more and more educational decisions down to the school level, and our school districts tend to be better run now. And there's a whole different sense I get in school districts of all sizes as I go across America, and that's all very, very encouraging.

We also have begun to puncture some myths, and that is that you can't get an excellent education in a small school, or if you live in an urban setting in a difficult neighborhood, the kids really can't learn. We know that's not true either. We have seen all these sort of fears that people had about coming to grips with the idea that we could establish a real, uniform commitment to excellence in education basically evaporate with this school reform movement.

In 1989 I had the privilege of being one of the Governors to meet with then President Bush at the University of Virginia and—when we articulated six national education goals—and I was sort of the designated hitter for the Democrats, and we stayed up all night long drafting these goals which then all of the Governors voted for and the President embraced, which basically were a lot like what Dr. Cash said. We started with the premise that everybody ought to have an opportunity to have a good preschool experience, that we ought to have a very high and uniform requirement for a curriculum that encompassed all of the things that all children should study, that we ought to achieve international excellence in math and science, that everybody ought to have a chance to get education beyond high school, and that we ought to have a system of lifetime learning, that our schools all ought to be made safe and disciplined and drug-free.

There was another part to the national education goals that was often overlooked because it was either inconvenient or in some cases outright opposed, and that is there was a long section that I had stayed up half the night writing and, therefore, had been a little bit peeved to see ignored all these years—[*laughter*]—which basically said that one of the ways that we have to implement these goals is to set up a system of uniform national standards, not Federal Government standards but national standards, that reading and mathematics and basic science is the same in Montana as it is in Martha's Vineyard and that we should not pretend otherwise and that we should not be afraid to be held accountable.

For years the Governors tried to do something about that, but the effort sort of fizzled out because there were all kinds of people who were opposed to it. Now, we fast-forward: The Congress has just passed a budget which will bring our budget into balance for the first time since 1969 but also has the biggest increased investment in education from the Federal level since 1965, everything from Head Start to access to college. It has the biggest increase in aid to people that go on to get a college education, people of all ages, including people that go back and get graduate education which could benefit many of you in this room today, since the GI bill was passed in 1945. It is an astonishing educational document. And that leaves out, therefore, in my view, the one major thing that we've been sort of skirting since the national education goals were issued in 1989, and that is the whole question of national standards in measuring our children by them.

In the State of the Union Address in January, I challenged all of the States to adopt standards that were national and indeed international in

terms of their quality, and then to participate voluntarily in reading tests for fourth graders and math tests for eighth graders to measure these standards in 1999. The national education goals actually call for 4th, 8th, and 12th or 11th grade exams at the choice of the schools in a whole range of subjects.

But I thought we ought to begin here. And the response has been quite encouraging. I made clear that this was voluntary; nobody was going to be required to do it, that the Federal Government would not develop or administer the test but would only help to pay for it, and that the test should not be misused but neither should we pretend that it's not needed. Almost every school in every State has a lot of tests that children are given. But some of the State tests really do measure national standards, and some don't. A lot of the individual achievement tests tell you where you rank on a percentile, but that's really not relevant. If we have national standards, 100 percent of the children ought to clear the bar. And if nobody clears the bar, the child who made the highest grade shouldn't be considered to have done enough. That is the difference.

There are certain basic things that all of our children should know. I've been very heartened at—a large number of States, the Defense Department schools, which educate a lot of children around the country and around the world, and something that would have been unheard of even in 1989—15 big-city school districts have come forward and said, "We want our children to be a part of this even if our States don't join," including the school districts in six of the seven biggest cities in America have said, "We are tired of being told our children can't learn. We are tired of being told we can't overcome our obstacles. We expect to be held accountable, and our kids, if anything, need a good education more than anybody else, not less, and we don't want to make any excuses anymore."

To me, this has been an overwhelming thing, especially in light of the long effort we've had since 1989 in trying to get this off the ground. That's the good news. And it is very good news, indeed. But now there are some people in Congress and in the country who don't want this to happen. They either say we've got enough tests already or the Federal Government's making a power grab or they're afraid that the tests won't be fair to people who don't do well on it.

I would just like to reemphasize, number one, these tests are voluntary; number two, the results are not to be misused, but it's helpful to know whether the children, individually or in a class or in a school or in a school district, do or do not perform at acceptable levels in reading and mathematics at the very least.

Today, we have basically two tests that measure us—our kids by national and international standards. One is the so-called National Assessment of Educational Progress, the NAEP test, which I'm sure a lot of you are familiar with; over 40 States participate in that. But only representative samples of the students do it, and the scores are given by school district, so they don't really address how the children are doing.

The other is the third international math and science tests, the so-called TIMSS test, which is only given to a few thousand students every year. But it should be very encouraging to us. This year for the very first time since those tests have been given, our fourth graders scored well above the international average in math and science, and the few thousand kids who take it are representative by race, by region, by income of the American student body, once again demonstrating that if you set a high standard and go after it, you can achieve it.

Now, also, to make full disclosure, our eighth graders are still below the international average, but that's, I think, because in large measure so many of the worst problems in our society hit kids when they reach adolescence. And in bigger school districts, so many of our middle schools are still organized around the family and community structures that existed in the 1950's and the early sixties, when in fact they probably ought to be as small as a lot of grade schools are today to really meet the needs and the challenges these kids are facing.

But the bottom line is, we know from this example that we can make it. And I think it would be a terrible mistake for people who are afraid our children can't measure up or who have a misguided notion that somehow the Federal Government is trying to take over the direction of education in America to persuade Members of Congress not to fund the tests. And that's basically an issue we're going to be fighting out over the next few weeks.

We have agreed and feel strongly that a nonpartisan board which has been established by Congress for over 20 years now should be in charge of the development of the exam. All we

want the Department of Education to do is to have the funds to pay for it and to help the States or school districts who need it, to give it. And now that we've got all these kids out there whose educators say they want to participate, I think we have to do it.

I said in the State of the Union Address that if there's one place politics ought to stop in America, it's at the schoolhouse door. And I have been gratified that we've had Republicans and Democrats from all over America supporting this effort.

Just yesterday the Secretary of Education went to Philadelphia, which has a remarkable superintendent named David Hornbeck, who used to be the superintendent of schools in Maryland, the State of Maryland, and he left the job to go to Philadelphia to prove that you could run a big-city school district and give educational excellence to all kids. And they've established a very rigorous standards program, and student achievement has risen among all students at all grade levels from all backgrounds in the Philadelphia school system. So it's just like everything else. Setting a goal means you're more likely to meet it than if you don't set it.

And those who say we shouldn't measure—if I were to say, "Well, we ought to stop testing airline pilots because it might be offensive to some people," we would be reluctant to fly. If I were to say that we should end the rigorous evaluation techniques that the United States military has because it might be offensive to some people, you would say, "You must be out of your mind." The military is a place where more people from more different backgrounds, more different racial and ethnic backgrounds, have found a way to achieve excellence than any other institution in our life. And besides that, they protect us better than anybody else is protected in the world. Why would you stop setting high standards in measuring to see if we meet them? That's all that I am trying to do.

So I hope that since Massachusetts is one of the first States to agree to voluntarily participate, I hope all of you will support this, and I hope that if you have the opportunity, you will encourage the Members of Congress and your Senators to support it, because to me, it's the last major step. I have done all I could to push more decisions down to the school district into the school level. We have dramatically reduced paperwork in the Department of Education. We have dramatically increased the ability of local school districts to spend Federal money—and States—according to their own designs, within the general framework of the intent of Congress. So I want more decisionmaking done at the local level, but I still think we ought to have national standards that give our children a chance to do well in the global economy. And I believe that they all can do well.

And I believe that the poorest of our kids, the kids that come from the most difficult backgrounds, need it more than others, because they look to you, they look to the schools to give them the chances that their own parents didn't have. I know it's harder for you, and I know a lot of you have to contend with problems that these children bring from home that weren't there a generation ago, but every single thing you can mention just means that they need it more, not less.

So I expect this to be one of the major debating issues of the next few weeks when I go back home to go back to work. And I came here to thank you for what you do, to ask you to continue to support the educational excellence, and to send a clear message that you believe that excellence and accountability and high aspirations are for all our children, because we know they can make it. And we know that for their sakes, we have to expect them to do so.

Thank you, and bless you.

[*At this point, Oak Bluffs Selectman Richard Combra presented a gift to the President.*]

The President. Let me say, I actually believe I could pass a history exam on Oak Bluffs. [*Laughter*] This is one of the most interesting communities that I have ever heard anything about, and its history over the last 100 years, particularly, is fascinating to me, and I always spend a lot of time here when we come to the Vineyard, and I'm grateful for this.

I also should tell you that someone gave Hillary and Chelsea and me that huge 1,000-piece jigsaw puzzle—[*laughter*]—and we did it. So I am now prepared for a detailed geography examination on Martha's Vineyard in general and Oak Bluffs in particular.

I also want to say this is a magnificent school, and just before I came in here, I was offered the chance by your principal to actually decorate one of the tiles. I have no doubt that mine

will not be nearly as good as the students' or the staff's, but I'll give it my best shot.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:53 a.m. in the library. In his remarks, he referred to Dr. Kriner Cash, superintendent, Martha's Vineyard Schools; and Laury Binney, principal, Oak Bluffs School. The President also referred to the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS).

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on the Partnership For Peace Initiative

September 3, 1997

Dear _____:

In accordance with section 514(a) of Public Law 103–236 (22 U.S.C. 1928(a)), I am submitting to you this report on implementation of the Partnership for Peace (PFP) initiative.

The recent NATO Summit in Madrid highlighted the tremendous success of the Partnership for Peace and the important role PFP plays as a permanent security structure for the undivided Europe of the 21st century. On the second day of the Summit, 27 Partner Heads of State and Government met with their NATO counterparts under the auspices of the new Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. This meeting, the first of its kind, underscored the strength of the cooperative relationship NATO has built with the Partners in the 3-½ years since the creation of PFP.

The Partnership for Peace has been instrumental in helping countries prepare for NATO membership. At the same time, it has also been a critical tool in helping all the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, regardless of their desire to join NATO, to build stronger ties with the Alliance and develop closer cooperative relationships with all their neighbors. As you will see from the attached report, NATO and its Partners have made impressive progress in broadening and deepening the Partnership over the past year. With the creation of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the implementation of enhancements to the PFP program, Allies and Partners together will help bring about our shared goal of a Euro-Atlantic community that is safe, secure, and united by common values and common understanding.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Jesse Helms, chairman, and Joseph R. Biden, Jr., ranking member, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and Benjamin A. Gilman, chairman, and Lee H. Hamilton, ranking member, House Committee on International Relations.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters With Documentation

September 3, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters ("the Convention"), adopted at the twenty-second regular session of the Organization of American States (OAS) General Assembly meeting in Nassau, The Bahamas, on May 23, 1992, and the Optional Protocol Related to the Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters ("the Protocol"), adopted at the twenty-third regular session of the OAS General Assembly meeting in Managua, Nicaragua, on June 11, 1993. Both of these instruments were signed

on behalf of the United States at the OAS headquarters in Washington on January 10, 1995. In addition, for the information of the Senate, I transmit the report of the Department of State with respect to the Convention and the Protocol.

When ratified, the Convention and the Protocol will constitute the first multilateral convention between the United States and other members of the OAS in the field of international judicial cooperation in criminal matters. The provisions of the Convention and Protocol are explained in the report of the Department of State that accompanies this message.

The Convention and Protocol will establish a treaty-based system of judicial assistance in criminal matters analogous to that which exists bilaterally between the United States and a number of countries. These instruments should prove to be effective tools to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of modern criminals, including members of drug cartels, "white-collar" criminals, and terrorists. The Convention and Protocol are self-executing, and will not require implementing legislation.

The Convention provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Convention includes: (1) taking testimony or statements of persons; (2) providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; (3) serving documents; (4) locating or identifying persons or items; (5) transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; (6) executing requests for searches and seizures; (7) assisting in forfeiture proceedings; and (8) rendering any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

The Protocol was negotiated and adopted at the insistence of the United States Government, and will permit a greater measure of cooperation in connection with tax offenses. I believe that the Convention should not be ratified by the United States without the Protocol. If the Convention and Protocol are ratified, the instruments of ratification would be deposited simultaneously.

One significant advantage of this Convention and Protocol is that they provide uniform procedures and rules for cooperation in criminal matters by all the states that become Party. In addition, the Convention and Protocol would obviate the expenditure of resources that would be required for the United States to negotiate and bring into force bilateral mutual assistance treaties with certain OAS member states.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Convention and the Protocol, and that it give its advice and consent to ratification, subject to the understandings described in the accompanying report of the Department of State.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 3, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 4.

Message to the Senate Transmitting Eastern Caribbean States-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaties With Documentation

September 3, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaties Between the Government of the United States of America and the governments of four countries comprising the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States. The Treaties are with: Antigua and Barbuda, signed at St. John's on October 31, 1996; Dominica, signed at Roseau on October 10, 1996; Grenada, signed at St. George's on May 30, 1996; St. Lucia, signed at Castries on April 18, 1996. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaties.

The Treaties are part of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties being negotiated by the United States in order to counter criminal activity more effectively. They should be an effective tool to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of crimes, including "white-collar"

crime and drug trafficking offenses. The Treaties are self-executing.

The Treaties provide for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaties includes: taking of testimony or statements of persons; providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; serving documents; locating or identifying persons or items; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; executing requests for searches and seizures; assisting in proceedings related to forfeiture of assets, restitution to the victims of crime, and collection of fines; and any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 3, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 4.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Barbados-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty With Documentation

September 3, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Barbados on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Bridgetown on February 28, 1996. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

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

The Treaty provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaty includes: taking of testimony or statements of persons; providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; serving documents; locating or identifying persons; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; executing requests for searches and seizures; assisting in proceedings related to forfeiture of assets, restitution, and collection of fines; and rendering any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 3, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 4.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Trinidad and Tobago-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty With Documentation

September 3, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago on Mutual Legal

Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Port of Spain on March 4, 1996. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

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

The Treaty provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaty includes: taking of testimony or statements of persons; providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; serving documents; locating or identifying persons; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; executing requests for searches and seizures; assisting in proceedings related to restraint, confiscation, forfeiture of assets, restitution, and collection of fines; examining objects and sites; and any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 3, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 4.

Remarks on the Terrorist Attack in Jerusalem and an Exchange With Reporters in Martha's Vineyard

September 4, 1997

The President. Today's bombing in Jerusalem is an outrageous and inhuman act. My thoughts and prayers are with the victims and their families and all the people of Israel.

It is clear that the perpetrators of this attack intended to kill both innocent people and the peace process itself. They must not be allowed to succeed. Everything possible must be done to stop them.

The peace process can only move forward in a secure environment. And the Palestinian Authority, through concrete actions on its own and continuing work with the Israeli authorities, must do all it can to create an environment that leaves no doubt that terror will not be tolerated. This is the message that Secretary Albright will emphasize when she travels to the region next week.

I know the overwhelming majority of Israelis and Palestinians yearn for an end to violence and for the start of lasting peace. If they are to see their hopes realized, we must see the strongest possible security cooperation. Only on that basis can the process proceed.

1996 Campaign Financing

Q. Mr. President, the Justice Department says it's investigating—reviewing, rather, whether campaign solicitations by Vice President Al Gore should warrant a preliminary investigation which could trigger the independent counsel law. Do you think that the Vice President's conduct should be investigated?

The President. I have nothing to add to what I've said before. I believe what he did was legal, and the Justice Department has to make its own determination, which I'm confident they will do, based on the law.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Back on the bombing, sir——

The President. Yes?

Q.——what does this do to the peace process, do you believe?

The President. I would hope it would give it added urgency. It is obvious that when things are hanging in limbo, all sides become more vulnerable to the enemies of peace, and particularly the people of Israel become more vulnerable to the terrorists who desperately do not want to see this peace process proceed. They

do not want a peaceful resolution of the differences between the Israelis and the Palestinians. They do not want us to be able to go forward to see an ultimate resolution with the Syrians and the Lebanese. Hamas does not want that. Hamas and the other terrorists, they thrive on anger and anxiety and uncertainty and being able to inject their murderers into this situation.

So what I hope will happen is that we will see—we believe we've made some progress—Mr. Ross went out there—on the security cooperation, and I hope we'll see some more, and I hope we'll see that this peace process can get going again.

I think it's all the more important for Secretary Albright to go, and I've made it clear. And I tried to call Prime Minister Netanyahu. He was in the hospital with the victims and so he was unable to take my call, but I look forward to a discussion with him. I think it's important that she go on and go right out there, and we keep pushing this thing.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:18 p.m. at the Richard Friedman residence. In his remarks, he referred to Special Middle East Coordinator Dennis B. Ross and Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on United States Government Activities in the United Nations

September 4, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report of the activities of the United States Government in the United Nations and its affiliated agencies during calendar year 1996. The report is required by the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 264, 79th Congress; 22 U.S.C. 287b).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 4, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 5.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Federal Labor Relations Authority

September 4, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 701 of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–454; 5 U.S.C. 7104(e)), I am pleased to transmit the Eighteenth Annual Report of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for Fiscal Year 1996.

The report includes information on the cases heard and decisions rendered by the Federal Labor Relations Authority, the General Counsel of the Authority, and the Federal Service Impasses Panel.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

September 4, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 5.

Remarks on the Death of Mother Teresa and an Exchange With Reporters in Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts
September 5, 1997

The President. With the passing of Mother Teresa of Calcutta, the world has lost one of the giants of our time. She served the poor, the suffering, and the dying, and in so doing, she served as an inspiration and a challenge to all the rest of us. With the power of her humble and unconquerable faith, she touched the lives of millions of people in India, here in the United States, and throughout the world.

Like anyone who ever met her, I was profoundly moved by her conviction and her courage. Hillary had the privilege of working with Mother Teresa and her community to open a home for abandoned babies in Washington, and later she and Chelsea had the opportunity to see her and her community work firsthand in India.

The home for the dying she opened in Calcutta almost 50 years ago is called *Nirmal Hriday*, Pure Heart. If ever there was a pure heart, it was hers. Mother Teresa is gone, but the Gospel teaches us that faith, hope, and love endure. She had them in abundance, and they will stay with us forever.

Deaths of Princess Diana and Mother Teresa

Q. Mr. President, this has been quite a week for the loss of meaningful women. Any comment—[*inaudible*]——

The President. Well, you know Hillary is going to leave in just a—well, a couple of hours now, maybe even shorter, to fly to London to the funeral of Princess Diana. And I think the world has been profoundly moved by that. And obviously, hundreds of millions of people around the world looked up to Mother Teresa and admired her. I think it will be a time of great reflection, and I hope a time of rededication.

I think all of us were deeply moved by the pictures today from London of Princess Diana's sons and Prince Charles and the royal family greeting the mourners and beginning the sort of public healing process, along with the private one. And I think tomorrow will be a sad but a very important and positive day.

Q. Do you think there might be a chance the First Lady might go to Mother Teresa's funeral?

The President. I don't know. I just heard.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:30 p.m. at the Richard Friedman residence.

Statement on the Death of Mother Teresa
September 5, 1997

With the passing of Mother Teresa of Calcutta, the world has lost one of the giants of our time. She gave comfort to the poor, the suffering, and the dying, and served as an inspiration and a challenge to all of us.

Hers was a ministry of action—of passion and compassion. She led by serving, and showed us the stunning power of simple humility. Her unconquerable faith touched the lives of millions of people in India, here in the United States, and all around the world. I had the pleasure of meeting Mother Teresa when she came to Washington, and I was moved by her conviction and courage. Hillary had the privilege of working with Mother Teresa and her community to open a home for abandoned babies in Washington, and later Hillary and Chelsea had the opportunity to witness firsthand the work of Mother Teresa and her community in India.

The home for the dying she opened in Calcutta almost a half century ago is called Nirmal Hriday—"pure heart"—and if ever there was a pure heart, it was hers. Mother Teresa is gone, but as the Gospels teach us, these things endure: faith, hope, and love. She had them in abundance. They will stay with us always.

The President's Radio Address
September 6, 1997

Good morning. I'm speaking to you this morning from the Edgartown Elementary School in Martha's Vineyard on the last day of a very special 3-week family vacation. This has been an especially important time for Hillary, Chelsea, and me, because it's the last vacation we'll have before Chelsea goes off to college in a few weeks. We've enjoyed both the natural splendor of this wonderful place and the natural warmth that the people of this community, some of whom are with us here today, have shown to all of us during our visit.

Today the world mourns the loss of two remarkable women. Their lives were very different but ultimately bound together by a common concern for and commitment to the dignity and worth of every human being, especially those too often overlooked, the desperately poor, the abandoned, the sick, and the dying.

With the passing of Mother Teresa of Calcutta yesterday, the world has lost one of this century's greatest humanitarians. Her worldwide ministry to the poor, the suffering, and the dying has served as an inspiration to all of us. With the enormous power of her humble faith and her lifetime of living it, she touched the lives of millions of people, not only in India but in our country and all around the world. Hillary and Chelsea will never forget visiting her mission in Calcutta. And we will always treasure the time we spent with her and be especially grateful for the home for abandoned babies she and her order opened in Washington and the chance Hillary had to help in getting it established.

Anyone who ever met Mother Teresa could see that within her very small frame, she carried a very big heart, big enough to follow God's will to show compassion and love for all our children, especially the sick and the forgotten. Mother Teresa once said, "The test at the end of life is not what you do; it is how much of yourself, how much love you put into what you do." Well, Mother Teresa put all of herself, all of her love, into serving mankind, and the world is a much better and nobler place because of how she lived.

The First Lady today is representing our Nation at the funeral of another woman of compassion, England's Princess Diana, whose tragic death a few days ago shocked and saddened millions around the world. The enormous outpouring of grief and support in the wake of Diana's death demonstrates that people saw in her more than her radiant beauty but, instead, a different kind of royalty. She became, as Elton John said at her funeral, England's rose, because she shared the life struggles of ordinary people, she cared about them. She was not too self-absorbed to lend her hand and her heart to people in pain or in peril, especially people with AIDS and the innocent victims of landmines.

Hillary and I liked her very much. She was a young woman of great gifts coming into her own, determined to raise her children to be well-grounded, strong young men, not isolated by their royal lineage, and determined to make a contribution to the people of Great Britain and the world. On her trips to Washington, Hillary talked with her about the challenges of parenting and Diana's civic commitments, her campaigns on behalf of children, for people with AIDS, and to ban landmines.

To our friends in Great Britain, I wish to express a special message of sympathy. Our two peoples who experienced so much together are experiencing this sad event together. Diana was not ours, but we grieve alongside you.

Mother Teresa and Princess Diana, two women of vastly different backgrounds and worlds, are gone. But each of them in her own way has shown us what it is to live a life of meaning through concern for others. That is the great legacy they leave us. Let us honor it. For whether we live to a ripe old age or must leave this life too soon, our time on Earth is short, and we live on only through the gifts we give to others who share the journey with us.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from Edgartown Elementary School in Martha's Vineyard, MA.

Remarks at Four Seasons Elementary School in Gambrills, Maryland
September 8, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. Jonathan, this is an important, good book for me to be reading. I've been reading a biography—right now, this morning, I was reading before I came to work—of President Grant, who was the commanding general of the Union forces in the Civil War. And I haven't gotten to the part about the *Monitor* and the *Merrimack* yet, so I thank you. So I can read this as long as I have it back by the 27th, huh? [*Laughter*]

Secretary Riley, Principal Leone, Governor Glendening and Lieutenant Governor Townsend, Senator Sarbanes. I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to my good friend Congressman Steny Hoyer; I know I'm in his district. And his late wife was a committed teacher of young children, and he wanted me to come here to his congressional district to make this announcement. And looking at you, I'm certainly glad I did. And I thank you for making me feel so welcome.

Secretary Riley asked how many people had read one book. I want to start by congratulating the star readers who are sharing the stage with me today. It is true that I have been an avid reader of books since I was your age, and it is also true what Secretary Riley said, that if you work hard and learn a lot, you have a good chance to live out your dreams, and you might grow up to be President. Once I was just sitting in an elementary school not very different from this, just like you.

I'm glad to be here today, especially because this is International Literacy Day, a day when people all over the world say we ought to be committed to making sure everyone can read. And one of the most important things we are doing, which your principal mentioned, is to support a program called America Reads. We're trying to get up to one million people all around the country to help parents and teachers make sure every single third grader in America can read independently by the end of that third grade. And I think that's a very good thing to do. It's obvious that all of you are doing that now.

Secretary Riley asked how many of you have read one book—anybody read five books, at least, this summer? Anybody read at least 10 books this summer? How about 15—any 15 books? How about 20? [*Laughter*] How about 25? Don't feel bad, I haven't read 25 books, either. [*Laughter*] You're out past me. How about anybody read more than 30 books this summer? Wow! Anybody read more than 40 books this summer? [*Laughter*] Anybody read 50 books this summer? Now, that's amazing. [*Laughter*] You need to tell me how you manage your time. I'd like to have some help on that. That's great. Well, give yourselves a hand—let's give everybody a hand for their reading. That's great. [*Applause*]

I came here today to talk about the importance of reading and learning, not only for you but for all the children in our country. How many of you know how to at least do a little work with a computer? Now, if I asked that in the White House, there wouldn't be that many hands go up. [*Laughter*] And you know that you're living in a time when the computer can do more and more and more things, right? And you probably know that someday before long, we probably will see telephones, televisions, and computers all combined into one thing. And you'll probably be able to carry it from room to room and hang it on the wall and get on the computer and talk to people all across the world, do research in libraries all across the world.

And this big explosion in what computers can do is changing the way people work and live and learn. And a lot of you will be doing jobs that are different from the jobs your parents are doing. A lot of you will wind up doing jobs that nobody has even thought up yet. They don't even exist yet. But what that means is, is that those of us who are your parents—and your grandparents' generation—we have a big obligation to make sure every single one of you can read well and can learn and can keep on learning for a lifetime because of the exciting world you're going to be living in.

If you have a good education, and especially if you can read, young people your age will be able to do more different things that they're interested in doing than any group of people who have ever lived in the history of human

beings on the Earth. It will be a very exciting time.

You might be interested to know that this year there are more than 52 million young Americans in school—more than 52 million—the largest number of children ever in school in the history of America. And it's very important that we do what we can to help them.

Now, what that means for all of us who are in the Federal Government, like Secretary Riley and me and Senator Sarbanes and Congressman Hoyer, or people at the State level, Governor Glendening, the Lieutenant Governor, the other State officials who are here, or your local superintendents—that all means different things. Sometimes it means just giving the schools more money. For example, we have doubled the funding to try to provide the opportunity for every school in America to hook up every classroom in America to the Internet by the year 2000. I understand that you're all going to be hooked up, all your classrooms, by the end of this year, and that's very good. But we want every single student in America to be in a classroom connected to the Internet by the year 2000.

We also have to do more than just spend more money. The other thing we're trying to do is to make sure that all of our children are learning more, starting with reading. I told you a minute ago that we have this America Reads program where we're giving young people, for example, who get scholarship money or work-study money in college—we're asking them to come out and work with people your age and read books with them and make sure everybody can learn to read.

And you probably know that we have more and more American students now who come from other countries, who are immigrants, or whose parents came from other countries. Right across the Potomac River in Virginia, from Washington, DC, there's a school district that has children from over 100 different racial and ethnic groups. They speak a lot of different languages. Many of them weren't taught to speak English. But they all must learn to read, and read well, and that's a huge challenge for our country.

Earlier this year, I told the Congress and the American people that if we didn't do anything else, we ought to make sure that no child got out of elementary school without strong reading skills and that all of our children acquired strong mathematics skills, because those are the foundations on which all other learning occurs. And to me, that means that we have to have national standards for reading, and we ought to measure those standards.

I want to—in 1999, I want to make sure we give a reading test to every fourth grader in America so we'll know if the children need help measuring up to national standards; we'll know if a class needs help; we'll know if a school needs help. Because you know as well as I do that I couldn't go to every grade school in America and ask how many read a book this summer and have everybody raise their hand. I couldn't go to every grade school in America and ask how many have read 5 books and have almost everybody raise their hand, and how many people have read 10 books and have a great majority of the children raise their hands. I couldn't do that.

But every child in America—every single child in America—needs to be able to read well and needs to be able to read independently by at least the end of the third grade, so that all this other learning can occur. That's what this whole national standards debate is about. We want everyone—students, teachers, principals, schools, school boards—to be held accountable and also to get the help and support they need if young people need more help in learning to read.

In Maryland here, where clear academic standards have been established and tests have been established to measure achievements, Four Seasons Elementary has posted impressive gains in reading scores. Just last week, Secretary Riley went to Philadelphia, where achievements have risen among all students at all grade levels because they set high standards and then they all were willing, all the students, to take a test to see whether they had met the standards. It wasn't a test to scare people. It was a test to help people to find out what they knew and whether they needed to learn more.

This should be something that has nothing to do with party politics. I think every American, Republicans, Democrats, independents, should favor high standards. I think people from all backgrounds should want all of our children to learn at a high level. And believe it or not, even though there are a lot of good things going on in America, and even though English and reading is the same in Maryland as it is in Montana, and mathematics is the same in California as it is in Maine, there is still no national

standard to say whether every child has learned to read well enough. So that's what we're trying to do.

We are trying to establish a fourth-grade standard of reading and an eighth-grade standard of math by 1999 that will tell us all whether our children are learning what they need to know and, most important, will give you the assurance you need that your future is going to be bright if you work hard and learn what you need to know.

I want to thank Governor Glendening. He was the first Governor in the country to support the movement toward national education standards. And I thank Maryland's commissioner of education and all the others who have supported this effort here in Maryland.

I also want to say this—I said this before—there are a lot of children in America whose parents weren't born here, a lot of children in America who themselves weren't born here, but there is no child in America who can't meet these standards. I believe all children can learn, don't you? Don't you believe all your classmates can learn?

Students. Yes!

The President. Don't you believe, if you get the help you need and if you work at it, you can learn what you need to know to make a success of your life?

Students. Yes!

The President. And don't you think you have a right to get the kind of education that will let you go as far as your dreams want?

Students. Yes!

The President. I do, too. And that's what this is about.

So I want to make sure all of our children are treated fairly. I want to make sure that all of them have the tools they need to achieve what they need to achieve. But I have found what I see here: When you expect high achievement from students, they always give it to you. And when you have low expectations of people, that's a mistake.

So I believe in you, and I believe in your future. These tests that we propose to give are voluntary. No school or school district will be forced to use them if they don't want to. But they will give us a sense of a national level of achievement in reading for fourth graders, in math for eighth graders. They'll be developed by an independent, bipartisan board. There's no politics in this, only our children.

But let me say this in closing: I'm not afraid of what America's children can do. I believe in what America's children can do. I'm not disturbed by the fact that we're becoming a more diverse country. I'm excited by it. After all, we're going to be living in a global society where we'll be tied to other nations by economic and cultural ties. And the fact that America is a great democracy that has people from everyplace else living here, as citizens, making their own way, is a good thing.

I imagine this student body here looks a little different than it would have if we'd had this picture taken 10 years ago. That's a good thing. We should be happy about our differences. But no matter how different we are, we all need to be able to read; we all need to be able to do math; we all need to be able to learn together. I am determined to see that you have a good future. But you have to do your part, which is to learn. And the only way you can do that is if your parents and the educators say, "Here is the standard. Here's what you should be learning."

I believe in your future. I have high expectations for you, and I see today that you believe in your future. Do you believe all children can learn to read?

Students. Yes!

The President. Do you think that all children should be expected to learn to read well?

Students. Yes!

The President. Would you like us to find out, so that if somebody is not reading well, we can teach them to read well?

Students. Yes!

The President. It would be unfair to leave somebody behind, wouldn't it?

Students. Yes!

The President. That's what I think, too. You keep reading, and we'll keep working.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:20 a.m. in the media center. In his remarks, he referred to Jonathan Knobel, fifth-grade student who introduced the President, and Lorna Leone, principal, Four Seasons Elementary School; Gov. Parris N. Glendening and Lt. Gov. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend of Maryland; and Nancy S. Grasmick, Maryland State superintendent of schools.

Remarks at American University
September 9, 1997

Thank you very much. First, thank all of you for that wonderful welcome. I told President Ladner that after you gave me such a buoyant welcome, I really didn't want to speak. I thought I should quit while I was ahead. [*Laughter*]

I appreciate the president's welcome and his profound words. I thank Neal Sharma for his introduction and for his leadership here among the students. To Chairman Jacobs and Professor Mintz, Secretary and Mrs. Dalton, City Councilman Thomas; to all the trustees and alumni and faculty and staff and students who are here, and the friends of American University who are here.

There are many people in our administration who graduated from AU or who otherwise have affiliation with it, including your former president Joe Duffey. And one of the most important is here with me today, former professor Judy Winston, who is the Executive Director of my race initiative, about which I want to talk a little. But I'd like for Judy to stand, wherever she is. She's here somewhere. Thank you, Judy. There she is.

At the start of a new school year, this is a time when students are going back to work and when those of us here in Washington are going back to work after the August recess of Congress. It is a time of genuine hope and earned optimism for America, and I can hear it in your spirited voices here today. I think it's a good time for me to talk to you and to our country about what we have to do in the remaining months of this year to make the most of this moment in preparing our country for the 21st century.

It is now—hard for me to believe—almost 6 years since I first announced my candidacy for President. Then, in late 1991, America seemed to be moving toward the new century with uncertain steps. Dramatic changes in the way we live and work and relate to each other and the rest of the world threatened the values by which we live our lives. We were in danger of becoming a more divided nation at the very moment when we needed to be moving forward resolutely together.

On the day I declared my candidacy, I said that our mission as a people must be to keep the American dream alive for all who would work for it; to keep America the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity; and to bring our own people together, across all the lines that divide us, into one America. America's oldest and most enduring values—opportunity for all, responsibility from all, a community of all—these things had to remain strong and vibrant in a new and different time, which required a new course of action.

Our Nation has remained young and strong now for over 220 years by always meeting new challenges in ways that renew our oldest values. That is the wellspring of our greatness. Our Nation was not founded on religion or race or geography but on a set of incandescent ideals, which have been reiterated and reaffirmed and reembraced at every critical moment in our history: Lincoln at Gettysburg; the Progressives forging a new freedom for an industrial age; Franklin Roosevelt rescuing America from the abyss in the name of our oldest ideals; Dr. King challenging America to live out the true meaning of our creed. At every single moment of challenge and change, we Americans have found a way to keep these old ideals, not musty words scratched on parchment but instead living guideposts for a new era.

For 4½ years now, Americans have worked to make this a time of change for our generation. We set a bold new economic course, reducing the deficit by over 80 percent even before the recent balanced budget agreement, expanding exports through over 200 trade agreements, and investing in our people and their future. We set about establishing America's credibility in the post-cold-war world, forging new alliances and standing up for our values from Bosnia to Haiti. And we addressed a generation's accumulation of profound social problems, bringing work and responsibility and community action to bear on the challenges of crime and welfare and poverty. And we began to build a new Government, not intent on doing everything but not content to do nothing; instead, a progressive Government committed to giving people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives.

Today we see the results: Unemployment remains below 5 percent; nearly 13 million new jobs since 1993; inflation remaining low and stable; investment growth and consumer confidence at their highest levels in a generation; after decades when they remained flat, finally family incomes beginning to rise again; violent crime has dropped dramatically for years now; we have seen the largest drop in welfare rolls in history; and many of our poorest urban and rural communities are in a springtime of renewal.

In late July, America reached a new milestone when I signed into law the first balanced budget in a generation. This was about more than numbers on a ledger. It embodies the single largest increase in aid to education since 1965. It includes the biggest increase in aid to help people go on to college and to community colleges and to graduate schools, the biggest increase since the GI bill was passed 50 years ago, and it will literally open the doors to college education to every person who is willing to work for it. It includes the largest single investment in health care since the passage of Medicaid in 1965, largely designed to insure up to 5 million children who don't have health insurance today. It restores just benefits for legal immigrants, and billions of dollars are provided to help move people even more from welfare to work.

Now, after years in which the deficit dominated our politics and dampened our economy, America finally has lifted that burden from the next generation. After years in which the two parties seemed often as tired and trapped as punchdrunk fighters in a ring getting smaller and smaller, finally we found a way for Democrats and Republicans to work together for the national interest. And in so doing, we've proved to ourselves that America can still work.

We are steering the vast changes underway today in technology, trade, and our social makeup—the very changes that once produced so much doubt and unease—in ways that will ensure that they will become powerful forces for good. In all this I want to emphasize that we are not merely riding the crest of the latest rise in the economic cycle. Our economic plan with the balanced budget at its center is the platform on which we are building America's future. Americans of this generation are forging and leading an entirely new economy. A larger proportion of Americans work in the computer industry today than worked in the auto industry at the height of the 1950's. And in the cutting edge industries of the future—computers, biotech, aerospace—America leads the world. But America also leads the world again, for the first time since the 1970's, in automobile production and sales.

In this new economy there'll still be ups and downs. There'll be recessions and crises. They'll demand action. But the economy has fundamentally changed. Once, the wealth of people came mainly from the gold in the ground or the abundance of our farmland or the power of our factories. Now, you know as well as anyone it will come from the skills of our people and the power of our imagination.

The news is good today. And in the face of good news, the easiest thing to do is to rest, to take a vacation, to believe our work is done, and to be satisfied that our challenges are met. But complacency is not an option and vacations have to remain short in a time still full of challenge and change. There is, in fact, a lot more to do to renew our values, to strengthen our Nation, to deal with problems still unresolved, if we are really going to give you the 21st century you deserve. Now we have to take the steps that are clearly before us. And the time to start is now, this fall, with a series of concrete actions we can take to cap a year of real progress for America.

First and foremost, we must press on to make opportunity available for all of our people. Equal opportunity is our central value, but the very meaning of that has fundamentally changed. For example, in the 19th century, opportunity meant access to a land grant. In the 21st century, it will mean access to a Pell grant, to a community college, to a trade school, to a university. And more education is important. We have made enormous progress. As I said, this budget contains the biggest increase in funds to help give people access to higher education in 50 years: not only the largest Pell grant in our history but in the last two budgets, 300,000 more work-study positions, new opportunities for savings in IRA's for college education, and tax credits which will literally make it possible for everybody in the country who doesn't have any access to college to get 2 years of college, and will help people to pay for 4 years and for graduate school. Nothing like this has ever been done before, and it will revolutionize opportunity when it comes to getting a college education.

But I want to explain something that's very important about why we're focusing on the next 3 months. The balanced budget agreement contains a 5-year plan for balancing the budget and contains the tax cuts. It has a spending plan in it. But the spending plan still has to be implemented every single year. And that is what Congress will do in the next 3 months in passing appropriations. So they have to authorize the money for the Pell grants. They must authorize the money for the work-study slots. They must authorize a doubling of funds for computers in every classroom so that we can meet our goal of hooking every classroom and library up to the Internet by the year 2000. It must authorize the America Reads initiative, which will help us to mobilize some of those community service folks you were talking about, work-study students all across the country, thousands of AmeriCorps students going into our schools, working with teachers and parents to make sure every single third grader in this country can read independently. We have to do that.

We also must get through the appropriations process with our commitment to national education standards intact. We know, for example, that America has the finest system of higher education in the world, and people come from all over the world to be a part of it. And I'm very proud of that. We also know, however, that we do not do as well as we should in our K through 12 education for all of our children. Of course, it's harder in America than a lot of other places; we have more diversity. We have more racial diversity; we have more linguistic diversity; we have more cultural diversity; we have more income diversity than we would like—the other diversity is all to the good, I think.

But we are making progress. For the first time this year on the international math and science scores, our Nation ranked well above the national average in math and science scores—well above the world average in math and science scores for fourth graders. But we still ranked below the world average in scores for eighth graders, as our children meet adolescence and all the difficulties that many of them face come to bear. We have to do better.

We are the only major nation in the world that does not have high, clear, uniform academic standards of excellence in basic courses in public education. We don't have them. It is a legacy of our State constitutional responsibility for education, K through 12, and local control of the schools. But uniform standards—mathematics are the same in Maine and Montana, and children have to learn to read whether they live in Washington or the southern tip of Florida.

We are now on the brink of being able to have a nonpartisan board set up by Congress for this purpose, to approve the development of examinations of fourth graders in reading and eighth graders in math. There are some who don't think we should do it. They say it's a Federal power grab. It isn't. The tests are voluntary. No State, no school district has to participate. The Government is not developing the tests. We're simply paying for it.

But I hope that all of you who got here to this university will look at all—there are 52.2 million children enrolled in kindergarten through 12th grade in America now, the biggest number of children ever, from the most diverse backgrounds ever. We are robbing them of the future you are here to claim if we let them get out of school without the basic skills they need to succeed in the university. And I hope you will support our efforts at national standards.

Now, your student body president made a wry remark about Social Security—[*laughter*]—and I know a lot of you don't think it's going to be there, but it is. It is going to be there. Clearly, one of our most serious responsibilities is to make sure that Social Security and Medicare are there for the next generation of Americans. It is wrong to let people pay into the fund for a benefit they will never receive. That is wrong.

We will begin in the next 3 months to build on this budget agreement in dealing with Medicare. This budget agreement extends the life of the Medicare Trust Fund by a decade. In fact, the structural changes that we have built in may even save enough money to carry it far beyond that. But we will also appoint, the leaders of Congress and I, members of a bipartisan commission to study Medicare and make recommendations for how it can be preserved for the next generation of Americans well into the 21st century.

We have shown that we can put our fiscal house in order while improving services for our elderly. Now we have to secure the future of this program. And then, we'll be beyond that to deal with Social Security as well. We can do this. If we can balance the budget, we can

plainly do this. These are problems that revolve around demographic changes in our society, and we owe it to you not to have to face this burden. I am confident that we will fulfill our responsibilities.

The next thing we have to do is to continue our efforts to expand trade to the rest of the world. The United States is now the world's number one exporter again. But we must continue to do this. We must continue to do it not only because it is right for us, because it is right for the world. Let me just give you a couple of interesting statistics. We have less than 5 percent of the world's people in this country; we have about 20 percent of the world's wealth. We cannot maintain our wealth unless we sell what we have to the other 95 percent of the people in the rest of the world.

Second, the growing economies of the emerging countries, principally in Asia and Latin America but also increasingly in Africa, are going to grow much more rapidly in the next 10 years than the advanced economies of America, Canada, and Europe. If we participate in that growth, we can move huge numbers of countries now classified as poor nations into the ranks of middle-income nations, where millions of children will have a more decent, more humane, more supportable future, where democracy will thrive, where we will have good partners not only in economic relationships but also in solving the other problems of the world when you have to take responsibility for them.

The United States has a clear, clear obligation to continue to expand the frontiers of trade. And tomorrow in the East Room at the White House, I will launch a campaign to persuade the Congress to renew the traditional authority Presidents have had for over 20 years now to break down foreign barriers to America's goods and services. This is very important to you and your future.

We do not need to be afraid to trade with the rest of the world. We are the most productive economy in the world. There will always be changes in this economy. There will always be new jobs being created and some going away. But on balance, we have benefited for 60 years by leading the way to integrate the world's economies. And that will promote peace. It will promote freedom. It will promote stability. It will raise the level of living standards in other parts of the world even as it maintains America as the world's most prosperous nation. And I hope you will support that as well.

As we expand opportunity, we must also continue to demand responsibility from our citizens. Among other things, we have a common responsibility to do all we can to strengthen our families for the 21st century. This new economy puts extraordinary pressures on parents, demanding more time away from their children, imposing new demands for affordable child care, bombarding children themselves with commercial images that make it harder than ever for them to be raised according to our most basic values.

We are working to pass a juvenile justice bill to help keep our children out of gangs, off of drugs, and away from guns. We will host the first ever White House Conference on Child Care, to explore ways all sections of society, including our Government, can better address perhaps the greatest problem facing working parents today. And we must make this historic opportunity real in our efforts to protect our children from the dangers of tobacco by passing sweeping legislation that focuses first and foremost on reducing smoking among young people. More people die from that than any other problem in our society today.

Next, we must meet a very large environmental challenge in the next 3 months. We will work toward a worldwide climate change treaty this December in Kyoto that protects the environment even as it promotes global growth by committing the nations that sign on to it to specific, clear guidelines in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere. We know—[*applause*]—you can clap for that—that's all right.

Now, there are students here from all over the world, students from all over the country. Many of you have witnessed and your families have witnessed, in your own homes, significant changes in climatic patterns in the last decade and more extreme climatic developments. It is becoming a part of the common parlance of America, all over the country, to talk about the 500-year flood we had along the Mississippi River. One Member of Congress, who happened to be a member of the other party, said to me the other day—he said, "Mr. President, we've had three 100-year floods in the last 5 years in my home State." He said, "Does that mean I get to wait 500 years before we have another bad flood?"

Many of you who are studying this issue know that a panel of over 2,500 scientists has concluded that the climate of the Earth is significantly warming in ways that will have not entirely predictable but almost certainly destructive consequences unless we do something about it.

This is something that will affect people of all incomes, of all backgrounds, from all parts of our country and, indeed, the whole world. We need the young people of America, particularly the university students who are in a position to study this issue, to make this a gripping national issue. And we also need people who have the confidence in our ability to break new technological and scientific barriers to stand up and say, "You cannot make me believe that we can't reduce greenhouse gas emissions substantially and still grow the American economy." We could reduce them 20 percent tomorrow, with technology that is already available, at no cost, if we just change the way we do things.

Now, this will be a very controversial debate. And there will be people who say, "President Clinton has spent 5 years killing himself to revitalize the American economy, and now he's going to take it down overnight by committing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in America." That is not true. But if you let the sea level rise and we flood the southern coast of Florida and we flood the southern coast of Louisiana and we otherwise disrupt what life in the United States is like over the next 50 years, then your children will pay the price for our neglect. We can grow this economy and do right by the environment. I think you believe that, and I need you to help me convince the American people that it can be done.

Finally, let me say we have a responsibility to improve the way our political system works. The amount of money raised by both parties is more than doubling now every 4 years. The primary driving thing is the cost of access to you, the voters. That is what is driving this, the cost of access through television time, through radio time, through mail, through printed materials. One of the things we have to do is to guarantee free or reduced air time for candidates for offices so that they won't need so much more money. And we are seeking that now.

But there is also a very important piece of legislation sponsored by Republican Senator John McCain and Democratic Senator Russ Feingold which will come to the floor of the Senate later this month. Every year I have been President I have supported a good campaign finance reform bill. And every year I have seen the bills blocked by a filibuster in the United States Senate—every single year. Now, the people who don't want it this year say they're going to do it all over again. They may do it, but if they do it this year, we intend to see that it happens in the full glare of public light. I ask for your support for campaign finance reform this year.

The third thing we have to do is to do a lot of work in the next 3 months to advance our interests and our leadership around the world. We live in a world very different from the cold-war world, and we still have to do a lot to shape it. We have an opportunity to lock in the gains of democracy and stability and free markets and lay the foundations for the century in which you will live most of your lives.

So far this year, we have ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention, so our soldiers and citizens will be safer from the threat of poison gas. We have worked hard to build an undivided, democratic, and peaceful Europe for the first time in history, inviting Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to join NATO. I look forward to working with the Senate to ratify this historic step next year, and I'm pleased today that a group of America's leading citizens endorsed it. We're forging new partnerships with Russia, with Ukraine, with Europe's other new democracies, working with all of our friends in Europe to give the people of Bosnia a chance to share in Europe's democratic future. First, we stopped the war and turned killing fields into playing fields again and bomb shelters into schools. Now we have to redouble our efforts to build a lasting peace.

In the months to come, we will continue to pursue peace in the Middle East, in Northern Ireland, continue to fight rogue states and terrorists, continue to make sure our military and diplomacy are the strongest in the world. But above all, in the remaining months of this year, we are going to reach out to our hemisphere and to Asia.

Over the last decade in the Americas, coups, conflicts, and command economies have given way to democracies and free markets. Next month I'm going to Venezuela, Brazil, and Argentina to work to expand trade, to fight drugs, to protect the environment, and to strengthen

our partnerships. The Americas can become a stronghold for our own peace and security.

By the way, 70 percent of our increased trade in the last year has come from the Americas, from our own neighbors in our hemisphere, and we should stick with them.

Because I want this effort to be truly bipartisan, I reached my hand across the aisle to choose an Ambassador to one of our most important allies and neighbors, Mexico, when I asked the Republican Governor of Massachusetts, Bill Weld, if he would serve. I believe, still, that he is the best person to be Ambassador to Mexico. And I believe—and I would believe this if there were a President of another party with a nominee with whom I did not agree—I believe when a President nominates someone for a job, that person is entitled to a hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee, and I think he ought to get it.

This fall, the President of China will come to Washington. China is home to a quarter of the world's people. In less than two decades, its economy may be the largest on Earth. America has a profound interest in seeing that China is stable, open, at peace with its neighbors. We want it to embrace political pluralism and the international rules of civilized conduct. We want a China that works with us to build a secure and prosperous future. China will choose its own destiny, but if we engage China instead of isolating ourselves from her, we can help to influence the path it takes.

President Jiang's visit is an important opportunity, not so much for grand statements and dramatic gestures as for constructive work on common challenges like the one we face on the Korean Peninsula, or protecting the environment, or stopping the spread of nuclear weapons, and for expanding the frontiers of free trade between us. It's also a chance for us to address, candidly and face to face, our differences on issues like human rights and religious freedom.

Sitting down together across the table is far more likely to produce progress than pointing fingers across the Pacific. So when President Jiang comes here, I hope the American people will welcome him and will say, "Yes, we have things that we disagree with you about, but you represent a quarter of the world's people, a large measure of the world's future, and your people and our people will be better off if we find a way to forge that future together."

Finally, in the next 3 months, we will be working for new ways to preserve perhaps the most fragile value of all, the bonds of community that bind us together as Americans. In this century, we have absorbed wave after wave of immigrants, drawn here by our abundance and our ideals. This century has seen unparalleled racial progress as African-Americans and other minorities join the American mainstream. Still, the very forces of progress that are propelling us forward could also pull us apart, threatening to isolate us, each with our own webpage but linked by few human bonds of community.

The age-old dilemma of racial inequality, racial prejudice, or just plain old fear and mistrust of people who are different from us is compounded by the new task of absorbing new immigrant groups into what is already the world's most diverse democracy. Within a decade, our largest State, California, will have no majority race. Within just a few decades, this entire country will have no majority race. We can study the demographic patterns and know what America will look like in the 21st century, but we have to look inside to imagine what America will be like in the 21st century. That answer is up to all of us.

I have asked the Nation to join me in a great national conversation about race, an effort to redress imbalance, to root out hatred and prejudice, to deal with real underlying problems that may have nothing to do with race but that manifest themselves in racial inequality and tensions, and above all, to bring Americans of different backgrounds together to face one another honestly across the lines that divide us.

Your president noted that you have people from 140 different racial and ethnic groups here on this university campus. Good for you. You can be America's laboratory. You figure it out and let us know.

This diversity of ours is a godsend. It is a huge gift in a global economy and a global society. If we can find a way not only to respect our differences but to actually celebrate them and still say what binds us together is even more important, we will have solved the conundrum that is paralyzing Bosnia, that is still leading to people blowing themselves up to kill innocent children in the Middle East, that has my people in Ireland still arguing over what happened 600 years ago, that has led to vicious tribal warfare in Africa, leaving hundreds of

thousands of people hatcheted to death. And yet, look around this room.

This is a question of imagination, of vision, of heart. And it is also very important to be hard-headed about it. Until everybody has economic opportunity that is real and educational opportunity that is real and streets that are safe, there will be racial disparities in America which will manifest themselves in things that look like racial discrimination whether they are or not. We have to deal with the underlying real causes here as well.

But don't kid yourself—fear of people who are different is an underlying real cause. How did people get to be Serbs or Croats or Muslims in Bosnia? How did they belong to the Orthodox Church, the Catholic Church, or the Muslim faith in Bosnia? It's an accident of history, of geopolitics going back hundreds and hundreds of years. The people are biologically indistinguishable. But they were more than happy to abandon decades of peace and begin within weeks to murder each other with abandon and shoot each other's children not very long ago.

There is something in us all that in our most defensive periods makes us want to find somebody else we can look down on—I mean, no matter how bad it is for me, at least I'm not her or him. Isn't there? And every one of us at some point in our life has been guilty of that in some way or another.

You come here in this magnificent university environment. You cheer with your great enthusiasm and hope for the future. You look at each other, and you're different, and you like it. That's the way we've got to make daily life in America. People have to get up in the morning and feel good about this country with all of its diversity, because we have to know what's good about the differences between us and celebrate them, and we must know, too, what it is that binds us together. What are the requirements of membership in the American community? What do you have to believe in and be willing to live by and be willing to stand up for in order to be an American? That is what we are going to do. We have to visualize our future as a truly multiracial, multiethnic, multireligious democracy that still runs in a straight line from here all the way back to George Washington. I'm convinced we can do it, but I'm convinced that all of you have to lead the way.

Now, let me say that a lot of this work has to be done with Congress. And I'm very pleased by the relationship that we had working on the balanced budget. I'll work with them to do everything we can to implement the budget, to confirm the judges and the others who await action. We are in unchartered territory, to some extent, but we know the times demand action of us, and I am sure the American people, without regard to their party, want us to work together in the public interest.

For all of you who are students here, consider this: It is now 844 days to the year 2000, to a new century and a new millennium and a new era of human endeavor. Will it bring new progress, new prosperity, and new greatness for America? It is basically up to us.

Thirty-four years ago, here at American University, President Kennedy delivered what many people believe was his greatest speech. It was an era bristling with superpower tension, but President Kennedy looked forward and saw a day when the cold war was a thing of the past. Because of decades of work to uphold our values by Americans of both parties, we are now living in the world John Kennedy imagined 34 years ago at American University.

So I leave you with this thought: It all depends on your imagination. It all depends on your imagination. Think how many children's lives we could save in all these trouble spots of the world if all the people with power and the people that support them just imagined their future in a different way, just took their heart and their head together and came up with a different picture than the one they see before them every morning when they get up. It is the most important force in the world.

President Kennedy imagined the world we are living in today, 34 years ago in the speech here at American University. Now it is up to you and to me and to our fellow Americans to imagine what the 21st century will be, and then to do what is necessary to make that vision a reality for all our people. That is what I came here to ask for your help in doing—for your help and for that of every other American. You've got a lot riding on it, and I'm betting that we're going to get there.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:30 p.m. at Bender Arena. In his remarks, he referred to Benjamin Ladner, president, Neal Sharma, student confederation president, William Jacobs, board of trustees chairman, and Mary Mintz, university senate

president, American University; Secretary of the Navy John H. Dalton and his wife, Margaret; Harry L. Thomas, Sr., District of Columbia City Council member, Ward 5; and President Jiang Zemin of China. The President also referred to the "Commencement Address at American University in Washington. June 10, 1963," *Public Papers of the Presidents: John F. Kennedy, 1963* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 459.

Remarks at a Democratic Business Council Dinner
September 9, 1997

Thank you very much. First I want to thank Steve Grossman for his leadership and his dedication. I had an opportunity to be with Steve and his wife during my holiday, and I met his son, who was singing for me with the Princeton Glee Club. You saw Steve standing here—his son is 6′5″ and weighs 290 pounds. [*Laughter*] So I tell you that to say, do not underestimate this man. [*Laughter*] He has hidden power that manifests itself in all kinds of interesting ways.

I thank Tom Hendrickson for the work that he's done on the Democratic Business Council. I love this group, and I'm very proud of the fact that since I've been President we've added hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of members to this group, people we asked to give contributions that are quite generous but by today's standards are still fairly moderate, because we want to get large numbers of people who want to participate with us in making the future for the Democratic Party.

I thank Alan Solomont. And I want to thank my Budget Director, Frank Raines, for coming tonight. After he engineered the balanced budget agreement, I thought he would never do anything else for the rest of his life. [*Laughter*] He thought he was entitled to retire, but I said no.

I had a great day today. I hope you did. I had a great day. I met with some wonderful people. I was able to see some progress in a lot of areas where we've been working hard. But I started the day—or I didn't start the day but in the middle of the day, at noon, I went to American University to give a speech about what I hoped we would do in the last 3 months and couple of weeks of this year. And it's a fascinating place, American University. They have students from over 140 different racial and ethnic and national groups. Ninety percent of the students are involved in community service. That's an astonishing thing.

American University 34 years ago was the site of President Kennedy's famous speech on arms control in the cold war. And many people believe it was the finest speech he ever gave. What I reminded the students of today was that in that speech, instead of just focusing on the problems that existed then between the United States and the Soviet Union, John Kennedy actually imagined a world where there was no more cold war, there was no more communist threat, our two nations were no longer enemies. We are now living in the world that he imagined 34 years ago.

And I made that point to tell them that they had to imagine the world they wanted to live in in the 21st century, and that everything I have done for the last 4½ years was a product of what I had imagined we would do and should do as a country.

It was almost 6 years ago that I announced for President, at a time when our country was in a very different position than it is now, when we seemed to be drifting into the future and be more divided than we ought to be and somewhat uncertain about what our role in the world ought to be. It seemed to me clear that we were going through a time where people were dramatically changing the way they work, the way they live, the way they relate to each other, the way we relate to the rest of the world, and that what is always called upon at a time like that is to take a new course that is consistent with the oldest values of this country.

And to me, my whole work has always been about three things: One, creating opportunity for everybody responsible enough to work for it; two, making sure our country remains the leading force for peace and freedom and prosperity in the world; and three, making sure that

out of all of our differences, which are legion, we still come together as one America. Opportunity, responsibility, community: Those are the things that I think about every day. And I've been thinking about them every day for 6 years and, indeed, even longer than that.

Now, we can be proud of where this country is. The country has got a lot of genuine hope and a lot of solid achievement. Before the budget was balanced, thanks to the work that the Democrats did in 1993, we had reduced the deficit by 80 percent. We had a historic drop in the welfare rolls. We had huge drops in the crime rate. You have places in inner cities and isolated rural areas that are beginning to see a renaissance of growth and development again where there hasn't been any in a very long time.

Now, this balanced budget agreement not only gives us the first balanced budget since 1969, when President Johnson presented his last budget before leaving office, it also gives us the largest increase in health investment since Medicaid in 1965, which will be used primarily but not exclusively to provide health insurance for about 5 million children that don't have it now. It provides the largest investment increase in education since 1965, which will be used, among other things, to make sure we reach our goal of hooking up all the classrooms and the libraries to the Internet by the year 2000, adding large numbers of children to the Head Start rolls, putting another 100,000 work-study positions in for college students, and doing a number of things that will help make our schools better. And finally, of course, we passed the tax portions of the bill, which among other things—and I think most importantly—essentially opened the doors of college education to all Americans who are willing to work for it, so that we can now say to a child struggling in a family maybe having a hard time making ends meet, "If you stay in school, if you make decent grades, and if you'll work for it, you can go to college. You'll either get a Pell grant or a work-study position or get a tax credit that will send you to college. You do not have to worry about that anymore."

So that's all very encouraging. But what I think is important is that we recognize we're living in a very dynamic time, and we have to keep pushing. I'm glad we have 13 million new jobs. I'm glad the unemployment rate is the lowest in 24 years. I'm glad the inflation rate is the lowest in 30 years. I'm glad that consumer confidence and business investment are at record highs. I'm glad about all of that. But it is not enough. I'm glad the crime rate has dropped, but it's still too high. And under our welfare reform law, we have to move even more people from welfare to work in order to meet the requirements of the law and avoid hurting any children, which we don't want to do.

So we have a lot more to do. And today I talked to the students at American University—I'll just say very briefly—about the things we're going to try to do just between now and the first of the year. First, we have to pass appropriation bills which implement the budget. I think it's very important that you understand the balanced budget agreement is a 5-year budget plan that enacted the tax cuts and the budget numbers for Medicare and Medicaid and the other so-called entitlements. But for education, transportation, everything else, we have to pass a budget bill every year for those things that is faithful to that agreement. So that's the first thing we have to do.

And in that agreement, in education, which is terribly important to me, we're also fighting a little battle underneath the screen which I hope has become more public in the last few days, to try to preserve the ability of the Department of Education to contract with a bipartisan group established by Congress to develop examinations in reading and mathematics for fourth and eighth graders so that we'll have national standards for the first time that will apply to all of our children.

The tests are voluntary, and they are not designed to be used for any reason to punish the kids but just to see whether our children are learning to read by the fourth grade and whether they know the math they need to know by the eighth grade. We're the only major country in the world that doesn't have national academic standards tied to international norms. To pretend that English is somehow different in Montana than it is in Maine, or that math is somehow different in Washington—Northwest Washington—than it is in southern Florida is pure folly.

And I am immensely gratified that a significant number of States, 15 big cities, 6 of the 7 largest big-city school districts in the country have said, "We would like to participate in this. We're not afraid. We want to know where we

are and how we can do better." That will be a big fight.

Then we're trying to pass a juvenile justice bill that will help to deal with what I consider to be the biggest threat to our civil society on the crime front, which is that crime had been going up dramatically among—most dramatically among people under 18. Now it's leveled off in the last couple of years, and we hope it's going down. But we still have a lot to do to keep our kids out of gangs, off drugs, away from guns, in school, living positive lives.

And I just want to point out, since Mr. Grossman and Mr. Solomont are from Massachusetts and they're very proud of it, that our juvenile justice bill is modeled in large measure on the program that has been operating in Boston, where it has been about 2 years now—2 full years—since any person under the age of 18 has been killed by a violent—gun. That's an amazing thing. And so we can do this, but it's very important.

The third thing we're going to try to do is to make sure that I get the authority that Presidents have been given since the 1970's to negotiate trade agreements, comprehensive trade agreements that can be presented to Congress for an up-or-down vote. That's very controversial now, I think because some people have ambivalent feelings about the trade agreements we signed with Canada and Mexico. I think the evidence is pretty compelling in the positive side there, but the main thing we have to understand is that this fast-track authority I'm seeking has nothing to do with that.

The question is, are we going to continue to lead the world to open up markets for American products worldwide? Are we going to continue to lead the world in targeting specific sectors of the economy where we have a particular advantage, like telecommunications? Are we going to continue to lead the world toward freedom and open markets by reaching out our hand to our neighbors to the south of us, like Chile and Argentina and Brazil, where 70 percent of the increase in America's trade in the last year has come from our neighbors in this hemisphere and to the south? And I do not believe that we dare walk away from that world leadership.

We negotiated over 200 trade agreements since I've been President. About 25 percent of our growth, of those 13 million jobs, has come directly because of the expansion of American trade. We can compete with anybody, and if I have anything to say about it, that's exactly what we're going to do, because America's national interest requires that we continue to lead the way.

Now, two or three other things I want to mention. The McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill will be up, and if it passes, it means all of you can still be here. [*Laughter*] But it would set a lid on contributions of about $20,000, I think. It would have other restrictions. And combined with our efforts to get free or reduced air time for candidates, it could really dramatically change the way politics works.

Now, every year I've been President we've had a campaign finance bill up in the Congress that was a good bill. And every year I've supported it, and every year it's died because of a filibuster in the Senate. And the people who don't like it promise that's what's going to happen this time. All I can say is, this time everybody in America will know about it for a change, and that's something to be said for that.

So I hope those of you—I personally don't believe it's a bad thing for people to contribute to their political parties. Even when our friends in the Republican Party get contributions from people that agree with them, I think that's a good thing. What is a bad thing is that the campaigns cost so much today that the restrictions and the rules set up in 1974 have been totally overwhelmed by the sheer cost of campaigns. And you know most of it is in communications costs, in television, in radio, in direct mail, and anything else. We have a chance to change that now, and I'm going to do my best to do it.

And finally, on the domestic front, a big global issue is this issue of climate change. I am convinced that the climate is changing. I am convinced that the industrialized world, now aided by the developing world, has put so many greenhouse gases into the atmosphere that the climate is warming. It is leading to more extreme climatic events all across America. Most of you, wherever you're from, can think of a more disruptive pattern of climate. A man told me just last week that he was leaving the place where he had lived for the last decade because the climate had changed so dramatically it was not at all like what it was when he moved there 10 years ago.

I say this to make this point: The countries of the world recognize that they need to reduce

the greenhouse gases they're putting into the atmosphere. But it's kind of like two people standing in an airplane with their parachutes on; everybody wants the other person to go first. Nobody wants to jump unless everybody does. And there's always going to be a reason not to do it. But the truth is that we are committed, all of us, including the United States, to embracing in Japan this December a goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions significantly by early in the next century. And we have to find a way to do it that still permits the economy to grow.

Now, we know that right now, if we all just change behavior, with available technology, with no cost, we can reduce it by 20 percent—right now, with available technology, at no cost. You cannot make me believe that we can't find a way to do this and still grow the American economy. And I have invested too much time and effort to create those 13 million jobs to see them all go away, but neither am I prepared to say that my grandchildren will live in a world that's hardly fit to live in because we couldn't take care of the environment that God gave us. And I refuse to believe that we have to make the choice. We don't. We're going to do this. We're going to do it right, and we're all going to do it together. But it's going to be a hard fight, and I'd like to ask for your support.

Finally, let me say, in terms of what we're going to try to get done between now and the first of the year: The Secretary of State is in the Middle East today. We are working very hard in Bosnia. The situation with regard to peace in Northern Ireland is better than it has been in a very long time, and we are hopeful and work very hard there. I think that you can see that the involvement of the United States is critical. And I intend to maintain it, and I intend to see that we prevail wherever we possibly can.

And the last point I wish to make is this: I'm going to try to step up over the next few weeks my public involvement in this racial dialog that I called for at San Diego State University—the University of California at San Diego, excuse me—not very long ago. I strongly believe that the diversity in this country is a godsend for the 21st century. It's a global society. If you want one example, Congress became acquainted with the fact that there were seven economies in Africa that grew at greater than 7 percent last year. So we had no trouble getting Republicans as well as Democrats to support the Africa trade initiative we put together, because it wasn't about black and white, it was about green. [*Laughter*]

And I don't say that—that's not a criticism of the Republicans. I am very grateful—I am very grateful for the bipartisan support we had. And I think that—if you look at the fact, where else could you go—I went to the American University, there's people from 140 different national groups there. In a global society, that is a godsend. But very few people have taken the time to think about what are the problems we've got that are still unresolved. How can we expect to do without racial problems if everybody doesn't have an economic opportunity and an education opportunity? And what will it be like when there is no majority race in California, our biggest State? We'll know within a decade. What will it be like when there is no majority race in the entire country? We'll know within three or four decades.

Now is the time to think about this. Now is the time to prepare for it. Why? We're living today without a cold war, in part because people in John Kennedy's time imagined that there would be a time when there would be no cold war. They never lived to see it, most of them. Only a few are still around who in the beginning of the cold war imagined that it would come to an end. But their imagination made all the difference. And how we imagine the 21st century and then go about giving meaning and reality to our imagination will make all the difference.

That's really why you're here. That's really what we're going to try to do with your investment. And that's what I think will make the biggest difference to our people.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:50 p.m. in the Crystal Room at the Sheraton Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Steve Grossman, national chair, and Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee; Mr. Grossman's wife, Barbara; and C. Thomas Hendrickson, chair, Democratic Business Council.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner
September 9, 1997

First of all, thank you, Steve, and thank you, Alan, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for being here. This is meant to be more of a conversation than a speech, and I want it to be so; I'll be quite brief.

We have had a very good year as a nation, and we've had a good year here in Washington. And it was capped by the passage of what I think is an excellent balanced budget agreement, not only because it does bring the budget into balance for the first time since 1969, which is a long time to wait, and therefore changes the whole dynamic of what we talk about here in Washington—we Democrats have been literally paralyzed for years and years and years in the efforts to do what a lot of what we thought ought to be done because everything was seen through the prism of the deficit; not so anymore—but also because this agreement has some remarkable positive things about it, including the biggest investment in health care since 1965, most of which will go to insure 5 million children who don't have health insurance now; biggest investment in education since 1965, which will go to put more children in Head Start, to put computers in our schools and to hook them all up, all the classrooms and the libraries, to the Internet by the year 2000; and has the biggest increase in help for people to go to college since the GI bill was passed 50 years ago. And that's just part of what's in this budget. It's a very fine budget.

But today I went to American University to talk a little bit about what we're going to try to do between now and the end of the year. It's all very well to say, "Well, we've got 13 million more jobs, and we've got crime coming down and welfare rolls dropping and a lot of the poorest neighborhoods in the country are beginning to be revitalized." But the truth is there is still a lot to be done, and we have a very busy agenda.

And you may not want to talk about it tonight, but let me just go through a list of some of the things that still have to be done. Number one: This balanced budget agreement has to be implemented. The balanced budget plan which was passed which I signed is a 5-year budget plan. It funds Medicare and Medicaid and all the other so-called entitlement programs and has the tax cuts in it. But anything that requires an annual appropriation, like education or transportation, we have to actually pass a bill every year, including this year, to make that budget agreement real.

So Steve talked about the national standards today—we are having quite a little vigorous debate in Washington about whether we ought to have national standards and whether there should be a test to measure whether every fourth grader can read and every eighth grader can do math. I think it's a miracle we've done as well as we have without doing it, since we're the only major country in the world that doesn't have both kinds of standards. And I hope we will have, and I intend to fight hard for it.

Secondly, we're going to try to pass the juvenile justice bill that will help to keep more of our kids out of gangs, off drugs, and away from guns. And it's very important.

We're going to try to prevail, for the fifth time in 5 years, but this time I think we've got a better chance and more visibility than ever before, with campaign finance legislation. I supported the bill every year for the last 5 years, and every year for the last 4 years the campaign finance reform legislation has been killed by a Senate filibuster. And as you know, it only takes 41 Senators to do it, and the people that did it before say they're going to do it again, even though some of their folks are no longer in the Senate. They may do, but this time we'll have at least the glare of day on it.

We are going to seek, starting tomorrow, in a very public way the authority that has been given to Presidents since the 1970's to negotiate comprehensive trade agreements. And this will be somewhat controversial, mostly because of people I think looking backward and thinking that the past trade agreements haven't been so great. But here are the facts: We've negotiated over 200 trade agreements since I've been President. We're now the number one exporter in the world; 70 percent of our export growth has come from our own hemisphere and from Latin America. And we estimate that about 25 percent of the 13 million jobs we've got have come

because of the expanded trade we've done. And I think we ought to do more of it.

Latin America will grow, Asia will grow quicker than the global economy. We are 5 percent of the world's population. We have 20 percent of the world's wealth. If we want to keep it we've got to sell to the other 95 percent. It's not complicated.

And so I hope that we will prevail in making that argument, because I'm convinced that more than money is at stake. Our world leadership in supporting democracy and open markets and a future where people work together and work out their problems, instead of fight them out, is very much at stake in this debate over the President's role in world trade.

Finally, we will have a major effort later in the year to reach consensus in our country—and it's going to be difficult to do—on a commitment that I need to make in December about how much we will reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by early in the next century.

I am convinced the problem of climate change is real. I know the American people have not fully focused on it yet, but literally, the overwhelming majority of scientists who have studied this problem say that our environment is changing dramatically because of the volume of greenhouse gases that we're putting into it. And it's fixing to get worse if we don't do something about it because all these developing countries—most importantly China, which is the biggest one—are getting rich the same way we did, that is, by burning fuels which put great stress on the atmosphere. We have got to turn this around.

And the United States cannot be dragged kicking and screaming into this. And I believe—I don't believe; I know—we can find a way to do it and grow the economy. This will be very controversial. And I hope that I can get a lot of support from the business people in this country and from labor organizations and from others who realize that we have to pass along to our children and our grandchildren an environment in which they can live, or all the economic growth in the world won't amount to a hill of beans if people can't breathe and enjoy their lives and feel that we're in a balanced environment. So that's a big issue.

Meanwhile, the Secretary of State is in the Middle East; we are struggling to make some progress in Bosnia; things look better in Northern Ireland than they have in a good long while. And the Chinese President is coming here before the end of the year, and I'm going to Latin America. And the country is in good shape. We're moving in the right direction. And those of you who have supported me made it possible, and for that I am very grateful. But I ask you to keep the energy behind our efforts. We've got to keep going. We've got to keep moving forward. We can't rest. And there's a lot more to do.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 p.m. in the Chandelier Room at the Sheraton Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Steve Grossman, national chair, and Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee; and President Jiang Zemin of China.

Remarks Supporting Renewal of Fast-Track Trading Authority

September 10, 1997

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, members of the administration. Mr. Lang, thank you for coming all the way from Iowa. And Susan, thank you for coming all the way from California; all else fails, you can give speaking lessons. [*Laughter*]

I also would like to thank the Members of Congress who have come. I see Senator Moynihan and Senator Baucus and a significant delegation from the House, including Congressmen Matsui and Fazio who have often been on the forefront of our trade issues. It's nice to see former Chairman Gibbons out there and former Congressmen Carr and Anthony. There may be—and former Congressman, our Ambassador to Mexico, Jim Jones. There are a lot of other former Members perhaps here, but I appreciate all of you being here to support this endeavor today.

These stories that we have heard, one from a farmer, one from a high-tech small-business person, make it clear that as we approach a new century and a new millennium, we live in a time of profound change and immense possibility. We have worked, as the Vice President said, to take our Nation and to lead the world to the edge of this new era in this new economy, to build on a strategy of eliminating the deficit, increasing investments in our people, and expanding our exports, and to do it in a way that would bolster America's world leadership for peace and freedom and prosperity around the world.

It is true that we have made significant progress with the balanced budget agreement in completing the business of balancing the budget, in making education our genuine top priority, and investing in our people. And it is a good thing that we are moving forward. But we must also recognize that for all the dramatic expansion of trade in the last 4½ years, for all the expansion in our economic opportunities and the enhancement of our world leadership, the world markets are changing so rapidly and growing so quickly, there, too, we must take new action to move forward.

I'm asking the Congress to renew the President's traditional authority to negotiate trade deals, to open more American markets for goods and services from our country, and to restore the partnership between the Congress and the President in the trade arena necessary to keep our economy strong and our leadership strong.

The Vice President said this before, but I want to reemphasize this: We are enjoying now an unemployment rate in the Nation of under 5 percent, with over 13 million new jobs in the last 5 years. We have stable inflation at the lowest level in 30 years. And it appears that after a very good year last year, our economy this year will also grow in excess of 3 percent.

Now, how do we intend to continue to do that if we have 4 percent of the world's people and we already have 20 percent of the world's income? We have to sell to the other 96 percent of the world's people, especially when we know that the developing economies are projected to grow in Latin America and Asia at almost 3 times the rate of the mature economies over the next 15 to 20 years. And if we do it right, by the way, it will make the world a much better place because 10 to 15 to 20 countries will move from the ranks of being very poor countries into being countries with sustainable incomes for their own people, making them better democratic partners, more likely to be positive contributors to the world of tomorrow, less likely to be trouble spots that will command America's attention to try to keep something bad from happening when we ought to be working with them to make good things happen.

So this is very much the way of the future that America must lead toward. We have worked for 4½ years—we had over 220 new trade agreements. I compliment our Trade Ambassador, Charlene Barshefsky, and her predecessor, Mickey Kantor. They have worked very hard. Most recently, we had an information technology agreement which will generate hundreds of billions of dollars in income.

We now estimate that of the important growth we've enjoyed in the last 4½ years, almost a third of it came because of our expansion of trade. During this period American has once again become the world's number one exporter, our largest producer of automobiles, the world's largest agricultural exporter, the world's largest producer of semiconductors. From the farms of our heartland to the high-tech firms of the future, business is booming in this country. And from specialty steel to telecommunications, America leads the world in a very competitive global marketplace.

But I emphasize again, this is not a static situation. In order for us to continue to create jobs and opportunities for our own people and to maintain our world leadership, we have to continue to expand exports. We have to use every tool we can get to open foreign markets to our goods and services; we have to continue the fight for open, fair, and reciprocal trade; we have to continue to stand against unfair trade practices; and we have to act now to continue this progress to make sure our economy will work for all the American people.

Congress, therefore, must renew the President's traditional authority to negotiate trade agreements. That is what we are here to say to the United States, and that is what we are here to ask you to help us to do.

Again, let me say this is something that I could not have appreciated the day I took the oath of office the first time back in 1993. This is about more than economics. It is very much about economics, and it is very important, but it is about more than economics. It's about

whether other countries will continue to look to the United States to lead to a future of peace and freedom and prosperity, about whether the world will be growing together instead of coming apart, about whether our economic ties will lead to cultural ties and ties of partnership, or whether we will be viewed as somehow withdrawn from the world, not interested in leading it, and therefore not nearly as influential as we might otherwise be for the causes in which we so deeply believe.

Every President of either party has had this authority since 1974 for a very good reason. It strengthens our ability to break down trade barriers and unfair trade restrictions in areas where we already lead and where our future lies, such as agriculture, telecommunications, medical equipment, environmental technology, and the creative power of our entertainment and our software. Every single trade agreement we will reach will tear down barriers to our goods and services, and that is good for America. And I think it is worth emphasizing again.

Virtually without exception—as far as I know, without any meaningful exception—the nations with whom we will negotiate agreements have markets that are more open than ours. When we talk about sectoral agreements, in all these sectors our markets are more open—the markets are more closed than ours. And in these sectoral agreements, all these sectoral agreements involve areas where we are highly competitive, where other markets are more closed than ours. In all the global agreements we would negotiate, we will be dealing with areas where we are already highly competitive. This is a good thing for us economically. And it is absolutely critical for our world leadership.

Now, just look at this information technology agreement. It's a good, representative agreement, even though it's larger in its scope than some others we'll be able to negotiate. We reached it with 42 other nations last December to unshackle trade on $500 billion in computers, semiconductors, and telecommunications equipment. It's the equivalent of a $5 billion cut in tariffs on American products exported to other nations, and it will lead to thousands and thousands and thousands of new high-wage jobs in America. It will also bind us, in one of the most critical areas of human endeavor, more closely to other countries with whom we want to share a common future in a positive way.

The second thing I'd like to emphasize again is that we want to concentrate on the fastest growing markets in the world, in Latin America and in Asia. These markets are going to go 3 times faster than our own and than Europe's in the next decade. They will become very important to our economic future, whether we do this or not. The question is, will it be a positive or a negative importance? Their economies are on a fast track. They are not waiting for us to pass a bill. And we have to face that.

The third point I'd like to make is that if we don't have this authority, we will leave the field to our competitors, to break down more trade barriers to their own products at our expense. Since 1992, in Latin America and Asia alone, our competitors have negotiated over 20 agreements that don't include the United States. For example, now that Canada has negotiated a trade agreement with Chile, every major economy in this hemisphere has duty-free access to Chilean markets—every major economy but one, ours. I don't think that's a very good deal for American business or American workers.

Finally, let me say again, if we want to spread prosperity and open trade to support peace and democracy and freedom and free markets, we must do this. Other countries look at this decision in the United States as a decision about whether we continue to lead the world toward freedom and openness and partnership. And make no mistake about it, it is about more than economics, but increasingly our foreign policy and our economic policy are merging. And what is good for us economically, when it is good for other countries economically, advances the cause of freedom and prosperity and free markets and stability and partnership.

It is a remarkable thing that for the first time in history, more than half the world's people live under governments of their own choosing. When I was a boy growing up, I think most people could not have imagined that. Now, unfortunately, many of us take it for granted. I spend a great deal of time every day reviewing the situation in the world, as you might imagine, and I can tell you, you cannot take it for granted. It is not certain that 10 years from now or 15 years from now or 20 years from now, more than half the world's people will still live under governments of their own choosing. The governments have to be able to deliver the

goods. They have to be able to show the benefits of freedom and democracy. And the partnerships we have, as I said again, that are very much in our own interest, by helping them to elevate their countries will also stabilize freedom and secure a better future.

Now, let me also say that those of us who support open trade have to acknowledge that the benefits and burdens of the global economy, both in this country and in other countries, will not automatically fall equally upon all shoulders. They never have, in any market, and they never will. We must acknowledge that the possible effects of global trade on some communities or businesses or workers will not be positive in the short run, even though we know that this agreement will be overwhelmingly positive for the vast majority of Americans in the short run and in the long run. But because of that, I have worked very hard for the last 5 years to give more and more Americans the tools to benefit from change, to take the changes that are going to occur anyway and make something good happen, especially giving Americans access to more and to better education.

We have to make sure that all Americans can reap the fruits of the economic growth we have enjoyed as a nation. But we cannot do that by stepping off the path of economic growth. We can only do it by giving all Americans the tools to participate in that growth.

And let me make one final point. As we continue to expand our economy here at home by expanding our leadership in the global economy, I do believe we have an obligation to support and to encourage labor standards and environmental protections abroad, indeed, around the world. Our commitment to workers' rights and environmental protection are, and have long been, reflections of our fundamental values. They also have been a benefit to our own economy, and they will become more a benefit to our economy as we move into a 21st-century world where maintaining a clean environment will create more high-wage jobs for working people, so that social responsibility and economic markets will merge in their common interests and objectives.

We will continue to seek even further adherence around the globe to fundamental worker rights and environmental protection, as we have for decades. We do not accept the fact that free trade should lower our standards to meet those of other countries. Indeed, our goal should be to persuade other countries to build on the prosperity that comes with trade to lift their own labor standards, their own people up and to make a commitment to economic growth with environmental protection, a commitment we must reaffirm this very year. Trade need not pull standards down; it must lift them up. And we can do that if we'll work at it.

Ladies and gentlemen, for more than 50 years now, we have had a bipartisan consensus on the importance of expanding trade for the American economy and creating a global trading system as a part of America's leadership for peace and freedom. Our prosperity, our leadership, our values, all have been richly rewarded by the efforts we have made. And whenever we have abandoned this course, we have done so at our peril, and our interests and our values have paid for it. It is now clearly more important than ever that we get a new consensus on building a new global economy for the 21st century. I am committed to consulting with the Congress to make sure that this fast-track legislation receives the full, bipartisan support it deserves and the American people expect.

If the historic budget agreement we reached in July taught us anything, it is that we actually can, and indeed, we must, pull together for the good of the American people and the future of our country. Our trade policy should not be about politics; it ought to be about prosperity and building a new economy for the new millennium. Our workers are the most productive in the world. They can outcompete anyone in the world, and we have to give them that opportunity. It's also about our leadership and the world we want for our children.

Finally, let me say this is very important, especially to the millions and millions of working families, because if we do not continue to expand markets for our country's products and services, there is no way, in a world where other economies are growing faster than ours, we can maintain our standard of living with 4 percent of the world's people and 20 percent of the world's wealth. The people with the biggest stake in this struggle are those who go to work every day at jobs all across America, jobs of all kinds.

I know there are heartfelt concerns that expanding jobs in exports and trade could wind up hurting some Americans. That's why we're moving to shape the changes we face. Change is certain; progress is not. But walking away

from this opportunity will not create a single job. No one suggests we should throw up greater barriers in our own marketplace. Walking away from this opportunity will only leave the inequalities that are there now, that do not work to the advantage of either American businesses or American workers. Backing away from this responsibility will not make the environment better. It won't clean up a single toxic waste site. Turning away from the effort will not expand our economy, enhance our competitiveness, or empower our workers.

I say again, the global economy is on a very fast track to the 21st century. The question is whether we are going to lead the way or follow. Today, this country is at the pinnacle of its influence. Our economy is the strongest in the world. We have been very, very blessed. This is not the time to shrink from the future. This is the time to lead to the future. We have a special responsibility because we are doing so well now—a responsibility to think of how our children will do, a responsibility to think of how others around the world will do, a responsibility to think of how this world ought to look like and ought to work like in 20 or 30 years.

So I say, the future will not wait for us, but we can shape it. I do not intend to sit on the sidelines, and I'll bet you, when the time for counting comes, the Congress won't either.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:28 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Eugene Lang, corn and soybean farmer from Grinnell, IA; and Susan Corrales-Diaz, president and chief executive officer, Systems Integrated, Inc.

Message to the Congress Reporting on Telecommunications Services Payments to Cuba

September 10, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

This report is submitted pursuant to 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6) (the "CDA"), as amended by section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, Public Law 104–114 (March 12, 1996), 110 Stat. 785, 22 U.S.C. 6021–91 (the "LIBERTAD Act"), which requires that I report to the Congress on a semiannual basis detailing payments made to Cuba by any United States person as a result of the provision of telecommunications services authorized by this subsection.

The CDA, which provides that telecommunications services are permitted between the United States and Cuba, specifically authorizes the President to provide for payments to Cuba by license. The CDA states that licenses may be issued for full or partial settlement of telecommunications services with Cuba, but may not require any withdrawal from a blocked account. Following enactment of the CDA on October 23, 1992, a number of U.S. telecommunications companies successfully negotiated agreements to provide telecommunications services between the United States and Cuba consistent with policy guidelines developed by the Department of State and the Federal Communications Commission.

Subsequent to enactment of the CDA, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) amended the Cuban Assets Control Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 515 (the "CACR"), to provide for specific licensing on a case-by-case basis for certain transactions incident to the receipt or transmission of telecommunications between the United States and Cuba, 31 C.F.R. 515.542(c), including settlement of charges under traffic agreements.

The OFAC has issued eight licenses authorizing transactions incident to the receipt or transmission of telecommunications between the United States and Cuba since the enactment of the CDA. None of these licenses permits payments to the Government of Cuba from a blocked account. For the period January 1 through June 30, 1997, OFAC-licensed U.S. carriers reported payments to the Government of Cuba in settlement of charges under telecommunications traffic agreements as follows:

AT&T Corporation (formally, American Telephone and Telegraph Company)	$13,997,179
AT&T de Puerto Rico	274,470
Global One (formerly, Sprint Incorporated)	4,857,205
IDB WorldCom Services, Inc. (formerly, IDB Communications, Inc.)	1,427,078
MCI International, Inc. (formerly, MCI Communications Corporation)	4,066,925
Telefonica Larga Distancia de Puerto Rico, Inc.	113,668
WilTel, Inc. (formerly, WilTel Underseas Cable, Inc.)	5,032,250
WorldCom, Inc. (formerly, LDDS Communications, Inc.)	1,378,502
	$31,143,432

I shall continue to report semiannually on telecommunications payments to the Government of Cuba from United States persons.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 10, 1997.

Remarks Announcing the American Heritage Rivers Initiative

September 11, 1997

Thank you, Jose. I think we should send him around the country to organize other young people, don't you? [*Laughter*] Thank you, Mr. Carlino; to the members of the administration who are here, and the Senators and Members of the House and all the rest of you.

We did not intend to regale you today with the natural splendor and riverfront aura of Room 450—[*laughter*]—of the Old Executive Office Building. I can't really take responsibility for the weather. I wanted to welcome you to Mount Vernon. The Vice President suggested I blame it on climate change. [*Laughter*] But we haven't had time to have the requisite number of studies done. [*Laughter*] So we're here to make the best of it.

Before I start and make remarks about this subject, I do want to say that something has occurred in the United States Senate this morning about which I am personally very pleased and for which I am grateful. I have been working, as everyone knows, since the day I became President to allow all our people to participate in the opportunities that this country offers and will offer in the new century. I think clearly the most important way to do that is to guarantee a world-class education to every young person. Just this morning, an overwhelming bipartisan majority in the Senate, 88 Senators, voted to move forward with the plan that I have advocated to establish national standards of learning in reading and mathematics, and to test our children in the fourth and eighth grades by 1999.

They have voted to make sure that these examinations would be written by a truly independent, nonpartisan board, and the measure that they have embraced will help parents to ensure that their children will master the basics of reading and math and to help measure the performance of the schools and teachers involved. This is another example of what can happen when people of good will of both parties get together and look to the future and not the past. And thank you, Senators, and I think this is very, very good news.

And what we're here today to talk about is also very good news and profoundly important. If you think about the stories of Pittsburgh and Chicago—I don't know how many of you have been to Pittsburgh to see the rivers there and see the changes in the community that are truly astonishing, in all the other little communities outlying Pittsburgh in southwest Pennsylvania. As you know—I think all of you know, Hillary is from Chicago, so I spent a lot of time in Chicago, and I've spent a lot of nights and days looking at the Chicago River.

And I think it's very important to remember that many of our greatest cities became what they are because they were built on rivers. And now if we want them to be even greater as we move into a totally new era and where their economies are changing, we have to make sure that the rivers that run through them are good,

clean rivers that offer the potential for young people like Jose to do something they can be proud of, to have a place that they can be proud to be a part of, and to preserve a heritage for their own children and grandchildren.

Rivers have always been the lifeblood of our Nation. They nourish our cities. They feed our soils. They allow us to expand our territory in commerce. They permit us, millions upon millions of us, to fish. You heard the Vice President putting in his little gig about the Tennessee rivers. You know, those of us who come from the States with a lot of rural land, all of us grew up living with the rivers, and all of us have these vivid memories of the rivers. When I graduated from law school and I went home to the hills in north Arkansas to live, before Hillary and I married and I bought a home, I rented two different places out in the country on two different rivers. I spent a lot of the happiest days of my life along the Buffalo River in the Ozark Mountains in north Arkansas, which was the very first river set aside by Congress in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. You can't get there from here. [*Laughter*] But if you do, it's worth the effort. [*Laughter*]

Nineteen years ago, when I first ran for Governor of my home State, I called my great-uncle at—who just passed away at the age of 91, and who had only an elementary school education but a very high IQ and a great wit. And we were having a heated election for the United States Senate that year, and I asked my uncle, I said, "Who do you want to win this Senate race?" He said, "I don't care, and I wouldn't care who was going to be Governor if you weren't my kinfolks." [*Laughter*] And I said, "Well, if I get elected, what do you want me to do?" Then he got dead serious. He said, "I want you to make sure that the rivers are clean and pure, so the fish will be in them and I can run my feet in them in the springtime." That was his platform for my campaign. [*Laughter*]

And there were many people of his generation of modest means who knew that if all else failed they could still go to the river in the springtime. And so this is a big part of what we are.

When I leave this office and I go home, I hope to continue a project I've been working on for many years—I worked on as Governor—to help both restore and enhance the development of our capital city at home along the Arkansas River. And the river has to be clean and pure and fully developed in its natural potential in order for us ever to make the most of that.

So this is a big deal to millions of people. And I suppose that it may be too free of controversy to arouse great interest today here, but we're all trying to change that, just like the Senate did this morning on the education issue. When I saw the two gentlemen before me speaking and then I was looking out here at all the mayors and all the representatives of the local community, about every third sentence they'd be nodding their heads: Yes, what they're saying is absolutely right. And that's a very, very good thing.

Today we are going to rededicate our country to restoring our river heritage and to reaffirm one of our oldest values, the importance of safeguarding our national treasures for all generations to come.

You know, we didn't get to go to Mount Vernon, but I think it's important to say a few words about the Potomac, since that is our river here. George Washington considered it one of the finest rivers in the world. But regrettably, for most of this century the Potomac suffered in ways that President Washington would have been perfectly appalled by. By the 1960's, when I came to school here, the river was so polluted that students on the boating teams at Georgetown actually had to get typhoid shots to go out on the water. But today, thanks to the ongoing—I was not on the crew team; that was my excuse. [*Laughter*] That's a true story. But today, thanks to the ongoing cleanup efforts in communities all up and down this river, the Potomac once again is a genuine, legitimate source of national pride.

All across the country we're seeing this kind of river renaissance. You heard about Chicago and Pittsburgh. We could have talked about Evanston, Wyoming; Cherokee, Iowa; Chattanooga, Tennessee—communities coming together to restore their rivers, to make them both attractive and natural and pure and commercially viable.

Today we take an important step to support and celebrate these efforts when, in a few moments, I will sign an Executive order to launch the new American Heritage Rivers initiative. Through this voluntary program which I first proposed in the State of the Union Address, we will lend our hand of assistance to community-led waterfront projects that protect natural

resources, promote economic revitalization, and preserve our cultural heritage.

For 90 days, starting today, communities that have developed plans to restore and reconnect with their rivers may submit nominations to participate in this innovative initiative. Shortly thereafter, a panel of experts will help me select 10 finalist rivers from among the nominations, each of which will earn a designation as an American Heritage River. These rivers, most likely a mix of rural, suburban, and urban rivers, will receive targeted and coordinated assistance to help bring the community plans to life.

Here is how the initiative might work for an urban river linked by junkyards and abandoned buildings. If the riverfront community comes forward with a good revitalization plan and wins American Heritage River designation, we'll first work with the community to select a skilled, full-time liaison, which we call a river navigator. Maybe we should have called it a river rat. [*Laughter*] The river navigator will then help the community line up Federal and private resources for everything from improving water quality to cleaning up brownfields to designating a riverfront plaza and finding loans for local entrepreneurs.

Every step of the way, the initiative will be driven by the needs and desires of the communities that choose to participate. There will be no Federal mandates, no regulations, no restrictions on property holders' rights. All communities interested in this collaborative concept will be able to learn from the success of the program participants by tapping into a very impressive American Heritage Rivers website.

The reason I'm so pleased by the American Heritage Rivers initiative is that it neatly combines three of the concepts that are closest to my heart, as the Vice President said: First, the notion of environmental stewardship; second, the idea of offering citizen support for a reinvented Government that actually works better and costs less; and finally, once again, that economic prosperity and environmental protection go hand in hand.

We must continue to embrace these three ideas. We must believe in them. We must live by them. The American Heritage Rivers initiative is a great first step. Let the nominations begin.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:52 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Jose Lopez, member of the Chicago River Restoration Crew, known in Chicago as River Rats; and August Carlino, executive director, Pittsburgh Rivers of Steel. The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks at a Congressional Reception

September 11, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Al. Thank you, Tipper. Thank you, Marianne, and to Trent and Tricia, and the Speaker was here earlier—to all of you, thank you for coming.

We tried to put speakers up in the other rooms. We can't get everyone in here. Sometimes the best laid plans don't work. I love it when there's a picnic outside, but if we'd done this last night, all of our food would have been destroyed. And then if we'd done it tonight—it's not raining, but right before you came it rained, so all of our food would have been destroyed again. And we thought at least we ought to feed you well. [*Laughter*]

But there is a long history of this. I actually thought the Vice President was going to tell you the story of the very first time a President had the Congress to the White House. John Adams was the first President to live here. He spent the last 4 or 5 months of his term in the White House. And the first time he invited Congress here, it was a bitter, bitter cold day in Washington. And as you can imagine, back in 1800 we didn't have any central heat. So John and Abigail Adams literally, themselves, as the Congress Members and their families were coming in, were going from room to room, from fireplace to fireplace. They started with 20 cords of wood; they were trying to throw them into

the fireplace and get the fire started. You can imagine how it was. And when they finished it—they'd worked themselves to death—they looked around; it was so cold all the Members of Congress were filing out. So at least you haven't left yet. I feel I'm ahead. [*Laughter*]

I'd like to say a special word about two groups of people here tonight. First of all, all of you who brought your families, I thank you for doing that. I love seeing the children here. There's one child here I especially like to see, Senator Boxer's grandson, because he's also my nephew, and there he is. I'm glad to see him. I'm glad all the children are here.

The second thing I'd like to do is to say—I haven't got a list here, so I'll get myself in trouble—but I want to mention especially with appreciation Lee Hamilton, Elizabeth Furse, and every other Member of Congress of either party who is retiring at the end of this session. Thank you for your service to the United States of America, and thank you for being here tonight. We're very grateful to you.

Finally let me say, as Tipper said, Hillary wanted to be here tonight, but she's going to Mother Teresa's funeral, and I think it very important that we send a delegation there. I know there's also a congressional delegation going, and I think that is a very appropriate thing to do.

I hope we'll go on, have a little fun tonight. We'll hear more from the Floating Opera—what a great name. I feel like that's what we are, half the time. [*Laughter*] Then we're going to go in the room over here and shake hands with anybody that wants to come by. But I stood in the hall for awhile and tried to visit with as many of you as I could—do not feel that you have to. This is not an obligatory receiving line. There is no obligation here tonight except to try to have a good time.

Let's give the band a big hand and listen to them. [*Applause*]

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:14 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Marianne Gingrich, wife of House Speaker Newt Gingrich, and Tricia Lott, wife of Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott. Originally planned as the congressional barbecue, the reception was moved to the East Room due to inclement weather.

Remarks Announcing the Nomination of David Satcher To Be Assistant Secretary for Health and Surgeon General and an Exchange With Reporters

September 12, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. Madam Secretary, our distinguished guests representing the health professions, to the Satcher family, and ladies and gentlemen.

Just yesterday, we learned of the strong public health progress our Nation has been making in recent years. We learned that last year, infant mortality declined to a record low, prenatal care reached a record high, the teen birth rate declined for the fifth straight year, and death from HIV and AIDS declined more than 25 percent. These are huge gains for public health, and much of the credit goes to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and their gifted leader, Dr. David Satcher.

As you heard from the Vice President, Dr. Satcher's many accomplishments are built on a deep foundation of personal experience. On the small corn and peanut farm where he grew up, he relied on a dedicated country doctor, the only African-American doctor in the area, to come to his family's side in times of need. That man, named Dr. Jackson, helped save David Satcher's life, and then he and other mentors and family members inspired him to dedicate his life to caring for the health of other people's families.

They inspired a man whose parents didn't have the opportunity to finish elementary school to himself become the first black M.D., Ph.D. in the history of Case Western Reserve University, then go on to become president of Meharry Medical College and the Director of the world-renowned Centers for Disease Control.

In part, because of the inspiration of his family doctor, David Satcher is uniquely qualified

to be America's family doctor. He's a mainstream physician with a talent for leadership. And I'm proud to announce that I intend to nominate him to be both Assistant Secretary for Health and the Surgeon General of the United States.

Only once before has the President asked one person to fill two of the Nation's most prominent public health offices. I do so today because in his role as Director of the CDC, the agency that is the world's best defense against disease, David Satcher has demonstrated his profound medical expertise and eloquent advocacy for the Nation's public health. He's helped to lead our fight to improve the safety of our food, to wipe out the scourge of emerging infectious diseases, to expand access to vital cancer screening.

I particularly want to thank him for guiding our childhood immunization initiative. Child immunization levels have now reached an all-time high, and cases of childhood diseases that can be prevented by vaccines are at an all-time low.

Now I look forward to working with Dr. Satcher on our most important public health mission, to free our children from the grip of tobacco. Every year, more Americans die from smoking-related diseases than from AIDS, car accidents, murders, and suicides combined. And we all know if people don't begin to smoke in their teens, it's unlikely they will ever begin to do so. We have to make the most of this historic opportunity to protect our children against the dangers of tobacco by passing sweeping legislation that focuses first and foremost on reducing smoking among our young people. And he will lead our Nation's efforts on many other health issues, as well.

Over the past three decades of serving the health needs of our Nation, David Satcher has earned the highest respect of public health officials around the Nation and, indeed, all around the world. No one is better qualified to be America's doctor. No one is better qualified to be the Nation's leading voice for health for all of us. And I am grateful that he is willing to serve.

Before I call on Dr. Satcher to speak, let me make one more comment about another nomination. I'm very disappointed that my nominee for United States Ambassador to Mexico, Governor Weld, did not receive a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today.

Because our relationship with Mexico is so very important to our security and to our economy, I want an Ambassador who can represent all Americans. In a spirit of bipartisanship, I selected a highly qualified individual in the Republican Governor of Massachusetts. I believe the full Senate should find a way to move forward on this nomination. And I am encouraged by suggestions that Senators are seeking a way within the rules of the Senate to do so. After all, a majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wants him to have a hearing, a majority of the United States Senate wants him to have a hearing, and all I have asked for is a fair hearing and an up-or-down vote on a man I believe to be highly qualified.

Now, I hope I'll receive a quick hearing and up-or-down vote, which will doubtless be up, on Dr. David Satcher.

Dr. Satcher.

Q. Mr. President——

The President. Please, let me finish.

[*At this point, Dr. Satcher thanked the President and made brief remarks.*]

Nomination of Governor William Weld

Q. Mr. President, Senator Lugar says that it's now up to you to prevail on Senator Lott to get the Weld nomination to the Senate floor. And, while I'm at it, will you go for a recess appointment if that doesn't work?

The President. Well, I certainly intend to talk to Senator Lott about it, although I would hope that Senator Lugar would do the same thing, and the other Republicans who want the fair and decent thing done. And my position is that this man should have a hearing. He's been a good Governor. He was a distinguished member of the Justice Department under President Reagan, and he's entitled to a hearing. And I believe if he gets a hearing, he'll be confirmed and he'll be able to go to Mexico. And that's what I'm working for.

Police Brutality

Q. Mr. President, the Congressional Black Caucus is in town, and they're calling on you today to address the problem of police brutality—[*inaudible*]—to the Justice Department. What do you have to say to the Caucus about the issue of brutality, and what should be done about it?

The President. Well, I believe that—first of all, I think that when any kind of State action

rises to the level of a constitutional violation, the Justice Department ought to be on top of it. And I look forward to meeting with—I'm going to be with the Black Caucus, and I look forward to hearing from them and to seeing what else they think we should do. This administration, I think, has done more for law enforcement than any administration in modern history, and we've been very supportive of it. And I think those of us who believe in law enforcement and support it should also hold it to the highest standards of conduct.

Proposed Tobacco Settlement

Q. Mr. President, you're meeting with your tobacco advisers this afternoon on the proposed settlement. Can you tell us what direction you're leaning in, and do you think that the penalties that are proposed on the tobacco industry are severe enough?

The President. Well, let me say the direction I will lean in is, I'm going to do whatever I think will best further public health and will best increase the chances that we can dramatically reduce smoking among young people. And I will do that—not only what, but when I do that. There are questions of substance and timing here, and it's a highly complex issue.

I want to thank Secretary Shalala and Bruce Reed for heading the process for our administration to review all aspects of this and also to hear from all people involved, including the tobacco farmers, which Secretary Glickman worked on. And I will be—at least I'll begin my review of that later this afternoon, and then I'll do whatever I think is best. But I can't—I don't want to make any specific comments until I have a chance to hear from my folks. They've been working on this very hard.

Nomination of Governor William Weld

Q. President Clinton, on the—back on the Weld nomination, what do you make of Senator Helms' implied threat that this could have fallout in your relationship with him on other foreign policy matters?

The President. Oh, I don't think it was implied. I thought it was explicit. [*Laughter*] I like that about Senator Helms; he always tells you where he is and what he's doing. This is just a—we've had a very cordial relationship, partly because we've been very candid and honest with each other, and this is just an area where we have disagreement.

I think Governor Weld would be a good ambassador; he doesn't. I think whether you believe he'd be good or not, he's entitled to a hearing, especially when a majority of the members of the committee and a majority of the Members of the Senate want him to have it. And so that's where I am, and we're at loggerheads. Now, as—Senator Lott operates the Senate under the Senate rules, and they may well have the ability to prevent this from ever happening, and they may prevail, but the battle is not over yet.

Q. Mr. President, Mr. Weld used the term "despotic" to describe today's proceedings. Would you go that far?

The President. Well, you know, I think that there are a lot of things about the Senate that when they operate properly may be good—the Senate was designed to slow things down in America by the Founding Fathers—but when they're abused can be bad. I think, among other things, that filibuster has been grossly overused in the last 5 years, and I know of no precedent for this action. But we'll just have to see.

I didn't answer that question on purpose. That's right, I didn't answer—let me remind you of what the situation was in the last recess. We just finished a recess, and Senator Lott told me in no uncertain terms that if I intended to recess-appoint Governor Weld, the Senate would not go into recess, and that he would do whatever was necessary to make sure the Senate did not go into recess. And again, I value my relationship with—we got a balanced budget out of this Congress in part because we trusted each other to tell the truth. So I have to be careful how I handle this. I would never mislead Senator Lott, and he might have the same position this time he had last time.

So I think it's premature to talk about that. We should do this the right way. This man has been a distinguished public servant, and he ought to get a hearing. Let's do this the right way and not talk about—there are circumstances under which recess appointments are appropriate, but the appropriate thing to do here is to give this man a hearing.

Thank you.

Surgeon General Nomination

Q. Mr. President, there has been some criticism on why you waited so long on appointing

a Surgeon General. Can you address those criticisms and also the other criticism that there doesn't even need to be a Surgeon General?

The President. Well, first of all, I—we had this ready to go. We thought the appropriate thing to do was to wait until right after the break instead of doing it right before the break. So we've been ready for some time. But I thought to do it after the August recess would give it greater national visibility and greater impetus going into the congressional hearing process.

And secondly, you could make an argument that we don't need a lot of folks, I guess, but my view is that the country is better off with a Surgeon General than without one. And I think of the contributions that Dr. Koop has made. I think of contributions many of our other Surgeons General have made. I think the idea of having a person who can be looked to by ordinary Americans for good advice and for strong advocacy on what they can personally do, on what the public policy of the country ought to be, and who can advise us about what we should be doing in policy and research and things of that kind, is very, very important.

I think the country kind of likes the idea that there ought to be a doctor that they can trust, that they can turn to for old homespun advice and for also keeping them on the cutting edge of whatever modern medical developments are. And I know that I certainly feel that way, and I'll feel a lot better when Dr. Satcher has been confirmed.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:30 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop.

The President's Radio Address
September 13, 1997

Good morning. America has had a summer of significant achievement, as we are working to protect our values and prepare our people for the 21st century. The balanced budget shows what we can do when we put aside partisanship and work for the public interest and our children's future. But America can't rest. One of the most important things we can do in the next phase of our progress is to pass long-overdue campaign finance reform.

Since I became President, I've worked hard to reform the political system to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. I've acted within my executive authority to limit the ability of important executive branch appointees to work for foreign governments when they leave office. I've worked with Congress to reduce the size of Government to its lowest level since President Kennedy was here and to pass sweeping lobby reform, limiting gifts from lobbyists to lawmakers. We've also gotten the line item veto so the President can cancel wasteful spending, but we haven't succeeded in reforming the campaign finance laws, though we've been trying for nearly 5 years.

The campaign finance system we have now, which is over 20 years old, has simply been overwhelmed by the rising cost of campaigns, largely advertising and other communication costs, and the flood of campaign cash required to meet those costs. The amount of money raised by both political parties now doubles every 4 years. And the candidates themselves are caught up in a fundraising arms race, spending more and more time raising more and more money, which is bound to raise more questions in the public's mind. The campaign system is broken, and every one of us must take responsibility for fixing it.

I'm doing what I can within the executive branch. I've asked our Federal Communications Commission to require media outlets to provide candidates with free air time, especially TV air time, which will reduce the need for more campaign money. I've also asked the Federal Election Commission to ban the large soft-money contributions to political parties from corporations, unions, and wealthy individuals. And the Justice Department has indicated it will go to court, when appropriate, to defend the constitutionality of limited campaign spending.

But there is no substitute for strong, bipartisan campaign finance reform legislation passed by the Congress. I proposed such reform when I ran for President, and I have backed reform legislation every year since then. And in every single year, reform has been blocked in the Congress by a filibuster in the United States Senate, a procedure by which only 41 of the 100 Senators can stop a bill from coming to a vote. Now the special interests and their allies in Congress are poised to strike again, waiting to quietly smother reform with another filibuster. But this year they won't get away with it, at least quietly, because Senators John McCain, a Republican, and Russ Feingold, a Democrat, have pledged to bring their reform legislation to a vote in the Senate this month, and all America will be watching.

On Thursday all 45 Democratic Senators—every single Democrat in the Senate—wrote to the Senate leadership in support. I'm very proud of them. I'm also proud that citizens' groups, spurred by business executives and civic leaders, have gathered one million signatures on a petition to Congress advocating campaign finance reform. I'm grateful to Presidents Ford and Carter and Bush, all of whom have called for reform. They are being joined by dozens of former lawmakers. And the American public clearly wants action.

This is a time of testing for Members of the United States Senate. The opponents of reform are gearing up to keep it from coming to a vote at all. Let's be clear: A vote to filibuster campaign reform is a vote to keep special interest money and kill reform; a vote to filibuster is a vote for the status quo. A Senator who votes "yes" on a filibuster is voting "yes" to soft money and "yes" to keep the cost of campaigns exploding and "no" on reform. That vote will be hard to explain to the American people.

This year, despite all the odds, we've got the best chance in a generation for reform. Throughout our history, the American people have overcome the resistance of entrenched interests to expand our democracy and to keep it strong in changing times. Let's make this autumn a season of reform in our campaign finance laws.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6:36 p.m. on September 12 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on September 13.

Remarks at the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation Gala

September 13, 1997

Thank you. Thank you very much. Congresswoman Waters, every time you get up to speak I'm always all ears. When you introduce me, I'm certainly all ears. I'm never quite sure what you're going to say—[*laughter*]—but I'm absolutely sure you will say what you think. Maxine Waters is my kind of public official. I've been to her district several times with her. She knows the people in the street, the people on the corners. She cares about the people that other people forget. Her district is the first one where I met young men who had been in gangs who were walking the streets with her to save the lives of other young people. That's the kind of thing she's done, and America owes Maxine Waters a debt of gratitude, and I thank her.

I want to congratulate Congressman Clyburn and LeBaron Taylor and all of you who are responsible for this event tonight. I was glad to be here, too, with Congressman Gephardt and with all the distinguished members of the audience. I see Kweisi Mfume there and Mrs. King and Mayor Barry, Dr. Height. Reverend Jackson, I'm always glad to see you. And I think I speak for many of us here when we say that you and your family and your mother are in our prayers, sir. God bless you. And thank you for the magnificent job you did leading, along with Secretary Slater, the American delegation to the African economic summit in Zimbabwe.

Let me also congratulate the award winners: Major Owens and Eva Clayton, Bill Lucy and Danny Bakewell, Laura Murphy and William Brooks, Myrlie Evers-Williams, Coretta Scott King, the late Dr. Betty Shabazz, and my good

friend, the chairman of our racial reconciliation advisory board, Dr. John Hope Franklin.

And finally, let me say one other word of introduction. One of your members is not here tonight because he had to go home to dedicate his new cathedral. But I want to wish Congressman Floyd Flake well as he leaves the United States Congress and goes home to his mission, where his heart is. Floyd Flake, in his church, has helped to start 11 businesses, employing hundreds of people in inner-city neighborhoods who would not have jobs otherwise. That's the sort of partnership I'd like to see us make with African-American churches all across the United States of America, so everybody who wants a job has one. So, even though he's going home, I want him to be a model that all of us here in Washington can continue to follow.

I want to say one serious thing. If you don't remember anything else tonight, remember this one sentence: I am profoundly grateful to the Congressional Black Caucus for making a dream of a lifetime come true; I am the opening act for James Brown. [*Laughter*] In one of James Brown's songs he says, "I don't want nobody to give me nothing. Just open up the door. I'll get it myself." I think that's the motto of the CBC. And for 4½ years, we've been working together to open up those doors.

Today, we see the results: unemployment below 5 percent, lowest African-American unemployment in 24 years; 13 million new jobs; family incomes up, African-American family income is up $3,000 in 3 years; the lowest poverty rate among African-Americans ever recorded; violent crime down 5 years in a row; record drops in welfare. That is the progress that I could not have possibly made if it had not been for the support of the Congressional Black Caucus, and I thank you very much for that.

And let me say that progress should spur us on, for there is still too much poverty, still too much lack of economic and educational opportunity. There is still too much discrimination. There is too much to do. And I come here today to say that, down to the last day of my Presidency, I will be there with you, working with you, fighting for a tomorrow that we can all share together.

I also want to thank the members of my administration who are here. Many have been noticed, but I'd like to say a special word of thanks to all the African-Americans who work in the White House. And to Bob Nash, Goody Marshall, Ben Johnson, Minyon Moore, Terry Edmonds, Ann Walker, Tracey Thornton, and Andy Blocker—I know they're here—there may be more. But I want to thank them for helping me to be a better President.

I also want to thank the CBC for its strong support of the man who will be the next Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Bill Lee. He's here tonight, and I thank you for sticking by him. For much of his career, Bill Lee's been a civil rights lawyer with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. He was not born into a position of leadership. Instead, he's a Chinese-American who worked his way out of poverty in Harlem to become a national leader in the fight for social justice. We need your support to ensure his confirmation. He will do a magnificent job.

I also want to ask your support for the man whom I nominated this week to be the next Surgeon General and Assistant Secretary of Health, Dr. David Satcher.

Finally, let me say, as the Congress comes back after its recess, I ask for your support to get from this Congress the money that was promised for the priorities we fought so hard for in the balanced budget agreement: the largest increase in aid to education since 1965, the biggest increase opening the doors to college for all—and aid to college—since 1945, and the biggest increase in health care for poor people and children since 1965. Now we've got to make good on the promises of that agreement, and I need your help to do that.

Finally, let me say that as we approach a new millennium, we must decide that we can never be what we ought to be unless we get there together. I was, just the other day, at American University in Washington. There are students from 140 different national and ethnic groups at American University. We don't have time for, or room for, discrimination. And we can no longer ignore the unfinished business of our past. We cannot continue to grow economically as long as there's a single soul in this country who needs a good quality education who can't get it and who is denied access to a job for which he or she is plainly qualified. We cannot do that.

And we have to decide, as a country, that we can't afford our past baggage or our present blinders. We've got to embrace a future in which we're all going forward together. Look around this room tonight. You are the future of America. Your children and grandchildren are

the future of America. And we are going to have the most exciting future that this country has ever had if we just make up our mind to make sure everybody has a chance to walk through that door together.

I ask your support for Dr. John Hope Franklin and Judy Winston. I thank you for the national townhall meeting on race relations in the new millennium that you held. I ask you to remember this: Everybody who gets to serve in Congress, certainly someone who gets to serve as President, has had a chance—all those folks—we've had our chance to live our dreams, but there's still a lot of people our age that were denied that chance. There are huge numbers of people our parents' age who never had that chance. We should promise that there will be no one our children's age who will be denied that chance to walk through the door of their dreams. That is our mission, and I promise to pursue it with you hand in hand until my last day as your President.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 p.m. at Union Station. In his remarks, he referred to LeBaron Taylor, chair, Congressional Black Caucus Foundation; Kweisi Mfume, president, and Myrlie Evers-Williams, chair, board of directors, NAACP; Coretta Scott King, founder, Martin Luther King Center for Nonviolent Social Change, Inc.; Mayor Marion S. Barry, Jr., of Washington, DC; Dorothy Height, president and chief executive officer, National Council of Negro Women; civil rights leader Jesse Jackson; William Lucy, international secretary and treasurer, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; Danny J. Bakewell, chair, The Bakewell Company; Laura W. Murphy, director, American Civil Liberties Union, Washington, DC, office; William Brooks, vice president of corporate affairs, General Motors; the late Betty Shabazz, director, institutional advancement and public relations, Medgar Evers College, City University of New York; entertainer James Brown, who performed at the gala; and John Hope Franklin, Chair, and Judith A. Winston, Executive Director, President's Advisory Board on Race.

Remarks to the Service Employees International Union

September 15, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you. This is a pretty good way to start off the week. [*Laughter*]

You know, I'm getting up in years now, and—[*laughter*]—every day I start a little slower, it seems like, and I always need kind of a jolt of energy. I may be dancing by the time I get back to the White House. This may be the afternoon of my first 5-mile run since the accident.

It's great to see you, and I thank Andy for that remarkable introduction and for his remarks and his passionate commitment. I thank your executive vice presidents who are up here on the stage with me, and all the rest of you for inviting me here.

We have a large number of people from the White House who have come here today. I think I should mention at least two of them. One is a gift you gave me or a theft I accomplished—[*laughter*]—but Karen Tramontano is doing a magnificent job. I also would like to note that the Assistant to the President and Director of Public Liaison used to work with you at the Labor Department, Maria Echaveste, and she is also doing a great job, and she's here with me.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here and delighted to see all of you, wishing I had one of those purple T-shirts to jog in. [*Laughter*] I'll get one before I leave. The SEIU—better not do that or it will be a story. [*Laughter*] The SEIU is leading the way for better wages, safer workplaces, more full-time jobs, and a brighter future for our working families. There's new life, new energy, new creativity in the labor movement in America, and a lot of it began right here with you, and I thank you for it. Because of your leadership in the workplace and your involvement in the political process, not just you but America is also back. I've come here today to thank you for what you've done, not simply for me and our administration but for the people of the United States,

to strengthen our families and to strengthen our economy and to strengthen our future.

I also want to talk to you about what we can do now to strengthen America's health care system and especially to talk about what we have to do to reduce fraud in the Medicare program so that it can serve America well into the 21st century.

We've come a long way from 6 years ago when I announced my candidacy for President. Then I said that I had a simple mission for America in the 21st century. I wanted to keep the American dream alive for every person responsible enough to work for it. I wanted to make sure that America would continue to be the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity. And I wanted to make sure that we could bring our people together across all the lines that divide us amid increasing diversity into one America—our oldest and most enduring values—opportunity for all, responsibility from all, a community of all Americans leading the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity.

We began with a bold new economic course that focused on three things: shrinking the deficit; selling more American products and services around the world; and investing in our people, in the capacity of all of our people, and being determined to leave no one behind. We also put a special effort on depressed communities. We had an aggressive anticrime strategy to try to bring the crime rate down by putting more police officers on the street and keeping more kids out of trouble, taking assault weapons off the street, keeping handguns out of the hands of people with a criminal or a serious mental health history. We had an aggressive effort to help move people from welfare to work. Now, 6 years later from the time I started, almost 5 years from the time I became President, we see the results: nearly 13 million new jobs, unemployment less than 5 percent, poverty down, the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history, dramatic drops in the crime rate year after year.

Maybe even more importantly, about midway through my first term, after decades of working harder and harder for lower wages, never keeping up with inflation, millions of Americans are finally beginning to see a rise in their paychecks. And it's about time. Incomes of American families have averaged an increase of $1,600 since the beginning of our administration, but it's getting better over time because of three things.

First of all, with your help last year, we raised the minimum wage because no hard-working parent should have to try to raise a child on $4.25 an hour.

Secondly, we more than doubled the earned-income tax credit in the economic program of 1993, which is worth, on average, over $1,000 a year in lower taxes to a family of four with an income of under $30,000 a year if they have a couple of children.

And thirdly, the children's tax credit, which was just adopted—and adopted to cover those young public employees that start out, and may be eligible for, the earned-income tax credit, too—will be worth another $500 a child to working families throughout this country.

These three things together are going to have a huge impact on the family incomes, particularly of people, let's say, in the bottom 40 percent of the income brackets in the United States.

From 1945 until the mid-seventies, all of us grew together. From the mid-seventies to the early nineties, our economy continued to grow, but because of inflation, because of foreign competition, because of all the restructuring going on in the American economy, we began to grow apart. Now we can grow together again. And I know that's what you want, and that's what I want. We've got to grow, and grow together. And that means we can't rest, because even though this is a time of extraordinary achievement and justifiable optimism for our country, we have to keep going until every single American can reap the rewards of a growing economy, and we're not there yet.

In the last budget bill, for the first time ever, we had so much increased aid to help people go to college or send their children to college—the biggest increase in 50 years since the GI bill—we can now honestly say we have now opened the doors of college education to all. But people have to walk through them in order to get the training they need to get the incomes that they want for themselves and their children.

We also are in the middle of a continuing struggle to secure the investments in the budget agreement for our schools and also to embrace the notion that we ought to have high national standards of academic excellence, which should apply to all of our children in all of our school districts—not Federal Government standards, national standards that should apply to all of our children.

We also have to pass sweeping legislation designed to continue this effort to keep tobacco out of the hands of our young children.

And we have to continue to grow the economy. There are some specific things in this budget agreement that are very important, designed to go right to the heart of the poorest communities in urban and rural America: doubling the number of community development banks that make loans to people in those neighborhoods; continuing to make sure that we have more and more empowerment zones, the program the Vice President has done such a good job on, to give people incentives to invest money where there are people who are unemployed or underemployed. That's good for our economy, to keep the jobs growing.

One other thing—and I know that we have often disagreed on this—I just want to say one more time. Our analysis is that between one-quarter and one-third of our economic growth that made 13 million jobs in the last 4 years came because we are selling more American products overseas. Why? We have 4 percent of the world's population; we have 20 percent of the world's wealth. If you want to keep 20 percent of the wealth with 4 percent of the population, you have to sell something to the other 96 percent. Now, in the next 15 years, our estimates are that the developing countries of Latin America and Asia will grow 3 times as fast as the United States, Europe, and Japan. And therefore, we have to be a part of that.

The last point I want to make is—all of you know this—our markets are already among the most open in the world. They're more open than all these countries we're making agreements with. So if we agree to have equally open markets, we give up far less than they do, and we open markets largely to our high value-added products. That's why I sought the fast-track trade authority, not because I want unfair trade agreements but because I think we have earned a presumption, at least, to be taken seriously when I say to you the 220 trade agreements we have negotiated had something to do with the 13 million jobs we have and the fact that we have the most successful economy we've had in a generation.

Should there be labor and environmental standards? Should we work hard to raise labor standards for working people around the world so that it increases everyone's income? Absolutely. Should we ask people to adhere to global standards so that we can preserve the global environment? Absolutely. But that means we should, too. That means that we should, too. We can't tell another country they should clean up their sewage and clean up their water unless we're willing to clean up the global air that we—we have to do it, too. We have to do it, too.

So we've got a lot still to do. But I want to focus in the last few minutes of my talk here on what Andy talked about. I want to talk about health care: Where we are and where are we going. You know, they said if I passed my health care plan that everybody was going to go into managed care, and it would be a bad thing. [*Laughter*] Well, we didn't pass the health care plan, and everybody's going into managed care. [*Laughter*] And it's not all bad.

But also we don't have anything like the choices for health care consumers that we had in our plan. So the good news is, we've rationalized the management of the health care system. The bad news is, we don't have the standards in there and the choices and the consumer protections that we would have had.

Now, we can't go strong into the 21st century if millions of our fellow citizens still go to bed every night worrying about whether their sons and daughters and parents can see a doctor. I said if we don't do something about it, the number of people without health insurance in America will continue to rise. And sure enough, it has. Now there are over 40 million of us without health insurance.

We can't be strong in the 21st century if American patients are only a dollar sign on a ledger book. We cannot be a strong nation—to be fair, too, we can't be a strong nation unless we know that Medicare and Medicaid will last and will be relatively free of the fraud and abuse that can so easily infiltrate any big program. So we have a lot to do.

It has become commonplace to say that we have the most excellent health care system in the world, but we are not very excellent in making sure all Americans can share in it. That is what we have to focus on. And it tickled me when Andy said that Bill and Hillary would outlive Harry and Louise. I certainly hope so. [*Laughter*] I have to tell you, though, a lot of times in my life I've gotten beat trying to do something I thought was right. And I prefer that than not trying in the first place. I'm glad

I tried to do the health care. I'm glad I tried to do that. [*Applause*] Thank you.

As you might imagine, I've had a lot of time to sort of Monday-morning quarterback myself and try to figure out how I could have done a better job. It is ironic that, having reduced the size of the Federal Government by 300,000 to its smallest size since Kennedy, I was accused of trying to have the Government take over the health care system; that having given more authority to the States than even President Reagan did, I was accused of trying to engage in a power grab for the Federal Government. I wasn't trying to do that. But the fact is that we have a system unlike any in the advanced world. And every other advanced country can figure out how to get health insurance to everybody, and we can't. And we wind up paying more because of it, because we don't do enough preventive health care, we don't do enough primary health care, we do too much through the emergency rooms. We have too many people with uncompensated care that the rest of us who have insurance pay for in higher rates. All because we have refused to try to rationalize this process.

Now, what I tried to do before won't work. Maybe we can do it in another way. That's what we've tried to do a step at a time until eventually we finish this. We can be very proud of the Family and Medical Leave Act. I was glad that your president mentioned that. That's the first major legislation I signed. Millions of people no longer have to make a choice between succeeding at work and home because of that. All the time, people still come up to me and talk about it—I travel around the country—just citizens come up and talk to me about their experiences under the Family and Medical Leave Act.

We can be proud that after the so-called Contract With America revolution in 1994, we didn't allow them to take away Medicaid, and we were able to preserve the social safety net. There are millions of poor children, pregnant women, disabled and older Americans who still have access to health care. A lot of them don't. A lot of them can't even vote, and they may not have a lot of political power. But you stood up for them, and I appreciate it, and I hope you're proud of it.

You can be proud that you supported and that there was enormous bipartisan support for the Kennedy-Kassebaum health insurance bill that says you can't lose your health insurance when you change jobs or just because someone in your family has been sick. That will preserve health care for enormous numbers of people, and you should be proud of that.

And you ought to be proud of the health care provisions of this last budget. The biggest increase in investment in health care for children since the Medicaid program passed in 1965 is in the balanced budget of 1997. It will permit us to insure up to half of the children who don't have health insurance. And if you'll help us, we might be able to actually insure more. Because of the 10 million children in America—40 million people roughly don't have health insurance, actually a little more; 10 million of them are children. Of those 10 million, 3 million, believe it or not, are eligible for Medicaid right now. And they're not on it, either because maybe their parents are first generation immigrants, aren't fluent in English, no one has explained to them that they're eligible. Maybe they're people who work for low wages, but they think somehow they'll be on welfare if their children take Medicaid.

It's a lot of work, but we could actually insure more than 5 million children with the $24 billion in this bill. If we could get the 3 million kids who are Medicaid-eligible right now onto Medicaid, we could take the same money and insure far more children. And we'll be back to you on that. But we need your help.

In addition to that, this budget also provided new preventive care benefits for mammographies, to try to head off prostate cancer, which is just as prominent in men as breast cancer is in women, and had what the American Diabetes Association said was the most significant advance in the care of Americans with diabetes since insulin was discovered 70 years ago. So this is a good budget.

But we have to work now to make sure that we devise a system that actually covers new children instead of a system that permits employers to continue to drop their employees' children from insurance because they're going to be picked up in public dollars. We must not do that. We must make sure that we cover new children.

I need your help in this. We cannot waste this opportunity. We've got to work with the advocates groups, the local communities, the State governments, the health care providers. We cannot blow this. This is an enormous thing.

You know, when you think about the rhetoric of the health care debate just a couple of years ago, and now you've got 80 percent of the Congress in both Houses voting for the biggest increase in health care coverage since Medicaid passed in '65, we have come a long way. And you can be proud of that. And you can be glad that now there are Members of both parties in Congress who are willing to vote to do this.

But it is complicated when you're doing this a piece at a time. We've got to do it right so we can go on to the next step and the next step and the next step. What about all those people that retire at 55 and lose their employer-based health insurance and can't draw Medicare until they're 65? What about all those people? What about all the people who have a right to keep their health insurance when they're between jobs, but after they've been without a job for a certain amount of time, they still can't afford it? I've got a right to own a Jaguar, but I don't. [*Laughter*] So we've got to be careful. We've got to do this right. And you can help on this. You can really help us on this. But the children of this country have got a lot riding on us doing this right, and we need you.

Finally, let me say, we've got to take some decisive steps to deal with some of the changes that are constantly evolving in the health industry. We've got to act to protect consumers first. Whether they have traditional health care coverage or managed care, we have to make sure they don't have inferior care. That's why I appointed the nonpartisan quality commission to write a consumer's bill of rights. And let me say, I want to thank your secretary-treasurer, Betty Bednarczyk, for serving on that. She's doing a good job, and I appreciate it.

Congress has to pass some legislation. It should ban gag rules in private health care plans, just as I did in Medicare and Medicaid. It should ban these horrifying drive-through mastectomies, just as it banned drive-through baby deliveries. The First Lady and a lot of other people have worked hard on this since I called for it in the State of the Union, but Congress still has not held a hearing on this. It's time to move, and I ask you to help me get Congress to move on this.

It should be made illegal for health companies to deny or drop coverage or raise rates based on genetic information. We're going to continue with this Human Genome Project, and that's a good thing. And some day in the not-too-distant future, young mothers and fathers will bring their newborn babies home from the hospital and they'll actually have a genetic map for their kids. And 99.9 percent of the time, I guess, or at least the vast majority of the time, it will just be good news with good information. Sometimes it will be terribly sad. But even when it's sad or challenging or frightening, it will give those parents the chance to give their children a longer life or a better life. But if we're going to find this information, we can't turn around and basically say, because of the march of science we're going to even increase further the number of uninsured people in America. And who's going to take care of them?

So this is a very important issue. And again, I ask for your strong advocacy on this. Science, yes; research, yes; tell people more about the health condition of their children, yes; but don't strip them of their insurance because of this march of science.

Congress should follow the new medical privacy guidelines we issued last week and pass legislation to make sure records now stored in computers stay just as confidential as records locked in a file cabinet. I think that average Americans really worry about this. You do—don't you worry that something gets in a computer, it will be halfway around the world and somebody is going to send you something in the mail to try to get some money out of you or do something? I think people really worry about this. How can we preserve privacy and still take advantage of the modern computer technology? We want people that deal with us to take advantage of computer technology if they can serve us faster or better or cheaper. We know they can save a lot of money. But in the end, privacy is worth an awful lot, and we don't want to see computer technology take it away.

And the last issue I want to deal with, again, is to say that we will never have a health care system as strong as it can be unless we strengthen our efforts to root out fraud and abuse in the Medicare program. They amount—these kinds of practices amount to a fraud tax on all the taxpayers of the country. And for those of you who work in health care, they cost public confidence in the work that you do. I know home health care workers want to put a stop to fraud and abuse, and I look forward to working with you to do that.

We put more Federal resources into this. Convictions are up 240 percent, and we've saved the taxpayers $20 billion already, but it is just the beginning. Home health care is one of the country's fastest growing industries. We want more people to be cared for at home if they can properly be cared for at home. Every month, nearly 100 home health providers—new ones—enter the Medicare program. But there is still too much evidence of widespread fraud and abuse that has to stop.

First, we're going to keep scam and rip-off artists from getting into the Medicare system in the first place. Today I'm declaring an immediate moratorium on the admission of new home health agencies to Medicare, and during this moratorium we'll develop tough new regulations to ensure that no fly-by-night providers enter or remain in the Medicare program. Second, I'm requiring all home health agencies to reenroll every 3 years so that they, too, will abide by these standards. Third, we will double the number of audits of home health agencies currently involved in the Medicare program.

Medicare for us is a way to honor our parents and strengthen our families. I was glad to fight for the comprehensive reforms that we got in the last budget that will give more choices to Medicare customers and still keep the program strong for more than a decade. No matter what changes we make in the structure of the program, we can't maintain it for what it should be if we tolerate unacceptable levels of fraud and abuse.

Earlier today I said that you represented the future of the American labor movement and the future of America. Just look around the room, and you'll see why—people who have come together across racial, professional, geographic lines to fight for a common future. That's what we all have to do. That's why I asked the American people to join me this year in a great conversation about our racial diversity and where we're going with it. What's our unfinished business that we've been lugging around for us? What about discrimination that still exists? What about destructive attitudes that still exist? What is the unfinished racial business of America? Question one.

Question two is, what about the future? What kind of country is this going to be like when, 5 years from now, there's no group with a racial majority in our biggest State, California, and when, within 40 years, there will be no racial majority in the entire United States? Now, we can look at the census projections and tell what we're going to look like, but that's not the same thing as saying what we're going to be like.

Everything we talked about today, every single specific issue is designed again to guarantee opportunity for everybody who will work for it, to maintain the leadership of our country in the world, and to bring us together in one community of America. That's what I want you to lead for.

Don't ever be afraid to be an instrument of change. Don't ever be afraid to stick your neck out and fight for change. And don't ever be afraid to hold yourself up to the scrutiny of life and say we want to represent the future of America. You look around this room, and you know you can do it. And when you think about how you feel at your very best in your work, you think about the best days you ever have working with people that are so different from you, you never imagined you'd ever get to know them or work with them, that's the way America ought to be every day. And that's what we need to keep working for.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:20 a.m. in the Phoenix Room at the Hyatt Grand Regency Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Andrew Stern, president, Service Employees International Union; and "Harry and Louise," characters in a series of commercials sponsored by the Health Insurance Association of America.

Statement on Withdrawal of the Nomination of William F. Weld To Be Ambassador to Mexico

September 15, 1997

With great disappointment I accepted Governor Bill Weld's decision today to withdraw as my nominee for Ambassador to Mexico. He would have been a superb Ambassador to Mexico.

The American people have not been well served during this process for several reasons. First, they have lost the opportunity of being represented in one of our most important ambassadorial positions by this outstanding public servant. Second, because Governor Weld was denied his right to a fair hearing, the American people lost their right to judge his qualifications for themselves. Third, they were denied a voice in this issue because their representatives in the United States Senate were prevented from voting on the nomination. And finally, at a time when we had been making strides towards a bipartisan foreign policy, the treatment that my nominee received reflected a divisiveness that does not well serve the American people.

Our relations with Mexico are critical to our national security and to our economy. I will now work to find a replacement for Governor Weld who will meet the same high standards he would have set.

NOTE: Press Secretary Mike McCurry read this statement during his daily briefing, which began at 2:24 p.m.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Mexico-United States Convention for the Protection of Migratory Birds and Game Mammals With Documentation

September 15, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Protocol Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States Amending the Convention for the Protection of Migratory Birds and Game Mammals, signed at Mexico City on May 5, 1997 ("the Mexico Protocol"). I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Mexico Protocol.

In concert with a similar Protocol between the Governments of the United States and Canada, the Mexico Protocol represents a considerable achievement for the United States in conserving migratory birds and balancing the interests of conservationists, sports hunters, and indigenous people. The Protocol should further enhance the management of and protection of this important resource for the benefit of all users.

The Mexico Protocol is particularly important because it will permit the full implementation of the Protocol Amending the 1916 Convention for the Protection of Migratory Birds in Canada and the United States ("the Canada Protocol") that is pending before the Senate at this time. The Canada Protocol is an important agreement that addresses the management of a spring/summer subsistence hunt of waterfowl in communities in Alaska and northern Canada. The Mexico Protocol conforms the Canadian and Mexican migratory bird conventions in a manner that will permit a legal and regulated spring/summer subsistence hunt in Canada and the United States.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

September 15, 1997.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Trade in Military Articles and Services
September 15, 1997

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

As required by section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2415), I transmit herewith the annual report on U.S. exports of defense articles and services, and on imports of military articles to the United States.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Remarks on the 50th Anniversary of the Central Intelligence Agency in Langley, Virginia
September 16, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very much, Director Tenet, Mrs. Tenet, Mr. Berger, Mr. Brandon, Senator Shelby, and Congressmen Gilman, Bishop, and Goss, and Congresswoman Harman. Someone told me that Secretary Cohen was here, but I haven't seen him yet. I will acknowledge him whether he is or not. He's a great friend of this agency.

To the men and women of the CIA family, past and present, I am delighted to be with you here today. I appreciate what George Tenet said. The last couple of years, I've been glad to see anybody or anything turn 50. [*Laughter*] Someone I know extremely well is turning 50 this year, along with the CIA, but it is still a classified state secret. [*Laughter*]

When George was sworn in, he promised to uphold the highest standards of this agency to deliver intelligence that is clear, objective, without regard to political consequences. That's just exactly what we want from our intelligence community, what we've come to expect from George, and what I have come to expect from all of you. I thank you very much for your service on this 50th anniversary.

Today we salute the men and women of the CIA for service, sacrifice, and selfless dedication on behalf of our Nation. We look back on the contributions of the agency in promoting America's interests and preserving peace. We commit ourselves on the verge of a new century to help keep America the world's leading force for freedom and peace in the future no less than in the past.

When President Truman created the CIA under the circumstances that George mentioned a few moments ago, few could have imagined how the world would look a half-century later. Two years after the Second World War, Europe was still in ruins, economies in turmoil, the Iron Curtain descending. The values upon which our Nation was founded and for which we had fought so dearly seemed under siege from Europe to Asia. But now Europe is at peace, Russia increasingly is our partner, the cold war belongs to the past. The tide of market democracy has reached the shores of every continent.

For the first time in history, more than half of all the world's people live under governments of their own choosing. Former adversaries are becoming new allies; former rivals, new partners and friends. I think it is important on this day to note, without reservation, that the men and women of our intelligence community played a crucial role in shaping these events over the last five decades. Through four decades of cold war, you stood on the frontlines of democracy's struggle worldwide. You served where others could not go. You did what others could not do. You helped us to understand what foreign leaders had in mind, what tools they had in hand, what resources they had in store. The intelligence edge you gave our country's national security decisionmaking made it less likely that

our troops would need to fight or that our lives would be put at risk.

By necessity, the American people will never know the full story of your courage. You labor in obscurity by choice and design, serving with quiet patriotism that seeks neither spotlight nor praise. President Eisenhower said in 1959, when he laid the cornerstone here at Langley, "Success cannot be advertised; failure cannot be explained. In the work of intelligence, heroes are undecorated, often even among their own fraternity."

But the 70 stars on the Wall of Honor bear witness to the valor of the highest order, a total commitment, an ultimate sacrifice, in some ways all the more moving for its required anonymity. Today, again, I say on behalf of a grateful Nation, we thank you.

Now we must work together to make certain that the CIA can serve our Nation in the future as it has in the past. You, better than anyone, know that at the end of the cold war we are by no means free of risks. Threats to our security and our values live on. Often they're more diffuse, more complex, but often no less dangerous than before.

As your first customer, let me reiterate, I depend upon unique, accurate intelligence more than ever. Your work informs every foreign policy decision I make, from dealings with leaders in the Middle East to Russia. Targeted and timely intelligence in some places is more difficult to collect than ever. In today's high-tech information age, the haystacks are getting bigger, but the size of the needles isn't. That's why we've worked so hard to adapt our tremendous intelligence capability to meet the challenges of this time, to make this era of change work for us, to ensure that we have the information we need to keep our Nation secure, and to help lock in the gains of peace and freedom all around the world.

Our first task is to focus our intelligence resources in the areas most critical to our national security, the areas where, as Director Tenet has said, we simply cannot afford to fail. Two years ago I set out our top intelligence priorities in the Presidential Decision Directive: First, supporting our troops and operations, whether turning back aggression, helping secure peace, or providing humanitarian assistance; second, providing political, economic, and military intelligence on countries hostile to the United States so we can help to stop crises and conflicts before they start; and third, protecting American citizens from new transnational threats such as drug traffickers, terrorists, organized criminals, and weapons of mass destruction.

You have risen to these challenges. In Bosnia, your information and analysis has helped our commanders to protect our troops and to give peace a chance to take hold. In North Korea, you warned us of their dangerous nuclear program and gave us the information we need to negotiate a halt to it. In Russia and the Newly Independent States, your support has helped us to lower the nuclear threat and to promote democracy and market reform. And here in our own hemisphere, your work with law enforcement has helped us to capture every top drug lord of the Colombian Cali cartel.

You have also worked hard to build better teamwork within the intelligence community to make better use of limited resources, with less duplication and more results. Today, your successes nearly are all joint efforts, reflecting the talent and courage and expertise of men and women across the board. The dramatic capture of Mir Aimal Kansi proves the vast potential of your growing teamwork with the FBI. You showed that America will not rest in tracking down terrorists who use violence against our people, no matter how long it takes or where they hide, and I thank you for that.

So on this 50th birthday, all of you here and the families who support you have a lot to be proud of. And now we have to build on that record for the future. Looking back on the last 50 years, we know the road has not always been smooth. But you have learned and persevered as an agency, and we have learned and persevered as a country. When problems arise, we have to meet them head on, learn from them, and make sure as we go forward that integrity and responsibility remain our watchwords every day. That's the best way to promote public confidence and to preserve the high standards which I know you share.

Through the dedication, professionalism, and hard work of men and women like you, this agency has played an integral role in keeping our Nation strong, advancing our interests, promoting peace, lifting the lives of millions around the world. Now each of us must do our part to carry that tradition forward, because even though the world has not changed—the world has changed—we will always have to rely on human judgment. No computer program will

ever replace it. You, the men and women of the CIA, put your passion and creativity behind our intelligence. We still depend on our case officers abroad who face new pressures, challenges, and dangers in a more complex world. We still rely on our imagery analysts who prove every day from the Cuban missile crisis to Desert Storm that a picture truly can be worth a thousand words and more.

We still need dedicated men and women to monitor foreign communications and sound the right alarms. We still need analysts to weave varied strands of data into logical, honest assessments and, when necessary, into warnings. We still need sophisticated counterintelligence to keep our secrets in and keep foreign agents out. And ultimately, our intelligence community's success depends upon the support of the public it serves and the Congress that oversees its work. So let me say again how pleased I am to see these distinguished Members of Congress here today, evidence of the strong partnership between the legislative branch and the intelligence community. Thank you for your presence.

In the walls here at Langley, there is inscribed that magnificent verse of scripture, "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." For five decades, the men and women of the CIA have made it their mission to bring that truth to light, often at tremendous personal risks and never for personal acclaim.

For five decades, your honor, your heroism, your judgment, and your intelligence has helped America to meet every challenge we have faced. Now, on the brink of the 21st century, with your help we can do that all over again for another 50 years. Once again, you stand at the forefront of America's defense, you embody America's best values, and you must help to carry us into a brighter future.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:25 a.m. in the quadrangle at CIA Headquarters. In his remarks, he referred to Stephanie Tenet, wife of Director of Central Intelligence George J. Tenet; Charles (Chase) Brandon, Public Affairs Officer, CIA; and Mir Aimal Kansi, apprehended suspect in the 1993 shooting of CIA employees at an intersection in Langley, VA.

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

September 16, 1997

The President. Good afternoon. Today I am taking the next step in our strategy to extend our prosperity into the next century. I have submitted legislation to the Congress that will renew the traditional authority granted to Presidents of both parties since 1974 to negotiate new trade agreements to open foreign markets to goods and services made by American workers.

We are at a moment of hard-earned optimism and great hope for our future, with 13 million new jobs, unemployment below 5 percent. Our 1993 economic plan, which cut the deficit by 80 percent, created the base conditions for this growth. The bipartisan balanced budget I have just signed, with its unprecedented investment in education, sets the stage for further prosperity into the next century.

But we must also recognize that a critical element of America's success has been our leadership in the global economy. More than a third of our growth in the past 4 years has come from expanded trade. Today, 12 million American jobs are supported by exports. Today, at the pinnacle of that strength, America must choose whether to advance or to retreat. I believe the only way we can continue to grow and create good jobs in the future is to embrace global growth and expand American exports.

The legislation I submitted today extends for 4 years the authority every American President has had for decades, to negotiate new agreements that tear down foreign barriers to our goods and our services, everything from computer equipment to chemicals. It will enable the United States to sell in the world's fastest growing markets, regions where our competitors

will step in if we retreat. It will help to create the high-wage jobs that come from exports, and it will do this while allowing us to advance protections for workers' rights and the environment, critical goals for us at home and for America abroad.

The Vice President and I are now going to Capitol Hill to meet with the Democratic Members of Congress to spell out why this legislation is in the national interest. The legislation reflects the values of both parties and reflects the abiding partnership between the President and Congress. It is a bipartisan partnership that has helped to produce strong prosperity and a partnership that must continue in the interest of the American people and our future.

Landmines

Q. Mr. President, are you changing your policy on landmines?

The President. No, I'm not changing my policy on landmines. I have been working very hard to try to reach agreement with the parties in Oslo.

But I would like to remind everybody here of a few facts. I believe that I was the first world leader to call for an end to the landmines that are killing so many innocent people around the world. The United States does not produce, sell, or deploy these mines, and we are destroying them. With the single exception of Korea—everyone in the world recognizes that Korea is a special problem because of the number of North Korean troops that are very close to Seoul. And we have been working with the people in Oslo to try to get an extended period of time to deal with that.

Now, there is another issue that relates to our antitank mines, which are slightly different from other countries, which also involve destruction devices that automatically go dead within a matter of hours or days. We're trying to work through these things.

But the United States has done more than any other country to bring an end to landmines. We have spent $150 million in the last 4 years in demining work. We are missing an airplane off the coast of Africa that deposited a demining team in Africa to continue this work. So we have not taken a back seat to anyone. But we have to make sure that our fundamental responsibilities through the United Nations for Korea, and to our own troops in terms of antitank mines, which are legal under this treaty, can be maintained.

And we're working on it. I don't want to discuss the state of play because I'm not quite sure what it is. But we have another day or so to try to work through this. The United States would like to be a signatory to this agreement, but I have to be sure that we can fulfill our responsibilities and protect our troops.

Q. Sir, how much of a fast track——

Proposed Tobacco Legislation

Q. Do you support an increase in the price of cigarettes of $1.50? Is that one of the proposals tomorrow on tobacco?

The President. I will announce tomorrow what I think we should do on tobacco. And we're going to come out for some clear principles that will further this debate, which we started a long time ago now it seems, with the action proposed by the FDA. Again, I will say I want to do what is necessary to protect children's health, particularly, and the public health in general. And I will be, I think, quite vigorous and clear tomorrow when I make that announcement.

Q. Sir, is the tobacco agreement dead? How much of a fast track is it going to be on after tomorrow?

The President. No, I don't think it's dead. You know, Members of Congress have made comments about whether it could be done or not this year. We ought do this as—we ought to get this legislation through Congress as quickly as we can. I would hope that we can get all the parties to the lawsuit involved to agree to it. But we have to do it right. So I will do it as quickly as possible, working with the leadership in Congress, but I want to do it right.

Q. Will you offer legislation on your own, sir?

The President. What did you say?

Q. Will you offer your own legislation?

The President. Well, tomorrow—let me just say this—tomorrow we're going to talk about general principles, and then we'll do some consulting to see what the most productive way to get legislation in the hopper is.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:55 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to departing for meeting with the House Democratic Caucus on Capitol Hill.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Proposed Fast-Track Trade Authority Legislation

September 16, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit a legislative proposal entitled the "Export Expansion and Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1997." Also transmitted is a section-by-section analysis.

This proposal would renew over 60 years of cooperation between the Congress and the executive branch in the negotiation and implementation of market-opening trade agreements for the benefit of American workers and companies.

The sustained, robust performance of our economy over the past 5 years is powerful proof that congressional-executive cooperation works. We have made great strides together. We have invested in education and in health care for the American people. We have achieved an historic balanced budget agreement. At the same time, we have put in place trade agreements that have lowered barriers to American products and services around the world.

Our companies, farms, and working people have responded. Our economy has produced more jobs, more growth, and greater economic stability than at any time in decades. It has also generated more exports than ever before. Indeed, America's remarkable economic performance over the past 5 years has been fueled in significant part by the strength of our dynamic export sector. Fully 96 percent of the world's consumers live outside the United States. Many of our greatest economic opportunities today lie beyond our borders. The future promises still greater opportunities.

Many foreign markets, especially in the developing world, are growing at tremendous rates. Latin American and Asian economies, for example, are expected to expand at three times the rate of the U.S. economy over the coming years. Consumers and industries in these countries prize American goods, farm products, services, and the many expressions of American inventiveness and culture. While America is the world's greatest exporting nation, we need to do more if we want to continue to expand our own economy and produce good, high-wage jobs.

We have made real progress in breaking down barriers to American products around the world. But many of the nations with the highest growth rates almost invariably impose far higher trade barriers than we do. We need to level the playing field with those countries. They are the nations whose markets hold the greatest potential for American workers, firms, and agricultural producers.

Today, the United States is the world's strongest competitor. The strength of the U.S. economy over the past several years is testimony to the creativity, productivity, and ingenuity of American firms and workers. We cannot afford to squander our great advantages by retreating to the sidelines and watching other countries conclude preferential trade deals that shut out our goods and services. Over 20 such agreements have been concluded in Latin America and Asia alone since 1992. The United States must continue to shape and direct world trading rules that are in America's interest and that foster democracy and stability around the globe.

I have pledged my Administration to this task, but I cannot fully succeed without the Congress at my side. We must work in partnership, together with the American people, in securing our country's future. The United States must be united when we sit down at the negotiating table. Our trading partners will only negotiate with one America—not first with an American President and next with an American Congress.

The proposal I am sending you today ensures that the Congress will be a full partner in setting negotiating objectives, establishing trade priorities, and in gaining the greatest possible benefits through our trade agreements. The proposal expands upon previous fast-track legislation to ensure that the Congress is fully apprised and actively consulted throughout the negotiating process. I am convinced that this collaboration will strengthen both America's effectiveness and leverage at the bargaining table.

Widening the scope of consultations will also help ensure that we will take all of America's vital interests into account. That is particularly important because today our trade agreements address a wider range of activities than they once did. As we move forward with our trade agenda, we must continue to honor and reinforce the other values that make America an

example for the world. I count chief among these values America's longstanding concern for the rights of workers and for protection of the environment. The proposal I am transmitting to you recognizes the importance of those concerns. It makes clear that the agreements we conclude should complement and reinforce those values.

Ever since President Franklin Roosevelt proposed and the Congress enacted America's first reciprocal trade act in the depths of the Great Depression, the Congress and the President have been united, on a bipartisan basis, in supporting a fair and open trading system. Our predecessors learned from direct experience the path to America's prosperity. We owe much of our own prosperity to their wisdom. I urge the Congress to renew our longstanding partnership by approving the proposal I have transmitted today.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 16, 1997.

Statement on Senate Action on Education Programs
September 16, 1997

The vote by a narrow majority of the U.S. Senate to support the Gorton amendment undermines the bipartisan spirit of cooperation that is so vital to improving American education. At worst, this decision to block grant education programs is, as Secretary Riley said, a "back-door attempt to kill off the Department of Education." At best, the vote was a hasty, ill-considered decision that would have a serious impact on our schools.

I welcome the Senate's overwhelming support for my proposal to offer States and communities voluntary national tests in fourth-grade reading and eighth-grade math. However, the adoption of the Gorton amendment less than 2 hours later eliminated the very funding needed to continue development of these tests.

The Gorton amendment would halt many of our most successful efforts to improve education, including our efforts to get computers into every classroom, raise standards through Goals 2000, establish more charter schools, assist young people in making the transition from school to work, help parents and schools keep our children safe and drug-free, and create more opportunities to help immigrant children learn English and stay in school. The amendment would seriously harm the title I program, which provides extra help to low-income students so they can master the basic skills of reading and math and reach high academic standards. It also undermines programs targeted to help gifted and talented students, support arts education, and promote exciting new efforts to create technology partnerships. Further, this amendment would slash funds used to help adults with severe disabilities obtain employment.

This is not a vote, as some would suggest, about who controls public education. Rather it is a vote about whether the Federal Government will maintain its commitment to help local communities strengthen accountability and raise academic standards in basic skills, improve teaching and learning, assist parents and schools in keeping children safe and drug-free, promote public school choice for parents and students, and prepare all of our students for the 21st century.

The Department of Education has historically targeted its funding to schools that serve disadvantaged students. If the Gorton amendment became law, the wealthiest school districts would be the winners and the rest of our communities would inevitably be the losers.

Politics must stop at the schoolhouse door. The Gorton amendment is unacceptable. I understand a similar provision may be offered in the House. Let me be clear. If necessary, I will use my veto power to make sure that no such provision becomes the law of the land.

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

September 16, 1997

I am disappointed that the House of Representatives voted tonight to block my proposal for voluntary national tests in the basic skills. These tests will help raise expectations for our students, provide clear standards of achievement in fourth-grade reading and eighth-grade math, and give parents the tools they need to measure the progress their children are making. They will help our students learn and our schools continue to improve.

Yet the House of Representatives tonight cast a vote for the status quo and against better schools. The same old forces that have resisted education reform over the past decade came together to defeat high national standards in the basics. They have voted against a plan to improve our schools by raising standards, empowering parents, and increasing accountability.

The House vote is unacceptable, and it will not stand. Last week, by a bipartisan vote of 87–13, the Senate endorsed my plan for voluntary national tests to help students master the basics and embraced my proposal to place them under the control of the independent, bipartisan National Assessment Governing Board. My administration will work hard to make sure that the final legislation reflects the bipartisan support of the Senate and the broad support of the American people.

Remarks to the Congressional Hispanic Caucus

September 16, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you for the wonderful welcome you have given to the Vice President and me. Thank you, Xavier. Thank you, Carmen, Carolina. To the Members of Congress who are here, members of the Hispanic Caucus Institute, members of our administration—all those who were introduced by the Vice President. I'd also like to acknowledge the presence here of the general chairman of our political party, the Democratic Party, Governor Roy Romer of Colorado. Welcome, Governor Romer.

Xavier pointed out that I have been here all 5 years I have been President. I come because I have a good time. [*Laughter*] I like it. I know that here I will see the future of America, the vitality, the energy, the commitment, the passion necessary to make this country what it ought to be. But I have been here five times. [*Laughter*] I mean, those of us who are linguistically challenged—[*laughter*]—always learn a few phrases—you know, *su voto es su voz; mi casa es su casa.* [*Laughter*] Now I can say, *su caucus es mi caucus.* I come here because when I leave here, I feel more alive, I feel more committed, I feel new energy, and I like what I see.

I thank the Members of Congress for their service. I thank the Hispanics who have served in our administration, more than in any other in the past; the members of the Cabinet who are here—Secretary Peña, Ambassador Richardson, Aida Alvarez. To all those in the White House—Maria Echaveste, Mickey Ibarra, Janet Murguia, and others. To my speechwriter, Carolyn Curiel, who I will soon nominate to be Ambassador to Belize; Gloria Tristani, whom I have just selected to serve as the newest member of the Federal Communications Commission.

There is also another person here I want to acknowledge who will have a lot to do with seeing that the face of the Federal Government and the policies of the Federal Government reflect the face and the heart of America. And here with me tonight is my nominee for Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Bill Lee. And I'd like to ask him to be recognized.

He grew up a Chinese-American in New York, has spent a lot of his life working for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. He has worked to defend and protect the civil rights of the most vulnerable among us. And I thank

you for your continued support for his nomination.

I'd also like to mention two people who aren't here tonight. We all miss Frank Tejeda whose career ended far too soon, as did his remarkable life. But I want to say again how much I enjoyed working with him and how much I miss him. And I'd also like to say a very special word of appreciation and good wishes to the first Hispanic-American elected to the United States Congress, Henry B. Gonzalez. He has been an irrepressible force for progress. He is an irreplaceable legislator. It has been my great honor to know him for 25 years, long before I ever dreamed I'd be here, and I'm quite sure long before he ever dreamed I would be here. [*Laughter*] But we wish him well, and we'll miss him.

Together, we have begun to prepare our beloved country for the 21st century. Tonight I want to take just a few moments of your time to talk about the work ahead and the responsibility we have to support each other in that work.

It's been nearly 6 years now since I announced my candidacy for President. Many of you started with me, almost all of you finished with me, and we have begun a journey to restore the American dream to everyone willing to work for it, to make America the world's greatest force for peace and freedom well into the next century, and to go forward into that new century in spite of all of our diversity as one America.

We began with a bold new economic course which reduced our deficit 80 percent before the recent budget passed. For all of you who voted for that, I hope that you're out there clapping to yourselves, because you deserve it. We expanded our exports with over 200 trade agreements. We invested in our people and their future. We took on the tough social problems at home and the tough foreign policy problems around the world.

Today, the American people are reaping the results of these last years of effort: unemployment below 5 percent, Hispanic unemployment dropping from over 11 percent to about 7 percent, a drop of over 35 percent; record rates of small business growth with Hispanic-American businesses growing at 3 times the rate of overall business growth; and hundreds of thousands of new Latino homes in this country. Violent crime has dropped 5 years in a row. We've had the largest drop in welfare rolls in history.

All this signals progress. We should be optimistic, we should be hopeful, we should be confident. But we all know we have more to do before every one of our people, every one of your people, and every one of the American people will be prepared to do well in the 21st century.

The first thing we have to do is to continue to expand and improve educational opportunity. I am proud that the budget I just signed represents the largest single increased investment in education since 1965. I fought hard to ensure that it included a 36 percent increase in funding for bilingual and immigrant education, to see that it expands Head Start. It funds our America Reads program to mobilize up to one million volunteer tutors to make sure our children can read well at an early age. It will help us to develop voluntary tests in reading and math to help children learn the basic skills they need to succeed, not to put them down but to lift them up.

It also opens the doors of college to all Americans for the first time in history with the biggest increase in support for people going to college since the GI bill passed 50 years ago. There's the largest increase in Pell grants in more than two decades, a $1,500 HOPE scholarship tax credit to open the doors of the first 2 years of college to all Americans, and further tax credits for all higher education for people of all ages, because we know we have to have a system of lifetime learning in America, and we should support that for people of all ages.

Despite a strong work ethic and falling unemployment, however, despite exploding numbers of new Hispanic-owned businesses, Hispanic family income is not yet rising. And one of the biggest reasons for this disparity in income is that too many young Latinos continue to drop out of school. The dropout rate for Hispanic-Americans remains far above the rates for whites or African-Americans. Many of these young people leave school for responsible reasons, to begin to help their families by working. But increasingly in a global economy, we must teach our children that responsibility means staying in school and going the whole route.

We have organized an intense effort in the White House to address the dropout problem of Hispanic-American students. I instructed

Gene Sperling, the head of the National Economic Council, Maria Echaveste, who heads our Office of Public Liaison, Mickey Ibarra, who heads our Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, and our Education Secretary, Dick Riley, to evaluate all of our current programs and identify what more we can do right now to help young Latinos reach their potential.

I am pleased that Senator Bingaman and Representative Hinojosa will soon introduce the "National Dropout Prevention Act of 1997" to establish a coordinated national strategy for lower dropout rates for Hispanics and others who should have their dropout rates lower. I want to ask you to help us with this. We need your support.

Let me also say, in the context of education, that balanced budget agreement just set a framework for the next 2 years. Every single year we have to make sure that the congressional appropriations are faithful to the agreement. And I ask your support in helping us and helping the Members of Congress make sure that those investments are there.

And in that connection, let me tell you, I, at least, and I think most of you, are quite concerned by the recent, very narrow decision in the Senate to support the Gorton amendment that would block-grant virtually all Federal education funds to the States. That's a step in the wrong direction, because whatever its intent, the effect of the amendment is to shift funds away from the schools that serve our neediest children. And unless we can persuade them to change it, I will not hesitate to use my veto power to prevent that hasty decision from becoming the law of the land.

Let me also say that that budget did one more thing that I want to emphasize—it did a lot of good things, including providing health insurance for up to 5 million American children, many of whom will be Hispanic children and the children of hard-working people who work all day, every day, but can't get health insurance at work. It also kept a promise I made last year to restore benefits to legal immigrants who come to this country legally, work hard, and contribute to our society. And I thank the Members of Congress who are here who made that possible.

The second thing we have to do is to sell more of our goods and services around the world. We have 4 percent of the world's population, 20 percent of the world's income, 96 percent of the world's consumers live somewhere else. The growing developing economies are growing at three times the rate of our European and other traditional trading partners. We have no choice but to compete for those new markets.

Indeed, 70 percent of our export growth this year comes from our neighbors—Canada to the north, and all the other neighbors are to our south, Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean, South America—70 percent of our growth is there. Now, the legislation I sent to Congress today to renew the President's traditional authority to negotiate trade agreements, to open markets to our products, and create good jobs, contains important provisions that will enable me to negotiate to protect both worker rights and the environment. And it will involve Congress every step of the way.

But I say again, it is in our interest to open these markets. Week after week, I read of these European leaders going to South America, saying, "America doesn't care about Latin America. Europe cares about Latin America. America is sitting up there sitting on its gain. We want you to be allied with Europe."

I say, they are our friends. I have worked hard to establish a good relationship, and I think we should go forward with fair, balanced trading agreements that will help our economy and help our relations.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Congressman Becerra and his allies in the Hispanic Caucus for the contributions that they made when I last went to Latin America several months ago, when I went to Mexico and Central America and to the Caribbean. Congressman Becerra and Congressman Reyes went with me; Congressman Romero-Barceló joined us in the Caribbean.

In a few weeks, I'll be going for a week's visit in Brazil and Argentina and Venezuela, and I'm looking forward to working with you, Congressman Becerra, and with the Caucus to make this productive for America as well. Thank you very much.

Let me make one other comment now about the last thing that I think we have to do. Our journey into tomorrow is about more than economics. It's about the kind of people we are and how we relate to each other. It's about whether we can really learn to not only tolerate each other, not even just to respect each other, but to celebrate the fact that people who are

so different share this land together and want to share its future together and deserve to share its future together because we are bound together by common values, by faith and family and work and community and service to country.

Now, in order to do that, we have to face some facts. The first fact is that we still have some unfinished business in this country, some discrimination that we have not resolved. It still exists. The second fact is that all those people that want to get rid of affirmative action carry a heavier burden than they have yet borne to show about what they were going to do to replace it, to guarantee everybody has an equal opportunity.

The third thing we have to do is to treat each other respectfully and honestly in all of our dealings, particularly in putting together our political system. So in that connection, let me just make one comment more about the census coming up in 2000 and the whole issue of sampling. My sole goal is to have the most accurate count of Americans. I have no other political agenda. I have never been involved in this in any way, shape, or form. Every expert who has reviewed the census process, including a recent report from the National Science Foundation, says that the sampling method the Census Bureau proposes to use in the year 2000 is designed to count hard-to-find Americans, including the homeless and some minorities, not to leave them out. We are not interested in counting people who do not live here and do not exist, but we want to make sure, finally, that everybody who is here is counted in the census of the American people in the year 2000.

If we're going to be one America, we have to make sure our immigration laws are fair and humane to all. To that effort, we have undertaken two initiatives I want to mention briefly. First, we're seeking to extend the legal authority that permits people to obtain permanent immigration status without having to leave our country, often leaving their families and their jobs behind. And second, we're working to enable some Central Americans and others who have already made lives for themselves here in the United States to be considered for permanent status under less stringent rules in place prior to the passage of the recent immigration bill.

But the most important thing we can do is to really make up our minds that we're going to share the future together. The reason that I organized this national conversation on race for the next year and had an advisory board constituted, including Linda Chavez-Thompson, who is well-known to many of you, is that it bothers me that so few Americans have really thought about what this country is going to be like in 20 or 30 or 40 years.

Within 5 years, our largest State, California, will have no majority race. Hawaii already has no majority race. Hispanic-Americans are the fastest growing American minority, but within a matter of decades, we'll all be members of some racial or ethnic minority.

Now, people have said for years—maybe for over 200 years, maybe going all the way back to the beginning—that America is not a place, a nation, that is about a particular religious creed or a particular race or even a particular place; America is just a set of ideas. We are about to find out. We are about to find out.

And so I say to all of you, when I come here and I feel your energy, your spirit, your patriotism, your dreams, your affection for each other and for your country, that is what I want every American to feel. And that's what I want you to be able to feel about every other American. And we have a heavy responsibility here. No other great democracy like ours has ever been so diverse, and yet people living together so closely. No one has ever tried to do this. We are trying to do this against the backdrop of reading in the last several years about all of the problems, from the Middle East to Bosnia, to Northern Ireland, to Africa, to you name it.

We say to the bottom of our soul, we don't believe in any of that. We don't seek, any of us, to lift ourselves up by putting someone else down. We are simply trying to create a country where everybody's responsible, has opportunity, where we're drawing together more closely every day, and where we're still trying to promote what we believe in around the world.

You, as the fastest growing group of Americans, have a special responsibility to make sure that message pierces the mind and heart of every one of your fellow citizens, because if it does, we'll take care of the economics, we'll take care of the other work we have to do. If we can get our hearts right and our heads straight about how we're going to do this together, we will get to the next century with this country still the greatest nation in human history.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:15 p.m. in the International Ballroom at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Representative Xavier Becerra, chair, and Carmen Votano, vice chair, Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute; and Carolina Reyes, wife of Representative Becerra.

Remarks on Proposed Tobacco Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

September 17, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. Mr. Vice President, Secretary Shalala, Secretary Glickman, thank you for your work. Thank you, Bruce Reed. I'd like to say a special word of thanks to David Kessler for the work he did—historic work he did at the FDA when he was here. Thank you, Dr. Koop, and members of the public community who are here. To Members of Congress, the attorneys general, the representatives of plaintiffs in the private litigation—and we have one of the injured parties here representing all of them—we thank all of them for coming today.

This is a time of prosperity and hope and optimism for America, with our economy improving, making progress on our social problems, our efforts to lead the world to a more prosperous and peaceful future making headway. But I think we all know that this country still has some significant challenges, especially in the health field. And if we think about what we want America to be like in the 21st century, the health of our people and especially the health of our children must be paramount in our thinking, in our vision, and in our efforts. That's why a year ago I worked with the FDA and we launched this nationwide effort to protect our children from the dangers of tobacco by reducing youth access to tobacco products, by preventing companies from advertising to our children.

The purpose of the FDA rule was to reduce youth smoking by 50 percent within 7 years. Earlier this year, a Federal judge in North Carolina said that the FDA has the authority to regulate tobacco products to protect the health of our children. There have also been other examples of litigation progress, as you know, brought by private plaintiffs and by the attorneys general. Now, these victories for public health drove the tobacco companies to the bargaining table. They extracted concessions that would have been literally unthinkable just a short time ago.

I want to say a special word of thanks to the attorneys general and the other parties who worked hard to negotiate this settlement. Everyone knows we would not be here had it not been for their foresight, their determination, and their relentless efforts.

Now we have this unprecedented opportunity to enact comprehensive tobacco legislation, working with all the parties involved, the Members of Congress, the attorneys general, the representatives of injured parties, the public health community, the tobacco farmers, and others. We have moved from confrontation and denial and inertia to the brink of action on behalf of our children, and that is all to the good.

Today I want to challenge Congress to build on this historic opportunity by passing sweeping tobacco legislation that has one goal in mind: the dramatic reduction of teen smoking. In the coming weeks I will invite congressional leaders from both parties to the White House to launch a bipartisan effort to enact such legislation.

There are five key elements that must be at the heart of any national tobacco legislation. Reducing teen smoking has always been America's bottom line. It must be the industry's bottom line. That is why I believe the first thing any tobacco legislation must include is a comprehensive plan to reduce teen smoking, including tough penalties. These penalties should be non-tax-deductible, uncapped, and escalating to give the tobacco industry the strongest possible incentive to stop targeting children as new customers.

One of the surest ways of reducing youth smoking is to increase the price of cigarettes. Today I call for a combination of industry payments and penalties to increase the price of cigarettes by up to a dollar and a half a pack

over the next decade, as needed, to meet our youth reduction targets. And I call upon the House to follow the lead of the United States Senate and repeal the provision giving the tobacco industry a $50 billion tax credit.

Second, any legislation must affirm the full authority of the FDA to regulate tobacco products. I believe the FDA's jurisdiction over tobacco products must be as strong and effective as its authority over drugs and devices. In particular, legislation cannot impose any special procedural hurdles on the FDA's regulation of tobacco products.

Third, effective legislation must include measures to hold the industry accountable, especially in any efforts to market products to children, while insisting on changes in the way it does business. I ask the industry again to make a voluntary commitment to stop advertising to children. And I call upon Congress to pass legislation providing for broad document disclosure so that the public can learn everything the tobacco companies know about the health effects of their products and their attempts to market to our children.

Fourth, Federal tobacco legislation must aim not only to reduce youth smoking but to meet other health goals as well. These include the reduction of secondhand smoke, the expansion of smoking prevention and cessation programs, the strengthening of international efforts to control tobacco, and the provision of funds for medical research and other important health objectives. We must build on the bipartisan agreement to fund children's health care in the recent balanced budget.

And finally, any tobacco legislation must protect tobacco farmers and their communities. We know that tobacco farmers are honest, hard-working people, most of whom live and work on small, family owned farms. In some States, entire communities rely on income from the tobacco crop. Any legislation must protect these farmers, their families, and their communities from loss of income.

Let me say in closing, I want to thank the Vice President especially, who cares so passionately about this issue. He's played a key role in our efforts to protect our children from the dangers of tobacco. I've asked him to take the lead in building broad bipartisan support around the country for our plan. I also want to thank Secretary Shalala, Secretary Glickman, and Bruce Reed, and all those who worked so hard on our administration's analysis of the proposed settlement and where we are.

And finally, let me say again, we wouldn't be here if it weren't for all the people in this room and the countless others they represent around the country. To me, this is not about money. It is not about how much money we can extract from the tobacco industry. It is about fulfilling our duties as parents and responsible adults to protect our children and to build the future of this country. We are doing everything we can in this administration to give parents the tools they need to raise their children, but parents have to be our partners as well. If this is not just about money, we have to recognize that even beyond the tobacco companies and all of us in this room, every parent in America has a responsibility to talk to their children about the dangers of tobacco, illegal drugs, and other things that can hurt them. We know if we have strong parental responsibility here, they can make a great deal of difference in protecting our children as well.

If we take responsibility, if we pass this legislation, if we do what we should here, if the tobacco industry will work with us, if other Members of Congress in both parties will work with us, we will have gone a very long way toward creating the state of health for our children that will make America an even greater nation in the new century.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, what are the chances of the Congress adopting your policy? And why is the industry so conspicuously absent?

The President. Well, first of all, I was encouraged by some of the comments that were made by some industry representatives. I think that they know that they have to have Federal legislation. They have an interest in that as well. And I would hope that they would be willing to work with us. But we cannot have the FDA crippled here, and we have to have real and meaningful penalties if the targets for youth smoking are not met. And so I feel very good about that.

I think the Congress—I think it's highly likely that they will take action. When they take action depends, I think, upon when they can work through the issues for themselves and how they decide how to divide up the work among the committees. But it's not too soon to start. We could have hearings on this fairly soon, and I

would hope to work with the Congress to develop a bill that would embody these principles.

Q. Mr. President, you haven't said what you're willing to agree to for the tobacco industry. Are you willing to agree to immunity from future liability?

The President. Well, I don't think they've asked for future liability, I think they've asked for immunity from liability for past suits. And the question there would be, what are they willing to agree to? They need to come and meet with us. We need to discuss it, and we need to see whether we can embody these five principles. These are the things I'm interested in.

To me, I'll say again, this is not primarily about money. This is about changing the behavior of the United States, both the behavior of the tobacco companies, the behavior of the American people, the future behavior of our children. I'm trying to create an environment here with these five principles that I believe would achieve that. And if they want to be our partners in it, I think we can get there. And I hope they will be.

Q. Are you willing to put your prestige on the line to ensure that this becomes law?

The President. Well, I think my personal prestige on this has been on the line for more than a year now. [*Laughter*] There for a while, I thought more than my prestige was on the line. [*Laughter*] You know, for a person involved in public life in Washington today, personal prestige may be an oxymoron. [*Laughter*] But at least you still have your neck most days.

Q. What do you say to the people——

Q. Mr. President, how do you protect the well-being of tobacco farmers—sounds like you're going to take away their livelihood.

The President. Well, there are a number of things which can be done, and I don't want to get into the details. Secretary Glickman can talk about it. But we have had farmers in various sectors in our agriculture society facing constricted incomes before, and we have done things which helped them. There was a—for example, I remember a few years ago something that affected dairy farmers in my State. There was a massive buyout program for dairy farmers, and in a lot of States like Arkansas, there were any number of small farmers that were having a very difficult time who had a chance to start their life on a different basis.

I don't want to minimize this. Tobacco has a very high return per acre. So it's not a simple thing. You can't just say to a tobacco farmer to go plant soybeans, even if the soil will hold them. This is, from an agricultural point of view, economically complex. But nonetheless, we have a responsibility to these people. They haven't done anything wrong. They haven't done anything illegal. They're good, hard-working, taxpaying citizens, and they have not caused this problem. And we cannot let them, their families, or their communities just be crippled and broken by this. And I don't think any member of the public health community wants to do that. And the Agriculture Department and I am personally very committed to this part; to me, this is one of the five things we have to do.

We're trying to change America and make everybody whole. And they deserve a chance to have their lives and be made whole and go on with the future as well, and I'm determined to see that they're a part of this.

Q. What do you say to the attorneys who thought this was a good deal and very proudly proclaimed it?

The President. Well, first of all, they were a part of all these ongoing reviews. Everybody was heard in this review process. And secondly, they all recognize, too, that this agreement has to be ratified by Congress. The tobacco companies recognize that. That means that all of us who are part of that process are, in effect, parties to this case, too. And that's the way you need to look at this. We're building on their deal. We're not rejecting their agreement. We're building on it. We're not rejecting what the attorneys general did. We're building on it. Look, if it hadn't been for what they did, we wouldn't be here.

I realize that there were two great things that started this. One is what Dr. Kessler and what we did at the FDA, and the fact that our administration was the first one ever willing to take this on. The other was the actions by the attorneys general and the private lawsuits that got the disclosure of the documents that created a total change in the public attitude and the public efforts here. And then long before that, there were the efforts of all of these people here from the public health community who have been telling us all this for years. And they had the public primed for it. Then the lawsuits brought about the disclosures, and then the FDA was moving.

Those three things together, I think—and of course, now there have been a lot of congressional hearings. Representative Waxman had a full head of hair when he came to Congress before he started on tobacco. [*Laughter*] And so I think you've got to give—to me, we're building on this progress, and that's the way you have to look at this. We are trying to do the best thing for the country in a way that is consistent with the agreement they made. We're building on the agreement. We're not tearing it down. We're building on it. And I think we can get legislation that will reflect it.

Thank you.

Military Aircraft Accidents

Q. What do you think about the string of air crashes, Mr. President, that have happened—Bosnia, the German representative that was killed?

The President. It's a terrible thing. We don't have all the facts yet. I was briefed early this morning on it, and obviously I'm profoundly concerned for the diplomat and the people that were on the aircraft and their families. But I can't comment on the facts of it until we absolutely know what the facts are.

Q. What about the other crashes?

The President. I must say, we're making—on balance, we're making some progress in Bosnia again. The events of the last several weeks are hopeful for the peace process and the Dayton accord.

Q. What about the other air crashes here in this country, this string of air accidents? What do you have to say about the air safety, and what are you going to be doing about that?

The President. I had a talk with the Secretary of Defense about them the day before yesterday, and I think we have to, first of all, analyze each and every one to see whether there is some pattern that would require some kind of review by the Air Force or whether it's just an unfortunate stream of coincidences that they all happened at the same time. I noted one that I learned about this morning involved Air National Guard planes, for example. That may or may not have anything to do with any problem with planes or anything like that.

I wouldn't over—jump to conclusions about this. Remember, every year—I try to say this once a year, so I want to say it now—it is easy for the American people to forget the risks that our men and women in uniform undertake. Every year we lose a couple hundred people serving the United States in the military in peacetime. It is dangerous work. They have to be well-trained. They have to be skilled. They have to be brave. It is a difficult thing. I am heartsick about the plane we are missing off the coast of Africa that took a demining team in there to continue our work against landmines.

But I don't want you to jump to a conclusion that there is something wrong because all these things occurred within a short space of time because, if you look over the course of a year, we may go months and months and months and nothing happens, but over the course of a year, we lose a significant number of people every year who serve our country in uniform because of the inherent risks involved in what they do.

We will do everything we can to make sure that they're as safe as possible, and if there is a pattern here that has to be looked into on air safety, you can be sure that the Air Force will do that.

Thank you.

Chelsea Clinton's Departure for College

Q. Are you dreading Chelsea leaving home tomorrow?

The President. Yes. This morning—the first thing I did this morning was go look through the boxes and make sure we had all the right things in the right boxes. [*Laughter*] But there's nothing I can do about it now. [*Laughter*] That's what you raise them for. I'm happy and sad at the same time.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:55 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Bruce N. Reed, Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy; David A. Kessler, former Commissioner of Food and Drugs; C. Everett Koop, former Surgeon General; and the late Gerd Wagner, Senior Deputy High Representative for Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina, who was killed September 17 in a helicopter crash in Bosnia.

Remarks on International Efforts To Eliminate Landmines and an Exchange With Reporters

September 17, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. I want to talk now about what the United States has done and what we will continue to do to lead the world toward the elimination of antipersonnel landmines.

Every year, landmines kill or maim more than 25,000 people: children, women, farmers peacefully going about their business. That is why, since I called for the global elimination of landmines in 1994, the United States has been at the forefront of the effort to ban them, not just in words but in actual, concrete deeds.

Eighteen months ago, I ordered a ban on the most dangerous types of landmines, those that remain active and dangerous long after soldiers have left the scene. These are the mines that are causing all the damage around the world today. These hidden killers prey on innocent civilians. They are responsible for the horrific mutilation of children from Angola to Cambodia to Bosnia.

In the months since I ordered that ban, the United States has destroyed 1½ million of these landmines. By 1999 we will have destroyed all the rest in our stockpiles, another 1½ million, with the exception of our mines at the demilitarized zone in Korea, the cold war's last frontier.

The United States has also led the world in the effort to remove existing landmines, again not with talk but with action that has saved lives. Since 1993 we have devoted $153 million to this cause. Our experts have helped to remove mines from the ground in 15 nations. They have trained and equipped roughly one-quarter of all the people who work at this effort around the world.

These efforts are paying off. In the areas of Cambodia where we've been active, the death rates for landmines has dropped by one-half. In Namibia, the casualty rate has fallen 90 percent.

These efforts do not come without real cost and sacrifice. The C–141 plane that went down in that terrible collision off the coast of Africa on Monday, in which nine Air Force crew members were lost, had just carried a unit of special forces demining experts to Namibia.

Last month I instructed a U.S. team to join negotiations then underway in Oslo to ban all antipersonnel landmines. Our negotiators worked tirelessly to reach an agreement we could sign. Unfortunately, as it is now drafted, I cannot in good conscience add America's name to that treaty. So let me explain why.

Our Nation has unique responsibilities for preserving security and defending peace and freedom around the globe. Millions of people from Bosnia to Haiti, Korea to the Persian Gulf, are safer as a result. And so is every American. The men and women who carry out that responsibility wear our uniform with pride and, as we learned in the last few days, at no small risk to themselves. They wear it secure in the knowledge, however, that we will always, always do everything we can to protect our own.

As Commander in Chief, I will not send our soldiers to defend the freedom of our people and the freedom of others without doing everything we can to make them as secure as possible. For that reason, the United States insisted that two provisions be included in the treaty negotiated at Oslo. First, we needed an adequate transition period to phase out the antipersonnel mines we now use to protect our troops, giving us time to devise alternative technologies. Second, we needed to preserve the antitank mines we rely upon to slow down an enemy's armor offensive in a battle situation.

These two requests are not abstract considerations. They reflect the very dangerous reality we face on the ground as a result of our global responsibilities. Take the Korean Peninsula. There, our 37,000 troops and their South Korean allies face an army of one million North Koreans only 27 miles away from Seoul, Korea. They serve there, our troops do, in the name and under the direct mandate of the international community. In the event of an attack, the North's overwhelming numerical advantage can only be countered if we can slow down its advance, call in reinforcements, and organize our defense. Our antipersonnel mines there are a key part of our defense line in Korea. They are deployed along a DMZ where there are no villages and no civilians. Therefore, they, too,

are not creating the problem we are trying to address in the world.

We also need antitank mines there to deter or stop an armored assault against our troops, the kind of attack our adversaries would be most likely to launch. These antitank mines self-destruct or deactivate themselves when the battle is over, and therefore, they pose little risk to civilians. We will continue to seek to deter a war that would cost countless lives. But no one should expect our people to expose our Armed Forces to unacceptable risks.

Now, we were not able to gain sufficient support for these two requests. The final treaty failed to include a transition period during which we could safely phase out our antipersonnel landmines, including in Korea. And the treaty would have banned the antitank mines our troops rely on from the outskirts of Seoul to the desert border of Iraq and Kuwait, and this in spite of the fact that other nations' antitank systems are explicitly permitted under the treaty.

We went the extra mile and beyond to sign this treaty. And again, I want to thank Secretary Cohen and General Shalikashvili and especially I'd like to thank General Ralston for the enormous effort that was made and the changes in positions and the modifications in positions that the Joint Chiefs made, not once but 3 times, to try to move our country closer to other countries so that in good faith we could sign this treaty.

But there is a line that I simply cannot cross, and that line is the safety and security of our men and women in uniform. America will continue to lead in ending the use of all antipersonnel mines. The offer we made at Oslo remains on the table. We stand ready to sign a treaty that meets our fundamental and unique security requirements. With an adequate transition period to a world free of antipersonnel landmines, this goal is within reach.

As further evidence of our commitment, I am announcing today a series of steps America will take on its own to advance our efforts to rid the world of landmines. First, I'm directing the Department of Defense to develop alternatives to antipersonnel landmines so that by the year 2003 we can end even the use of self-destruct landmines, that is, those, again, that are not causing the problem today because they destroy themselves on their own after a short period of time. We want to end even the use of these landmines, everywhere but Korea.

As for Korea, my directive calls for alternatives to be ready by 2006, the time period for which we were negotiating in Oslo. By setting these deadlines, we will speed the development of new technologies that I asked the Pentagon to start working on last year. In short, this program will eliminate all antipersonnel landmines from America's arsenal.

Second, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff David Jones has agreed to be a personal adviser to me and to Secretary Cohen to help us make sure the job gets done. Throughout his career he has demonstrated a concern for the safety of our troops second to none, and in recent years he's been a powerful, eloquent voice for banning landmines. There's no better man for the task, and I thank him for accepting it.

Third, we will significantly increase our demining programs. No nation devotes more expertise or resources to the problem than we do today. Next year, we currently plan to provide $68 million for worldwide demining efforts, almost as much as the rest of the world combined. We will begin demining work in as many as eight new countries, including Chad, Zimbabwe, and Lebanon.

But we can, and will, do more. I am proposing that we increase funding for demining by about 25 percent beginning next year. We must improve our research and development to find new ways to detect, remove, and dispose of these landmines. We must increase assistance to landmine victims to help them heal and take their place as productive members of their societies. And we must expand our training programs so that nations that are plagued by landmines can themselves do more to clear away these deadly devices. Every mine removed from the ground is another child potentially saved.

Fourth, we will redouble our efforts to establish serious negotiations for a global antipersonnel landmine ban in the conference on disarmament in Geneva. We will begin by seeking an export ban next year and one that applies to the major landmine producers, the people who themselves cause these problems because they're making and selling these landmines—none of them were present in Oslo. In the end, we have to get them on board as well.

I am determined to work closely with the Congress, with Senator Leahy, Senator Hagel,

and others to implement this package, because I think together we can take another step in the elimination of landmines that will be decisive.

In that connection, let me say, I had a brief visit with Senator Leahy today, and I think that there's no way I can say enough about what he has done. He is a genuine worldwide leader in this effort. He has been recognized around the world. He has worked with us very closely, and I thank him. And I'm confident that we can do more by working together.

I believe, and I think everyone in the United States and everyone leading the Pentagon believes, that every man, woman, and child in this world should be able to walk the Earth in safety, that we should do everything we can to guarantee this right, and we can do it while preserving our own ability to secure the safety of our troops as they protect freedom around the world. These steps will make a major dent. We are working hard, and we intend to keep going until the job is done.

Thank you.

North and South Korea

Q. Does that mean the U.S. will not be represented at Ottawa? And how much threat is there of a famine-stricken North Korea being able to invade South Korea? I mean, aren't they starving to death?

The President. Well, first of all, we've done everything we could to prevent them from starving to death, you know. I've strongly supported humanitarian food aid to the North Koreans. But frankly, it depends on how you read the risk. I mean, the tension between the two Koreas is still there. They have a million troops there. And my elemental experience in human psychology—and I think a lot of our experts in military strategies agree that sometimes people are most dangerous when they feel most threatened and most helpless, most frustrated.

So I would just say to you, the fact that they have had some food problems does not in any way, in my mind, mitigate the risk. And anybody who's ever been to the DMZ and who has ever driven from Seoul to the DMZ and seen how short it is and has seen a million—you know, the numbers of troops there, and you see our people up there in those outposts and how few they are—and again I say, these mines are put along the DMZ in clearly marked areas to make sure that no children will walk across them. There is no place like it in the world.

And let me also say, this is not a unilateral American presence there. We are there under an armistice agreement that proceeded from the authority of the United Nations to conduct the Korean war in the first place and then to have the armistice. We are there fulfilling the worldwide community's responsibility to preserve the peace and safety there.

And it's very easy if you're not one of those Americans in uniform up there, saying, "Oh, well, this will never happen. They'll never do it." But you could move a million people into Seoul pretty quickly. And no one I know believes that under present circumstances, with the hostilities that still exist between the two countries, that we could do anything to stop that if we didn't have the strong deterrent of the landmines that are in that very carefully marked field there.

United States Action Against Landmines

Q. Sir, does it pain you to be in the company of Russia and China, Iran, Iraq—other countries that won't be signing in Ottawa?

The President. No, we're not in their company. It pains me that for whatever reason—and I understand—I have a lot of sympathy with a lot of these countries in Ottawa, that were in Oslo. I have a lot of sympathy with the countries that have themselves had a lot of people killed from landmines. But the argument that I have tried to make to them is that what we really have to do—we will never solve this problem until we get the producers, the people that are making these landmines, to stop making them, stop selling them, and stop using them. That's what we have to do. And I believe the United States is in a better position to work with the rest of the world to get that done than nearly any other country. But I don't feel that I'm in their company at all.

We unilaterally stopped producing, stopped selling, stopped using these landmines. We have unilaterally destroyed a million and a half of them. I imagine that no country in Oslo can make that claim. We're going to destroy another million and a half by 1999. I doubt that any country in Oslo can make that claim.

We have done everything we could. We have even said we are going to unilaterally give up our self-destruct landmines that do not—as far as I know, have not killed a single civilian or

maimed a single child anywhere in the world. And thousands of them have been tested. They all self-destructed when they were supposed to, except one that was an hour late.

So we are not in their company. I wish we could sign the Oslo agreement. I understand the difficulties of the countries involved and the emotional feelings surrounding this issue, but we have to have some time to deal with our challenge in Korea. And our antitank mines, we believe, are more effective than other countries' are, and there is an explicit exception for antitank mines that is written in such a way that doesn't cover ours. And I could never agree not to have antitank weapons, given the kinds of combat that our people are likely to be in, in any kind of projected scenario, over the next 20 to 30 years. I couldn't do it. We have to have some resolution of that. It would just be—that would be completely irresponsible for me to let our people be in combat situations without an antitank device that I thought was the most effective available.

Proposed Tobacco Legislation

Q. Will you ask Congress to stay in session in order to pass tobacco legislation?

The President. Well, let me just say, what I will ask Congress to do is to get into this now, bring all the parties together, have hearings as quickly as possible, and move as quickly as possible. I think the most important thing is that we make it clear that this process is not dead. It's taken new life. It's gone on to a new step. Congress has to resolve all these jurisdictional questions—how many committees in the House, how many committees in the Senate, who does what. But I'm going to work with them. I hope to give new life, a new impetus to this by the announcement I made today, and I think we did.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Sir, you have the Secretary of State with you. What do you think are the next steps for the Middle East peace process, and what impact will that have on your remarks to the U.N. on Monday?

The President. Well, first of all, I think she did a superb job in the Middle East with a very difficult circumstance. And I have nothing—I could sit here until midnight and not give a better synopsis than the one line she used in the Middle East where she said, "The good news is we made some small steps, but we need to take big steps." And that is my—that Secretary Albright distilled in that one phrase where I think we are.

But Mr. Berger and the Secretary and all of us, we're putting our heads together. We're going to do everything we can to keep pushing this. And I have seen some encouraging signs in the last couple of days that all the parties realize that they have special responsibilities to get this thing back on track. And we're going to look at our options and do everything we can.

But I also say what I've said from the beginning: If you look at all the good things that happened early on in my administration in the Middle East, the United States facilitated them but did not create them. In the end, the peace is for the parties there to make, and they have to have the vision and the courage and the strength to do it. But we're going to do everything we can to try to create the conditions in which they can succeed and to try to protect them from the downsides if they do take risks for peace.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:30 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Iran

September 17, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, and matters relating to the measures in that order and in

Executive Order 12959 of May 6, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) (IEEPA), section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c). This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 and does not deal with those relating to the emergency declared on November 14, 1979, in connection with the hostage crisis.

1. On March 15, 1995, I issued Executive Order 12957 (60 *Fed. Reg.* 14615, March 17, 1995) to declare a national emergency with respect to Iran pursuant to IEEPA, and to prohibit the financing, management, or supervision by United States persons of the development of Iranian petroleum resources. This action was in response to actions and policies of the Government of Iran, including support for international terrorism, efforts to undermine the Middle East peace process, and the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. A copy of the order was provided to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate by letter dated March 15, 1995.

Following the imposition of these restrictions with regard to the development of Iranian petroleum resources, Iran continued to engage in activities that represent a threat to the peace and security of all nations, including Iran's continuing support for international terrorism, its support for acts that undermine the Middle East peace process, and its intensified efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. On May 6, 1995, I issued Executive Order 12959 to further respond to the Iranian threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

Executive Order 12959 (60 *Fed. Reg.* 24757, May 9, 1995) (1) prohibits exportation from the United States to Iran or to the Government of Iran of goods, technology, or services; (2) prohibits the reexportation of certain U.S. goods and technology to Iran from third countries; (3) prohibits dealings by United States persons in goods and services of Iranian origin or owned or controlled by the Government of Iran; (4) prohibits new investments by United States persons in Iran or in property owned or controlled by the Government of Iran; (5) prohibits U.S. companies and other United States persons from approving, facilitating, or financing performance by a foreign subsidiary or other entity owned or controlled by a United States person of certain reexport, investment, and trade transactions that a United States person is prohibited from performing; (6) continues the 1987 prohibition on the importation into the United States of goods and services of Iranian origin; (7) prohibits any transaction by a United States person or within the United States that evades or avoids or attempts to violate any prohibition of the order; and (8) allowed U.S. companies a 30-day period in which to perform trade transactions pursuant to contracts predating the Executive order.

At the time of signing Executive Order 12959, I directed the Secretary of the Treasury to authorize, through specific licensing, certain transactions, including transactions by United States persons related to the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal in The Hague, established pursuant to the Algiers Accords, and related to other international obligations and United States Government functions, and transactions related to the export of agricultural commodities pursuant to preexisting contracts consistent with section 5712(c) of title 7, United States Code. I also directed the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to consider authorizing United States persons through specific licensing to participate in market-based swaps of crude oil from the Caspian Sea area for Iranian crude oil in support of energy projects in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, and Turkmenistan.

Executive Order 12959 revoked sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 12613 of October 29, 1987, and sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, to the extent they are inconsistent with it. A copy of Executive Order 12959 was transmitted to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate by letter dated May 6, 1995.

2. On March 5, 1997, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Iran pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extended the authority for the current comprehensive trade embargo against Iran in effect since May 1995. Under these sanctions, virtually all trade with Iran is prohibited except for trade in information and informational materials and certain other limited exceptions.

3. On August 19, 1997, I issued Executive Order 13059 in order to clarify the steps taken in Executive Order 12957 and Executive Order 12959, to confirm that the embargo on Iran prohibits all trade and investment activities by United States persons, wherever located, and to consolidate in one order the various prohibitions previously imposed to deal with the national emergency declared on March 15, 1995. A copy of Executive Order 13059 was transmitted to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate by letter dated August 19, 1997.

The order prohibits (1) the importation into the United States of any goods or services of Iranian origin or owned or controlled by the Government of Iran except information or informational material; (2) the exportation, reexportation, sale, or supply from the United States or by a United States person, wherever located, of goods, technology, or services to Iran or the Government of Iran, including knowing transfers to a third country for direct or indirect supply, transshipment, or reexportation to Iran or the Government of Iran, or specifically for use in the production, commingling with, or incorporation into goods, technology, or services to be supplied, transshipped, or reexported exclusively or predominantly to Iran or the Government of Iran; (3) reexportation from a third country of controlled U.S.-origin goods, technology, or services by a person other than a United States person; (4) purchase, sale, transport, swap, brokerage, approval, financing, facilitation, guarantee, or other transactions or dealings by United States persons, wherever located, related to direct or indirect trade with Iran or the Government of Iran or to goods or services of Iranian origin or owned or controlled by the Government of Iran; (5) new investment by United States persons in Iran or in property or entities owned or controlled by the Government of Iran; (6) approval, financing, facilitation, or guarantee by a United States person of any transaction by a foreign person that a United States person would be prohibited from performing under the embargo; and (7) any evasion, avoidance, or attempt to violate a prohibition under the order.

Executive Order 13059 became effective at 12:01 a.m., eastern daylight time on August 20, 1997. Revocation of corresponding provisions in prior Executive orders does not affect the applicability of those provisions, or of regulations, licenses, or other administrative actions taken pursuant to those provisions, with respect to any transaction or violation occurring before the effective date of Executive Order 13059. Specific licenses issued pursuant to prior Executive orders continue in effect, unless revoked or amended by the Secretary of the Treasury. General licenses, regulations, orders, and directives issued pursuant to prior orders continue in effect, except to the extent inconsistent with Executive Order 13059 or otherwise revoked or modified by the Secretary of the Treasury.

4. The Iranian Transactions Regulations, 31 CFR Part 560 (the "ITR"), were amended on April 18, 1997 (62 *Fed. Reg.* 19670, April 23, 1997), on July 30, 1997 (62 *Fed. Reg.* 41851, August 4, 1997), and on August 25, 1997 (62 *Fed. Reg.* 45098, August 25, 1997). In April 1997, Section 560.603 was amended to require a United States person to file a transaction report as to each foreign affiliate that engages in reportable oil-related transactions involving Iran of $1,000,000 or more during the calendar quarter.

In July 1997, sections 560.510(d)(1) and (d)(2) were amended to generally license all payments of awards against Iran issued by the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal in The Hague, irrespective of the source of funds for payment, and to generally license implementation (except exports or reexports that are subject to export license application requirements of Federal agencies other than the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC)) as well as payment of awards or settlements in cases to which the United States Government is a party.

Sections 560.525(a)(3) and (a)(5)(i) were amended to generally license the provision of legal services to initiate and conduct U.S. court and other domestic legal proceedings on behalf of persons in Iran or the Government of Iran and to initiate proceedings to resolve disputes between the Government of Iran or an Iranian national and the United States or a United States national, notwithstanding the prohibition on exportation of services to Iran. On August 25, 1997, general reporting, record keeping, licensing, and other procedural regulations were moved from the ITR to a separate part (31 CFR Part 501) dealing solely with such procedural matters. (62 *Fed. Reg.* 45098, August 25, 1997). A copy of these amendments is attached.

5. During the current 6-month period, OFAC made numerous decisions with respect to applications for licenses to engage in transactions

under the ITR, and issued 12 licenses. The majority of denials were in response to requests to authorize commercial exports to Iran—particularly of machinery and equipment for various industries—and the importation of Iranian-origin goods. The licenses issued authorized certain financial transactions, including those relating to disposal of U.S.-owned goods located in Iran and extension of, but not payment under, standby letters of credit. Pursuant to sections 3 and 4 of Executive Order 12959 and consistent with the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 and other statutory restrictions concerning certain goods and technology, including those involved in air-safety cases, Treasury continues to consult with the Departments of State and Commerce on these matters.

The U.S. financial community continues to scrutinize transactions associated with Iran and to consult with OFAC about their appropriate handling. Many of these inquiries have resulted in investigations into the activities of U.S. parties and, where appropriate, the initiation of enforcement action.

6. On March 20, 1997, a seven-count indictment was returned by a grand jury in the District of Maryland against a U.S. resident and two Iranian co-conspirators. The March indictment superseded a two-count indictment handed down on February 13, 1997. Each indictment charged violations of IEEPA and the ITR involving the attempted exportation from the United States to Iran of sophisticated state-of-the-art gas chromatographs used in the electric power industry, which were prevented from reaching Iran.

The U.S. Customs Service has continued to effect numerous seizures of Iranian-origin merchandise, primarily carpets, for violation of the import prohibitions of the ITR. Various enforcement actions carried over from previous reporting periods are continuing and new reports of violations are being aggressively pursued. Since my last report on March 14, 1997, OFAC has collected four civil monetary penalties totaling nearly $22,000. The violations relate to the unlicensed import from or export of goods to Iran. Civil penalty action is pending against 37 companies, financial institutions, and individuals for violations of the Regulations.

7. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from March 15 through September 14, 1997, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Iran are approximately $850,000, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, and the Office of the Legal Adviser), and the Department of Commerce (the Bureau of Export Administration and the General Counsel's Office).

8. The situation reviewed above continues to present an extraordinary and unusual threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. The declaration of the national emergency with respect to Iran contained in Executive Order 12957 and the comprehensive economic sanctions imposed by Executive Order 12959 underscore the United States Government opposition to the actions and policies of the Government of Iran, particularly its support of international terrorism and its efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. The Iranian Transactions Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Orders 12957 and 12959 continue to advance important objectives in promoting the nonproliferation and antiterrorism policies of the United States. I shall exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 17, 1997.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Federal Advisory Committees
September 17, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

As provided by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), as amended (Public Law 92–463; 5 U.S.C., App. 2, 6(c)), I am submitting the Twenty-Fifth Annual Report on Federal Advisory Committees, covering fiscal year 1996.

The executive branch continues to implement my policy of maintaining the number of advisory committees within the ceiling of 534 required by Executive Order 12838 of February 10, 1993. As a result, the number of discretionary advisory committees (established under general congressional authorizations) was held to 501, or 37 percent fewer than those 801 committees in existence at the beginning of my Administration. Savings achieved through elimination of discretionary committees during fiscal year 1996 totalled $2.5 million.

Through the advisory committee planning process required by Executive Order 12838, departments and agencies have worked to minimize the total number of advisory committees specifically mandated by statute. The 407 such groups supported at the end of fiscal year 1996 represents a modest 7 percent decrease over the 439 in existence at the beginning of my Administration. However, more can be done to assure that the total costs to fund these groups in fiscal year 1997, or $38.5 million, are dedicated to support high-priority public involvement efforts.

During fiscal year 1996, the General Services Administration (GSA) initiated a process for collaborating with executive departments and agencies to increase public participation opportunities at all levels of American society. Building upon my Administration's commitment to expand access to Federal decisionmakers, managers at all levels will be provided with more timely guidance that includes enhanced options for achieving objectives, better training, and exposure to a variety of tools and techniques, which when used in conjunction with advisory committees, offer additional flexibility to address a wide variety of public participation needs.

Actions to broaden the scope and effectiveness of public participation within the Federal sector will continue during fiscal year 1997. During the year, GSA will develop newly updated guidance implementing FACA. At the same time, GSA will continue to support and work closely with such agencies as the Council on Environmental Quality and the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior to align its efforts with key Administration policies relating to ecosystem and land management priorities.

My Administration will continue to work with the Congress to assure that all advisory committees that are required by statute are regularly reviewed through the congressional reauthorization process and that remaining committees are instrumental in achieving national interests.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 17, 1997.

Remarks on the 50th Anniversary of the United States Air Force in Arlington, Virginia
September 18, 1997

Thank you very much. Secretary Cohen, Secretary Widnall, General Eberhart, Chaplain Denlinger, Chief Benkin, to the Air Force Band, the Air Force Academy Cadet Chorale, the friends and families, especially the men and women of the United States Air Force. I'm delighted to be here as we celebrate this 50th anniversary of the best air force in the world.

Secretary Widnall thanked me for coming to your 50th birthday party. Actually, I thank you for having me. Ever since I turned 50 myself, I've been looking for all the company I can

find. [*Laughter*] And since I can't run for office anymore, Secretary Cohen, I'm glad to come here and have this crowd you raised for me. I appreciate it very much. [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, 50 years ago, when our Nation emerged from the crucible of World War II, we faced a political and military landscape that had been forever changed. Our European allies were devastated, the Iron Curtain was descending, the values for which we had fought so dearly seemed under siege from Europe to Asia. At that moment, only the United States had the strength to uphold the struggle for freedom around the world. And though our people were eager to turn their energies back home, we rose to the awesome responsibility at hand, creating the institutions that would protect our security and promote the cause of liberty and peace and eventually enable us to prevail in the cold war and enjoy the conditions that exist today, when, for the first time in human history, more than one-half the people on this planet live under governments of their own choosing.

In 1947, 50 years ago, the 4 essential players in that struggle came to life: the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Council, the Department of Defense, and the United States Air Force. For the record, I think it should be noted that President Truman signed this act aboard his so-called Sacred Cow, the C–54 Presidential aircraft that served back then as Air Force One. In case you're wondering, President Truman was just like me; he didn't have an escape pod on his plane either. [*Laughter*] I might say, as long as the Air Force is flying me, I don't feel the need for a way out.

Fifty years later, our Air Force remains a world-class force without peer, thanks to the extraordinary men and women who serve in it. Your soaring spirit, your dedication, your skill have helped America to master the skies. You've made us more secure. You've made the world a safer place.

We have seen your courage and expertise in time of war. We have seen your compassion and sacrifice in time of peace. We have seen the around-the-clock flights of the Berlin airlift. We saw you in MiG Alley in Korea. We saw the longest humanitarian airlift in history during the war in Bosnia. We saw you in the skies over Baghdad in Desert Storm. And just a few days ago, we saw the nine crewmembers of the C–141 perish off the coast of Africa after carrying a team of experts to help support our demining efforts in Namibia.

We have seen you rise to the challenges of our time, from the development of the air expeditionary forces that give me an invaluable tool in time of crisis, to last week's deployment of Commando Solo aircraft to help prevent the enemies of peace in Bosnia from sabotaging the Dayton agreement. We have seen your vision and commitment to excel as you sharpen your technological edge to dominate the battlefields of the future.

And perhaps most important, we see in the 12 Outstanding Airmen of the Year the best traditions, the best hope, and the brightest future of the Air Force, the leadership and talent and dedication that make you second to none.

I want you to know on behalf of all Americans, I am proud of them and proud of all of you who serve in the United States Air Force. To the pilots, the flight crews, the Red Horse engineers, the technicians, the security police, the space and missile operators, all who contribute to the strength of America in the skies, and to all the families who support you, our Nation is profoundly grateful.

Today is a well-earned day of celebration for your golden legacy of achievement. But as you know better than anyone, there is never a day of rest. We pay tribute to the last 50 years with a determination to look to our Air Force men and women to help us meet the challenges of the next 50 years. We know we can always count on you; we always have. Aim high, and reach for new horizons.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:50 p.m. in the Courtyard at the Pentagon. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. Ralph Eberhart, USAF, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force; Maj. Gen. William J. Denlinger, USAF, Chief of Chaplains; and Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force Eric Benkin, USAF.

Statement on the Helicopter Tragedy in Bosnia-Herzegovina
September 18, 1997

I am deeply saddened by the deaths in Bosnia yesterday of five dedicated Americans serving the cause of peace. David Kriskovich, Deputy Commissioner of the International Police Task Force (IPTF); Leah Melnick, Human Rights Officer with the Office of the High Representative; Livio Beccaccio, Senior Adviser to Deputy Commissioner Kriskovich; Marvin Padgett, IPTF Training Coordinator and Police Monitors; and William Nesbitt, Bosnia Program Manager for the Justice Department's International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Program (ICITAP), perished when a U.N. helicopter crashed on its way from Sarajevo to Bugojno and Brcko.

Also lost in this tragic accident were five German citizens, including Ambassador Gerd Wagner, Senior Deputy High Representative, as well as a British and a Polish citizen.

These men and this woman were serving the cause of peace and reconciliation, dedicated to building under exceptionally difficult circumstances what was envisioned at Dayton almost 2 years ago. The selfless commitment of such talented people is inspiring. We are determined to carry forward their vital work.

My heartfelt sympathy is extended to the Kriskovich, Melnick, Beccaccio, Padgett, and Nesbitt families as well as the families of their colleagues. May they take comfort in the good works of their loved ones, for as the Scripture tells us, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Australia-United States Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty With Documentation
September 18, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Australia on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Washington on April 30, 1997, and a related exchange of diplomatic notes signed the same date. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

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

The Treaty provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaty includes: taking testimony or statements of persons; providing documents, records, and other articles of evidence; serving documents; locating or identifying persons; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; executing requests for searches and seizures and for restitution; immobilizing instrumentalities and proceeds of crime; assisting in proceedings related to forfeiture or confiscation; and rendering any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the Requested State.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and related exchange of notes, and give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

September 18, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 19.

Statement on the Study by the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence
September 19, 1997

Today's study released by the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence confirms what we have known all along: that the Brady law is helping to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. The study also gives us more good news about the Brady law—that it has worked to help disrupt illegal gun trafficking patterns, making it more difficult for gun traffickers to do business.

While States are no longer required to conduct Brady background checks in light of the Supreme Court's recent decision, I am pleased that State and local law enforcement agencies around the country are overwhelmingly continuing to do these checks on a voluntary basis. Our goal remains unchanged: no background check, no handgun purchase.

I have pledged to do everything in my power to make sure that we continue to keep handguns out of the hands of criminals—including extending Brady background checks to violent juveniles who should not be able to buy a gun on their 21st birthday. Today's study further makes the case that for the safety of our communities and of all Americans, Brady background checks must continue.

The President's Radio Address
September 20, 1997

Good morning. We're living in a time of great hope and optimism and prosperity in our Nation. Our economy is booming. We've cut the deficit 80 percent and passed a plan to balance the budget. Crime and welfare rolls are dropping. But perhaps most important for the long-term future of America, this has been a banner year for education, too.

Our historic balanced budget is truly an education budget, with the largest new investment in education since 1965, from more children in Head Start to our America Reads program that will mobilize a million volunteers to make sure all our children can read when they leave the third grade, to putting computers in all our classrooms and libraries by the year 2000.

We've also had the largest increased investment in helping people to go on to college since the passage of the GI bill 50 years ago. The increased Pell grant scholarships and work study positions, the HOPE scholarship to help pay for the first 2 years of college, and other tax credits and IRA's, all these things will truly open the doors of college to all who are willing to work for it for the first time in American history.

But we can't rest. We have more to do in education to fully prepare our children to seize the opportunities of the new century. And especially, we all know we have to do more to improve the quality of public education.

I have called upon all Americans to leave politics at the schoolhouse door and to work together to provide our children with the best education in the world. And many have answered that call. Just last week, the Senate voted overwhelmingly, 87 to 12, for voluntary national tests in fourth grade reading and eighth grade math, bringing us an important step closer to setting high national standards of academic excellence that will ensure that no child leaves our schools without mastering the basics.

Unfortunately, two events in recent days have jeopardized this essential progress in education. First, the same forces that have resisted education reform and high standards and accountability for years in the House of Representatives have voted against developing the national standards we need to challenge students, improve teaching, empower parents, and increase accountability in our schools. In effect, they've cast their votes against better schools and for a status quo that is failing too many of our children.

Second, the Senate narrowly passed an amendment that would undermine some of our most successful efforts in the last 5 years to strengthen our schools. National efforts to bring

more charter schools to more communities, to bring computers to every classroom, to create safe and drug-free schools across our country, all these would virtually be abolished by an amendment which would throw all our education funds into a pot and distribute it in an arbitrary way to the States.

Today I'm going to see firsthand just how high these stakes are. I'm visiting the San Carlos Charter Learning Center in California, one of many charter schools across our country and in the State of California that are bringing new life, new energy, and new creativity into public education. Charter schools are established by educators with less redtape but higher expectations. Students must choose to attend them, and they exist only as long as they're doing a good job.

Our administration has been helping charter schools to get started all across our country, and our balanced budget contains funds to establish hundreds more of them all around America. This is an innovation we cannot afford to lose. Making sure every 8-year-old can read, every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old can go on to college, these are national goals, and we must support national efforts to meet them.

In the 21st century, our children must have a world-class education. We must strengthen our schools, raise our standards, insist that our students master the basics, and demand excellence at every level. So if Congress sends me partisan legislation that denies our children high national standards or weakens our national commitment to stronger schools, I'll have to give it the failing grade it deserves, and I'll veto it.

Bringing vital change and progress to our schools will take courage and the steadfast commitment of all. But throughout our history, we have always risen to the challenge of building better futures for our children. If we all work together, we are up to the task today as well.

Thank you.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 3:16 p.m. on September 18 in the Oval Office at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on September 20.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion on Charter Schools at the San Carlos Charter Learning Center in San Carlos, California

September 20, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. First, thank all of you for coming here today and sharing your Saturday morning. I thank the superintendent for his really marvelous remarks. He talked about all the things that we have in common. I saw a living symbol of his dedication to education above all else and one thing that we have in common that he didn't mention. If you look closely at his tie, you will see it is a pattern of golf balls and tees. And on this beautiful Saturday morning, he's here with us. [*Laughter*]

Let me thank your instructional coordinator, too, for being here, leaving her 11-day-old baby. I would like to see the 11-day-old baby, but I think it's—where's the baby? A wise mother leaves the baby outside. [*Laughter*]

Hillary and I are delighted to be here. And I want to spend most of my time just at this panel today. But I thank all of you for coming because I believe in charter schools, and I believe they are an important part of helping us to lift our standards and renew our schools and achieve the kind of educational excellence that all of our children need as we move into the 21st century.

I congratulate the San Carlos Learning Center for being the first of its kind in California, which obviously makes it among the very first in the United States.

Let me just give you a little brief personal history here. When I was Governor of my State for 12 years, I spent a great deal of time working on school reform—and so did Hillary—spent lots of time in the schools, talking to teachers, talking to parents, talking to students, dealing with issues of curriculum development and teacher training and all those things. And when we were active in the 1980's, the State of Minnesota became the first State in the country

to pass a public school choice law, to give parents and their children more choice among the public schools their children attended. I think we were the second State to pass that law. And we used it quite a lot.

Then, when I began to run for President in 1991, Minnesota became the first State in the country again to pass a charter school law, recognizing that sometimes it wasn't enough just to give the parents and the students choices but that we needed to give the educators and the parents and the students with whom they worked options to create schools that fit the mission needed by the children in the area, and that if you gave them options and held them accountable, we might be able to do something really spectacular. Then, 5 years ago today, I think, California became the second State in the country to adopt a charter school law, and then you became the first of those schools.

In 1994, I passed legislation in Congress to help us support more charter schools. By the end of 1995, there were about 300 charter schools in the country. Today, there are 700 charter schools in the country. Many of them have been helped by the program we passed in Washington in 1994.

The historic balanced budget agreement that we just passed into law includes the largest commitment to new investment in education since 1965, among other things, expansion of Head Start programs, more funds to support computers in the schools—I'll say more about that in a moment—our America Reads initiative to help make sure every 8-year-old can read independently, and the biggest increased investment in helping people go to college since the GI bill passed 50 years ago: tax credits for the first 2 years of college, credits for the remainder of college, IRA's, Pell grants, work-study positions. All these together mean that for the first time ever we can really say, if you're responsible enough to work for it, no matter what your income or your difficulties, college is now a real option for you in America, for every single American. And I'm very proud of all of that.

But one of the things that was in this balanced budget that didn't get a lot of notice is enough money for us to help to set up literally thousands more charter schools in America—because excellence in education is more than money. And from my point of view, having spent years and years and years working on this, we need two things. We need a set of national standards of academic excellence that will be internationally competitive in basic subjects, and then we need grassroots, school-based reform, because education is the magic that takes place in every classroom and indeed in every student's mind, involving every teacher, every student, and also, hopefully, support from home.

So that's why these charter schools are so important to me. And that's why we've tried to help a lot more schools like San Carlos get started on the path that you've been on now for some years.

For people who don't know exactly what they are, let me say that charter schools are public schools that make a simple agreement. In exchange for public funding, they get fewer regulations and less redtape, but they have to meet high expectations, and they keep their charter only so long as their customers are satisfied they're doing a good job.

As I said, we've gone from—the day I took office, there was only one charter school in America—January of '93. Then, a couple years ago, we were up to 300. Now there are 700. And what started as a movement in Minnesota and California now encompasses 29 States; 27 more States have passed charter school laws.

These funds in our budget, as I said, should allow us to set up several thousand more over the next 4 years. Today I am pleased to announce that we're going to release $40 million in grants to help charter schools open. Startup costs are often the biggest obstacle. And in States that can't afford to help, it's a terrible problem. I see a lot of people nodding their heads out there who have had experience with this.

So we have curriculum development costs, teacher training costs, new technology costs—all these things can help. The $40 million we're releasing today, of which about $3.4 million will come to California, will help us to establish another 500 charter schools in 21 States. So we'll go from 700 to 500 in one pop here.

And as I said, pretty soon—and if all the States will join in, we obviously can help all of them—we'll have well over 3,000, perhaps even over 4,000 by the year 2000, which is enough to have a seismic echo effect in all the public school systems of America. So that's what we're trying to do.

Let me say that there are a couple of problems that we're going to face. Last week, the U.S. Senate, by a very narrow margin, supported

an amendment that would make these charter schools' funding that I just announced the last such announcement that would ever be made, because it would lump all the education funds together and arbitrarily distribute them to the State without regard to whether these programs were continued or not. And in the process, it would abolish very specific and highly successful education reform programs like the charter schools, where we work with local communities and school districts. It would abolish our highly successful effort to put computers in the classrooms—I'll tell you how much movement has happened on there in just 2 years—and to create safe and drug-free schools. I think that would be a mistake.

The House of Representatives recently passed, although the Senate opposed them, an amendment that would prohibit us to pay for—not to develop but to pay for—a nonpolitical, private organization to develop voluntary national tests of excellence in mathematics and reading. I think that would be a mistake. This is the first time, last year, in history that our students in elementary schools scored above the international average in math and science. We're doing much better in America, but we don't test all of our kids. We just test a representative sample. I think we need to know how we're doing based on a common standard.

So we have these problems in the Congress, and if either one of these provisions makes it into the final bill, I will have to veto it. So I hope that we can continue to work on moving forward in the right direction. And in that connection, I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to Congresswoman Anna Eshoo, who I think is one of the—absolutely—even I would say this if I were in Washington—she really is one of the finest, most forward-looking Members of the United States Congress, and she's made a big difference in our country today.

Now, running these charter schools, as we are about to hear, is not easy. It's not self-evident how to do all this. It sounds great to say, "We'll cut you free of redtape and bureaucracy. You have to perform at a higher level. You've got to get the parents involved." There are all kinds of practical problems, and we'll hear about some of them.

The Secretary of Education, Dick Riley, is going to convene a national conference on charter schools in Washington this November to bring together teachers, administrators, parents, others who are interested in this to share best practices and look to the road ahead. But just think about where we can go with this. If we go—we've gone from one to 700, to 500 more, with a budget that calls for funds for 3,000 more—just this year's budget alone, that will be funded starting October 1st, if we get the funds for it, will give us enough funds for another 700—or 900 to 1,000 schools.

So this movement can sweep the country and can literally revolutionize both community control and standards of excellence in education if we do it right. That's what the panel is about.

And before we start, let me just thank some of the business leaders who are here today for their commitment to educational excellence: Regis McKenna, David Ellington, Brook Byers, Terry Yang, Paul Lippe. And I'd like to say a special word of thanks to Larry Ellison who is up here on the platform. He's the chairman and CEO of Oracle Corporation.

Two years ago this week, I met with Larry and a number of other high-tech executives to talk about another one of my passions, which is to connect every classroom and library in every school in America to the Internet by the year 2000. And that, like everything else, it turned out to be more complicated. It sounded great, but we not only had to connect them, we had to make sure we had the hardware, the software, and the trained teachers to do the job.

So we got this group of business people who knew about all this, who are working very hard to try to make sure that we can do that, give all the support services to every school. We got the Federal Communications Commission to give what amounts to a $2¼ billion a year subsidy to schools, to lower the rates they have to pay to hook onto the Internet. But to give you an example of what we can do when we work together, since we made that announcement 2 years ago, California has 65 percent of the schools connected, which is twice the percentage you had 2 years go, and 4 times as many classrooms connected as just 2 years ago. That shows you how quickly we can move.

And Larry has not only sponsored the San Carlos Learning Center but yesterday he announced Oracle's promise to spend $100 million in a foundation to help schools across America who need support to get the kind of connection

to the future through telecommunications technology that we all want. So thank you, Larry, for doing that.

So this is a good news day, but what I want to do now is to turn it over to the panel, and let's get into the facts of the charter school movement and see. Hopefully, by being here today, this will encourage the 21 States who do not have charter school legislation to adopt it; it will encourage the Congress to fully fund the charter schools program for the next 4 years; and it will help us to take what you have done here and spread it all across America in a way that will guarantee international standards of excellence in the education of all of our children.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the roundtable discussion proceeded, after which the First Lady made closing remarks.*]

The President. First of all, let me say I agree with everything she said. [*Laughter*] I'd just like to make a couple of brief points to build on what Hillary said. I want to say, first of all, I have no hidden agenda here. I believe the only way public schools can survive as the instrument by which we educate our children and socialize them and bring them together across all the lines that divide us is if all of our schools eventually—and hopefully sooner rather than later—are run like these charter schools. That's what I believe. I am not running for office anymore. I have no political interest in this. I am thinking about what our country is going to be like 20, 30, 40, 50 years from now.

And you know what Tom said about the industrial model, that's part of the problem. A lot of our schools are organized on an industrial model—a lot of our middle schools are almost—are organized for when families were like Ozzie and Harriet, instead of like they are today. There are a lot of organizational problems. It's also true that our schools get money from a lot of different places and have to suffer rules from a lot of different places, and a lot of people think if they give up their rulemaking, they won't matter anymore. And in some way, the most important person here is the superintendent because he's here supporting this instead of figuring out how he can control it. And I think that's important.

And so Hillary and I have been working at this business for a long time now, seriously since 1983—really seriously. There has been a dramatic change in the attitudes of the teacher unions, which is positive. There have been dramatic advances in the attitude of administrators, which is positive.

But I just want to say, we cannot—there are a lot of people who believe in the information age, with things changing as fast as they are and with standards needing to be as high as they are, that we ought to just basically send everybody money and let them do whatever they want to about education and forget about the public education network—let it sink or swim. The problem with that theory is that the short-term costs to people who got left behind would be staggering.

But if we want to preserve excellence and the socially unifying impact of public schools over the next generation, I am telling you, every school in the country has got to become like this one. The power needs to be with the parents, with the children, with the teachers, with the principals. And those of us who are up the lines somewhere, up the food chain, what are we interested in? We're interested in what Kim said. We're interested in results. We don't need to make rules. We're interested in results, and we want to be able to measure them. We want to know our kids are going to be all right and our country is going to be all right.

Let them make the rules in the schools. Let them figure it out. And then education will be something that will get bright young lawyers to leave their more lucrative law practices to do something that doesn't pay as much but makes them feel good when they go to bed every night and get up in the morning. That's what we want. And until every school is run like that, you and I should not rest.

Thank you. God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:19 a.m. in the gymnasium. In his remarks, he referred to Don Shalvey, superintendent, San Carlos School District; Elise Darwish, instructional coordinator, San Carlos Charter Learning Center; Regis McKenna, president, Regis McKenna, Inc.; David Ellington, chief executive officer, Net Noir; Brook Byers, partner, Kleiner, Perkins, Caufield & Byers; Terry Yang, cofounder, Yahoo!; Paul Lippe, vice president, Synopsis; Tom Ruiz, teacher, International Studies Academy Charter School; and Kimberly Polese, president and chief executive officer, Marimba, Inc.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Luncheon in San Francisco, California

September 20, 1997

Thank you very much. First let me thank all of you for coming. I'm sorry we were a little late getting here. Maybe we were just a little slow on the uptake after yesterday. I think you know we had another stop to make before we could come up. But I'm very grateful to you for being here.

I thank Alan Solomont and Dan Dutko for being here and for their work for our Democratic Party. Thank you, John Goldman, and all the other cochairs of this event.

This has been an interesting weekend for Hillary and for me, and I'm actually glad to be here. And when Mayor Brown said what he did—I think I came to California in my first term more than 30 times. I don't know if I can come out here anymore. [*Laughter*] If I come out here anymore, Willie will have me paying taxes in San Francisco. [*Laughter*]

But I do want to say that I'm very grateful to the people of this State not only for the support that I have received—Al Gore and I were fortunate enough to carry California both in 1992 and by an even bigger margin in 1996—but also for the work that was done by Californians with our administration which made it possible for us to help California to make the comeback that is now evident to everyone.

It was always clear to me that this State, which was effectively the sixth biggest economy in the world and had 13 percent of the population of America, had to make a big economic comeback in order for America to come back. This State which has so much racial and ethnic and religious and other kinds of diversity has to be able to prove we can live and work together in order for America to be able to live and work together. So I feel very much rewarded by the experience that Hillary and I and the Vice President and others have had not only personally but by what we have been able to achieve together. And I thank you for that.

You know, Hillary told you we went to this seminar last night that was chaired by Bill Perry and Warren Christopher about the expansion of NATO, something that I do feel quite passionately about. But it was ironic that Strobe Talbott was there giving the speech, our Deputy Secretary of State, because the very first time I ever saw Stanford was in February of 1971 when he took me there to see the woman who is now his wife. I still remember everything we did. I remember the movie we saw. It made a very profound impression on me.

But we were talking last night about the world we're trying to build and leave our children, and that's what I'd like to ask you to think about. You know, the Scripture says, "Where there is no vision the people perish." Whether you believe that or not, it is perfectly clear that no change occurs that is positive unless someone has imagined it. And at a time when things are changing anyway, when the way we work and live and relate to each other and the rest of the world is very much in flux, it is absolutely imperative that we have citizens and leaders who can imagine the future in a different way, so that we can shape it in the way that we want our children to find it.

The reason I'm thinking about it is, we were talking about that last night in terms of the world. I said, one of the things I admired about President Yeltsin is he has a great imagination. He can imagine a future for his people very different from the one they have endured. In 27 years in prison, Nelson Mandela could have just shriveled up inside, but instead he bloomed like a flower in the desert and he came out full of imagination about new and different ways to bring people together who had literally been butchering each other for a long time. The great thing about the former Israeli Prime Minister, the late Yitzhak Rabin, is that he could imagine a future in the Middle East where he made peace with people he had spent his whole life fighting.

So if you think about where we are here as a country, I am profoundly grateful for the results which have been achieved. I am glad we've got the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years. I'm glad we've got the lowest poverty rate ever recorded among African-Americans. I'm glad we've got the biggest drop in inequality among working people, in the last 2 years, we've seen in decades. I'm glad that the crime rate

has gone down every year I've been President, and we've had record numbers of reductions in people on the welfare rolls. I'm glad for that. I'm glad for the fights that we made.

Sometimes I think it's easy for people who are reporting on current events to forget that there is quite a difference here in who stands for what. The family and medical leave law, for example, has enabled millions of people to take some time off when their children are born or someone in their family gets sick. One party was overwhelmingly for it; the other party was overwhelmingly against it, although there were some Republicans, thank God, who stood by and helped us.

The same thing is true on our efforts to expand health care coverage. In this last budget, $24 billion in the balanced budget is allocated to help provide health insurance to half the kids in this country who don't have it. Does anyone really believe that would have happened had it not been for the Democratic Party? The answer is a resounding no. I can tell you; I was there.

We had the biggest increase in investment in education since 1965—in a generation—the biggest increase in helping people to go on to college—of all ages—since the GI bill was passed 50 years ago. You can now get a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college, which opens community college to every person in the country; more Pell grant scholarships; more work-study; other tax credits and deductions for all the other years of higher education for Americans of any age. We have finally created an environment in which we have opened the doors of college to all Americans who are willing to work for it.

This is a stunning achievement. It will change the future of America. No one can seriously argue that it would have happened had it not been for our party. That was the contribution we made to this balanced budget agreement. That was our driving passion. And so I say to you, there are consequences to the outcome of elections that affect people, that we can too easily forget.

And as you look to the future, in spite of all these good results—that's the point I'm trying to make—this is not a time for America to sit on its laurels. Why? First of all, because everything changes. But the rate of change today is so breathtaking—yes, so we balance the budget, and we have invested in our future, and we've expanded trade. But what are we going to do tomorrow to keep this economy going until everybody who needs a job or a better job or an education has a chance to participate in the economy?

Well, one of the things we have to do is keep expanding trade. I want Congress to give me the authority every previous President for the last 20 some years has had to expand trade. I do not want the Europeans, in effect, to have a bigger foothold in Latin America than we do, in Chile and Argentina and Brazil and Venezuela. That would be a terrible mistake. Two-thirds of our trade growth—two-thirds of our trade growth has come from our neighbors, from Canada to the southern tip of South America, in the last year. We dare not walk away from that.

I want to keep working on education until every school in America looks like the one that I visited today in California, where every school is like a charter school, in the control of the parents, the students, the teachers, and the principal; where redtape is low and expectations are high and the school only stays in business as long as it does a good job. That's the only way we're going to save public education in a modern world. And we need to have that kind of result. And we need to keep working until we get there.

So there is a lot still to be done. The world still is not properly organized, although we're getting there, to deal with the security threats that our children will face. I hope to goodness by the time I leave, we'll really be able to say there's no reasonable prospect of a recurrence of a nuclear-dominated world where people will really be in fear of one country dropping a nuclear weapon on another. I hope we'll be there. And we're working hard with the Russians to get there, and with others. But we will have to face the fact when I leave office in January of 2001 that the open borders we're creating and the open commerce we're creating and the explosion of technology we're seeing makes it possible for the organized forces of destruction to wreak havoc among decent people of the United States and throughout the world. And we must be organized to deal with terrorism. We must be organized to deal with drug traffickers. We must be organized to deal with people who purvey ethnic and religious hatred into the butchery of hundreds of thousands of people, whether it's in Africa or Europe or any

other place in the world. We have to be organized to deal with that.

There's lots to do. And I just want to say that I started with a vision. I wanted to be able to say when I left office that every child in this country would have the opportunity to live up to his or her own dreams and capacities if he or she were willing to work for it. I wanted to be able to say that we were still the world's leading force for peace and freedom and prosperity in the world. And I wanted to be able to say, that amidst all of our increasing diversity, we were coming together as one America, respecting, even celebrating our differences but bound together by things that unite us, more importantly.

And every day I fight against the things I think will undermine that, and I fight for the things I think will advance it. And all you have to do is to go back to the fight on family leave and the budget fight in 1993, the fight for the assault weapons ban, for the Brady bill, for 100,000 police on the street in 1994, the fight against the contract on America in 1995, the fight against taking the guarantee of medical care away from our poorest children, the fight against taking away all that Federal aid to education that was helping us to advance opportunity—just go through every single decision that's been made in the last 5 years—most of you who have come here to help us could have made more money in the short run helping the other party. You came here because you thought we needed to go forward together and because you shared that vision.

I'm here to tell you that we need to keep on with that vision because we, in spite of all the good times, we dare not rest. We have too much to do, too many people to lift up, and too many new bridges to cross before we get to that new century. And thanks to you, we're going to be able to do it.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:50 p.m. in the Postrio Restaurant at the Prescott Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee; Dan Dutko, chair, National Victory Fund; John Goldman, dinner cochair; Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr., of San Francisco; former Secretary of Defense William J. Perry; former Secretary of State Warren M. Christopher; President Boris Yeltsin of Russia; and State President Nelson Mandela of South Africa.

Remarks at a Saxophone Club Reception in San Francisco
September 20, 1997

Thank you very much. I'm always uneasy when Hillary is up here about to introduce me. I never know what is really going to be said. [*Laughter*]

You know, we—it's the world's worst-kept secret that we took our daughter to Stanford over the weekend—[*laughter*]—and bid her goodbye yesterday. And so, from, like, 6 o'clock on, Hillary and I are officially overseeing one of America's empty nests. [*Laughter*] And I've been thinking about how I was going to fill it. I was thinking about maybe I would get a dog to go with Socks, you know. [*Laughter*] When I heard Hillary talking, I thought that Willie was going to move in with us. [*Laughter*] Mayor, I love you, but they need you here. They need you. [*Laughter*]

I love to come to San Francisco. I love the community. It was wonderful; we got off the highway and were coming up from—we came up from Palo Alto and were coming up through the streets, and I now know—I've made that trip so many times from the airport that I know every block. And there's a little marker on every block, and I see the neighborhoods change. And I look for the people to change in the street. And I can always sort of measure how I'm doing by whether it's the same good response in every block, and then when I'm not doing so good there's a difference. [*Laughter*] And once I was doing so poorly, there was no difference in any of the neighborhoods the other way.

But I always love coming here, where the people are so expressive and so alive and so

committed, I think, to building the kind of community that involves all Americans that our whole country needs. And so I'm very glad to be here.

I want to hear this band. The name of this band really—LaVay Smith and her Red Hot Band? Is that really the name of this band? I like that. That's good. [*Laughter*] And I love all these 1940's ties, you know. It's just great. It's another part of San Francisco, right?

I want to just say a couple of things seriously. First of all, I love this Saxophone Club. And every Saxophone Club meeting I've been to, since I started out in 1992 and some bright young person had the idea of forming it, has kind of reaffirmed my faith in America because it gives people a chance to participate in the democratic process, to contribute at a modest level, and to feel like they're a part of our administration. We also have all kinds of people in the Saxophone Club, including people of all ages. It used to be, when we started out, there were only young people in the Saxophone Club, and I decided that was discriminatory, and I see we've taken care of that here tonight. [*Laughter*] We have a wider range of people, which I think is good.

But I'd just like to say, as I'm very much thinking about this today as we started our daughter on her college education, our administration has been very much about the future of this country, about trying to fix America's present problems and organize our country in a way that will enable us to have the best years of America in the 21st century.

So when I ran for President, I said that I had a rather simple vision, which I still think about every single day: I want this country to be a place where everybody who will work for it has the opportunity to live out their dreams; I want this country to be a place that people still look to to lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity; and in some ways most important of all, I want this country to be a place where we not only tolerate, not just respect all of us for our differences but we actually celebrate them and are still bound together by a set of common values which make us all Americans and enable us to have one America with all of our differences. In a world in which people are killing each other tonight, are full of hatred tonight in different places because of all of their differences, I think it's very important that we build that kind of America.

And I'm glad that what we sought to do has worked for our country. I'm proud of the fact that we cut the deficit by 80 percent even before we passed the balanced budget plan. I'm proud of the fact that we've invested in education. I'm proud of the fact that this new budget has the biggest increase in education funding since 1965 and the biggest increase in helping people go to college since the GI bill was passed 50 years ago.

When all these tax incentives, work-study positions, and Pell grants and IRA's get in place, it will literally be possible for us to say that every person in this country who is willing to work for it can get a college education. For the first time in history, we can say that. And that's important. I'm proud of that.

Christine talked about what we tried to do in health care, with health insurance in this budget for half of the kids in America, 5 million of them don't have health insurance; more work for the 16 million families that are affected with diabetes; new advances to help people deal with breast cancer and prostate cancer and other things. We're moving in this health area. I'm proud of that.

I'm proud of the fact that the crime rate has gone down 5 years in a row and that we were able to defeat our opponents in the other party who were against the assault weapons ban, who were against the Brady bill, and who were against putting 100,000 more police on the street. They were wrong on all three counts, and the crime rate is going down because we listened to law enforcement people and community people. I'm proud of that.

I'm proud of the fact that we waged the war to protect the basic fabric of nourishing the environment through clean water and clean air and setting aside natural spaces, all those things that were under so much assault in 1995, in early 1996.

I'm proud of the fact that we have the lowest welfare rolls we've had in a long time and the smallest percentage of Americans on public assistance since 1970. I'm proud of that.

But there is a lot more to do in this country, because we're still changing very fast. We have to figure out a way now to make this economic growth available to Americans in neighborhoods and rural communities that haven't accessed it. We have to figure out a way to make the technological revolution that America is leading the way in broadly available, in all the schools in

our country and to people who, if they had access to it, could make more of their own lives.

We have to figure out a way to keep the whole rate of growth with low inflation going on. We have a figure out a way to continue to sell our products and services to the rest of the world in a way that helps developing countries and helps Americans as well. We have to figure out a way to grow the economy while reducing the amount of pollution of the environment and the amount of greenhouse gases we're putting into the atmosphere. Otherwise, we may leave our children, and certainly will leave our grandchildren, with a legacy where they may be money rich and nature poor in ways that we can never forgive ourselves for doing.

So we still have a lot of big challenges out there. We have a world that is still not free of danger, as we all know. We have to figure out a way to continue to work on the nuclear threat until it doesn't exist anymore. And then we must at least, by the 21st century, have organized ourselves to deal with all those problems we all face that can cross national borders and are moving more quickly now because of technology: terrorism, drug trafficking, the promotion of war and killing based on ethnic or religious or racial or other hatreds. All these things that we have to face together. So there's a lot left to be done.

And in the next 3 years and some odd months, I just want you to know that I intend to work down to the last minute of the last hour of the last day to make sure that we continue to make progress for the American people. How are we going to—yes, you can clap for that. [*Applause*] I want you to understand what this is about, what your being here is about.

We have honest differences—now, we had a principled agreement on the balanced budget agreement where both sides got something they wanted, because we had done all—our party had done 80 percent of the work in balancing the budget; we could all say we wanted to balance the budget and still get some things we wanted with the growing economy. And I want to search for principled bipartisan compromise whenever I can, at home and abroad. There are those who think we should never do that; I think that's plain wrong. Whenever we can agree in good conscience, we should agree.

But I don't want you to forget either that there are choices to be made, and there are honest differences. Today I was at a school which was the first charter school created in California, when California became only the second State in our country to say that we ought to let public schools just be creative and get rid of a lot of the redtape—in a lot of these school districts, and let them start up.

I met a young lawyer, Mayor, who gave up his law practice to start a charter school here in San Francisco. And I met one of his students today, and it was awesome to think about our public school system basically sprouting a thousand flowers, all having one thing—they've got to produce results. Kids have to learn; they have to prove they can learn; they have to show they know something. Otherwise, we believe we ought to let creative people get in there and prove that all of our children can learn without regard to their race or their background or their income.

Now, there's a big fight going on in Congress now because some people would like to just write a check to the States and let them decide what to do with all the Federal education money. I don't think that's a very good idea, do you? And I think it would be a mistake for us not to be promoting the charter school movement. I think it would be a mistake. We need more of them.

I think it would be—2 years ago, I came to San Francisco and said, "We're going to wire every classroom and every library in every school in America by the year 2000." Today, the percentage of California schools that are hooked up to the Internet is twice what it was 2 years ago. The percentage of classrooms hooked up to the Internet in California alone is 4 times what it was just 2 years ago. We are supporting that with a specific program directed to these local school districts. I think it would be a mistake for us to back away from that and say, "We ought to let all 50 States decide whether that's a priority or not. If it is, fine. If it's not, walk away from it." I don't agree with that.

So we have these philosophical differences. The Senate in a bipartisan show of support agreed with me last week that we ought to have a nonpartisan board develop national examinations to have national standards of academic excellence in the basics of reading and mathematics for our children. An overwhelming vote in the House, led by the leaders of the other party, said no. I personally think that is crazy. I don't think you can have international standards of education if you don't measure them.

I don't want to run the schools. I'm trying to get less bureaucracy in the schools. I just want to say, "Here are the results; measure them. You figure out how to solve the problem. Inspire your kids, but don't tell me that all our children can't learn." So there is a big philosophical difference there. I think that's important.

You must never forget that all this matters. You must never—you look at the judges that I have appointed and the fact that they're not only the most diverse group by race and gender in the history of the Republic, they have the highest rating from the American Bar Association of any President's since the American Bar Association has been rating the appointments of the President to judgeships.

What happens? The United States Senate, under the control of the other party for the last 2 years, last year was the only time in 40 years—even in an election year, they haven't confirmed one judge to the Court of Appeals. Right now, over 50 of them sitting up there waiting to be confirmed. Why? Well, one Congressman said that he wanted to intimidate, and one of the Senators said it sounded like a good idea to him.

Well, I hope they won't be intimidated, and I think the Senate ought to do its constitutional duty and confirm the judges. And I'm going to keep appointing people that I think are mainstream, well-qualified judges that can represent America instead of one political point of view. And I think you believe that, and I hope you'll support me in that.

There are reasons why you're here. And I want to challenge you—I want you to go out to your friends and neighbors and say, "Look, I went to this event, and I became a part of this group, and I did it because I wanted to have a say in the world our children and grandchildren live in, and here's why I did that, and you ought to make a decision, too."

I believe that we need a Government in Washington that is not committed to solving people's problems for them, but at least we'll give them the tools to solve their problems themselves. I believe that.

And I believe that there are some things that we can only enjoy if we enjoy them in common, and therefore we must achieve them together, like clean air and safe drinking water and natural spaces we protect, along with national security. That's what I believe. And I believe we have to achieve this future together.

So I want you to leave here proud of being here. I want you to leave here full of energy from being here. And I want to you to leave here committed to getting others enlisted in our cause.

Every member of the Democratic caucus in the U.S. Senate has endorsed the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill. If we can pass it—and we've been trying now—every year I have endorsed a good bill, and every year the other party has filibustered it to death in the Senate—and still—you know, if you read about it, you can't tell who's on what side. [*Laughter*] It's a mystery to me because it's clear what happened. And they say they're going to do it again, but they may not get away with it. So if we can pass good campaign finance reform, then two things will have to happen: number one, we have to get reduced-cost or free TV time for candidates so they can still communicate in California; and the second thing is, you'll be even more important—you'll be even more important because we'll have to expand your numbers.

So I say again, when you leave here, you just remember what Hillary said—I normally agree with what she says—[*laughter*]—but when she said you were the most important person in this democratic enterprise, that is the truth. And we have to decide now—we are still in the process of defining what America will be like in the 21st century; we are still in the process of doing that. And I've got a very long agenda of things that I'm committed to doing in the next 3 years that I want to be your agenda.

But I want you to think, most importantly, about the big issues. Twenty, thirty, forty years from now, wouldn't you like to be able to say that every child in this country who will work for it can live out his or her dreams? Wouldn't you like to be able to say that your country is still leading the world toward a more peaceful, more free, more prosperous state? Wouldn't you like to be able to say that out of all the ashes of all the problems that we have seen from the Middle East and Northern Ireland, to Bosnia, to Rwanda and Burundi, to you name it, America rose up at the end of the 20th century to be a country where there is no single race or ethnic group in the majority, but we got along, and we worked together, and we respected and celebrated our differences, and then

defined what we had in common to make us one America? That's what I would like, and that's what you're making possible.

Thank you. God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:29 p.m. in the Terrace Room at the Fairmont Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Christine Pelosi, member, event steering committee.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in San Francisco
September 20, 1997

Hillary and I are trying to get used to our first 48 hours of the empty nest syndrome. [*Laughter*] And so we found the youngest couple we could to host this dinner tonight—[*laughter*]—who have 17 years to worry about this happening.

I want to thank Halsey and Deborah for taking us in. And thank you, John and Ann and Brook and Sandy and Jeanne, all of you who sponsored this dinner tonight.

I will be very brief. I'm obviously in a rather reflective mood, as all of you who have ever sent a child off to college would be at this moment. I am profoundly grateful for the chance I've had to serve as President, grateful for the support I have received in two elections from the people of California, and particularly appreciative of the unprecedented help I have had not only in elections but as President from the communities represented in this room—sometimes directly working with us on hooking up more of our classrooms and libraries to the Internet, providing the software, the hardware, the training of teachers, sometimes indirectly, by continuing to advance the frontiers of knowledge and grow the economy.

I want to leave you basically with a simple thought as we break up and go to dinner. I came to this job 5 years ago with what I thought was a very clear, simple vision. I recognized a lot of the details I didn't know, although I thought I knew a lot about the basic economic issues and the basic educational issues and the basic social policies before the country. But I wanted to prepare America for a new century. I wanted to create opportunity, make sure that we could create, together, opportunity for everybody who would work for it. I wanted us to come together, instead of be driven apart, by our diversity. And I wanted us to continue to lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity.

The first thing we had to do was fix a lot of things that weren't working, that just didn't make any sense. One was our economic policy; so we adopted a new one designed to invest in our people, balance the budget, and expand trade in American products and services. It has worked. You have made it work. Millions of other Americans have made it work. But no one can seriously question that fiscal responsibility, investing in people and technology and our future, expanding American trade makes sense. And it's basically taken a burden off the backs of the American people in our productive capacity and also tried to play to our strengths.

The second thing we tried to do is to basically make America habitable again by having a serious anticrime policy that built on what was working on the streets. Now no one seriously questions that the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban and the 100,000 more police—that that was the right approach. And it's a good thing to have crime going down dramatically. People, just friends of mine who aren't even in politics, comment from time to time now as they travel from American city to American city how much safer it is in city X, Y, or Z than it used to be.

We have changed the way the Government works. We had the biggest reduction in welfare rolls in history. The Federal Government has 300,000 fewer people working for it than it did the day I became President. And we are trying, slowly but surely, to modernize it.

I saw someone out of your general line of work was in Washington the other day saying that most people out here operated at 3 times faster than normal business life; most people in Government operate 3 times slower. Therefore, you're nine to one ahead of us. [*Laughter*] I don't know who said that, but I think the math is right and the characterization is roughly accurate. But I'm trying to change that.

So tonight, as I think about the future of all those young people who started college yesterday, I think America is very well poised for the future. But I think things are changing so rapidly we have to recognize that a lot of our systems still don't work as well as they should, especially the education system. And more importantly, I think we should be focusing on what we need to make work for the future. How can we now provide the kind of institutional and environmental framework to guarantee that America will work well 20, 30, 40 years from now, to give America a chance to succeed, to give these dreams that our children have a chance to prevail?

The one huge issue we have to face is how to continue to grow the economy while improving dramatically our capacity to preserve the environment. I'm convinced the climate change challenge is real, and yet there are no simple, easy answers about how to transition our economy from where it is now to where it needs to go.

Another problem we haven't resolved is, how can people reconcile work and family? More and more people are working and raising children, and we need them to succeed at both. Desperately, we need people to succeed at both. And that means we have to have new arrangements. And then there's all the technology questions that you're more familiar with than I am.

We have succeeded, I think dramatically, in reducing the nuclear threat. And we're going to do more the next 3 years. But our children will live in a world where terrorism, organized crime crossing national borders using high technology, drug trafficking, and people who have high-tech weapons but very primitive designs rooted in ethnic, religious, and racial hatreds, can cause a lot of trouble to a lot of people who 10 years ago would have never even bought into it. But now, because the world is so mobile and borders are so open and porous, we all become more vulnerable. So we have to figure out ways to protect privacy and yet give ourselves the common capacity to promote public safety.

So what I'd like to talk about tonight over dinner is, what about all those things in the future? I'm very glad the country is in better shape than it was 5 years ago, but we still have a lot to do to give our children the country that they deserve and to feel like all of us have done our job. And anything you can do to help, I'll be very grateful for.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:09 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Halsey Minor, chairman and chief executive officer, The Computer Network (CNET), and his wife, Deborah; John Doerr, partner, Kleiner, Perkins, Caufield & Byers, and his wife, Ann; Brook Byers, partner, Kleiner, Perkins, Caufield & Byers; and Sanford R. (Sandy) Robertson, chairman, Robertson, Stephens & Co., and his wife, Jeanne.

Remarks to the 52d Session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York City

September 22, 1997

Mr. President, Secretary-General, distinguished guests: Five years ago, when I first addressed this Assembly, the cold war had only just ended, and the transition to a new era was beginning. Now, together, we are making that historic transition.

Behind us we leave a century full of humanity's capacity for the worst and its genius for the best. Before us, at the dawn of a new millennium, we can envision a new era that escapes the 20th century's darkest moments, fulfills its most brilliant possibilities, and crosses frontiers yet unimagined.

We are off to a promising start. For the first time in history, more than half the people represented in this Assembly freely choose their own governments. Free markets are growing, spreading individual opportunity and national well-being. Early in the 21st century, more than 20 of this Assembly's members, home to half the Earth's population, will lift themselves from the ranks of low-income nations.

Powerful forces are bringing us closer together, profoundly changing the way we work and live and relate to each other. Every day millions of our citizens on every continent use laptops and satellites to send information, products, and money across the planet in seconds. Bit by bit, the information age is chipping away at the barriers, economic, political, and social, that once kept people locked in and ideas locked out. Science is unraveling mysteries in the tiniest of human genes and the vast cosmos.

Never in the course of human history have we had a greater opportunity to make our people healthier and wiser, to protect our planet from decay and abuse, to reap the benefits of free markets without abandoning the social contract and its concern for the common good. Yet today's possibilities are not tomorrow's guarantees. We have work to do.

The forces of global integration are a great tide, inexorably wearing away the established order of things. But we must decide what will be left in its wake. People fear change when they feel its burdens but not its benefits. They are susceptible to misguided protectionism, to the poisoned appeals of extreme nationalism, and ethnic, racial, and religious hatred. New global environmental challenges require us to find ways to work together without damaging legitimate aspirations for progress. We're all vulnerable to the reckless acts of rogue states and to an unholy axis of terrorists, drug traffickers, and international criminals. These 21st century predators feed on the very free flow of information and ideas and people we cherish. They abuse the vast power of technology to build black markets for weapons, to compromise law enforcement with huge bribes of illicit cash, to launder money with the keystroke of a computer. These forces are our enemies. We must face them together because no one can defeat them alone.

To seize the opportunities and move against the threats of this new global era, we need a new strategy of security. Over the past 5 years, nations have begun to put that strategy in place through a new network of institutions and arrangements with distinct missions but a common purpose: to secure and strengthen the gains of democracy and free markets while turning back their enemies.

We see this strategy taking place on every continent: expanded military alliances like NATO, its Partnership For Peace, its partnerships with a democratic Russia and a democratic Ukraine; free-trade arrangements like the WTO and the global information technology agreement and the move toward free-trade areas by nations in the Americas, the Asia-Pacific region, and elsewhere around the world; strong arms control regimes like the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Non-Proliferation Treaty; multinational coalitions with zero tolerance for terrorism, corruption, crime, and drug trafficking; binding international commitments to protect the environment and safeguard human rights.

Through this web of institutions and arrangements, nations are now setting the international ground rules for the 21st century, laying a foundation for security and prosperity for those who live within them, while isolating those who challenge them from the outside. This system will develop and endure only if those who follow the rules of peace and freedom fully reap their rewards. Only then will our people believe that they have a stake in supporting and shaping the emerging international system.

The United Nations must play a leading role in this effort, filling in the faultlines of the new global era. The core missions it has pursued during its first half-century will be just as relevant during the next half-century: the pursuit of peace and security, promoting human rights, and moving people from poverty to dignity and prosperity through sustainable development.

Conceived in the caldron of war, the United Nations' first task must remain the pursuit of peace and security. For 50 years, the U.N. has helped prevent world war and nuclear holocaust. Unfortunately, conflicts between nations and within nations has endured. From 1945 until today, they have cost 20 million lives. Just since the end of the cold war, each year there have been more than 30 armed conflicts in which more than a thousand people have lost their lives, including, of course, a quarter of a million killed in the former Yugoslavia and more than half a million in Rwanda.

Millions of personal tragedies the world over are a warning that we dare not be complacent or indifferent. Trouble in a far corner can become a plague on everyone's house.

People the world over cheer the hopeful developments in Northern Ireland, grieve over the innocent loss of life and the stalling of the peace

process in the Middle East, and long for a resolution of the differences on the Korean Peninsula or between Greece and Turkey or between the great nations of India and Pakistan as they celebrate the 50th anniversaries of their birth.

The United Nations continues to keep many nations away from bloodshed, in El Salvador and Mozambique, in Haiti and Namibia, in Cyprus and in Bosnia, where so much remains to be done but can still be done because the bloodshed has ended.

The record of service of the United Nations has left a legacy of sacrifice. Just last week, we lost some of our finest sons and daughters in a crash of a U.N. helicopter in Bosnia. Five were Americans, five were Germans, one Polish, and one British, all citizens of the world we are trying to make, each a selfless servant of peace. And the world is poorer for their passing.

At this very moment, the United Nations is keeping the peace in 16 countries, often in partnership with regional organizations like NATO, the OAS, ASEAN, and ECOWAS, avoiding wider conflicts and even greater suffering. Our shared commitment to more realistic peacekeeping training for U.N. troops, a stronger role for civilian police, better integration between military and civilian agencies, all these will help the United Nations to meet these missions in the years ahead.

At the same time, we must improve the U.N.'s capabilities after a conflict ends to help peace become self-sustaining. The U.N. cannot build nations, but it can help nations to build themselves by fostering legitimate institutions of government, monitoring elections, and laying a strong foundation for economic reconstruction.

This week the Security Council will hold an unprecedented ministerial meeting on African security, which our Secretary of State is proud to chair and which President Mugabe, chairman of the Organization of African Unity, will address. It will highlight the role the United Nations can and should play in preventing conflict on a continent where amazing progress toward democracy and development is occurring alongside still too much discord, disease, and distress.

In the 21st century, our security will be challenged increasingly by interconnected groups that traffic in terror, organized crime, and drug smuggling. Already these international crime and drug syndicates drain up to $750 billion a year from legitimate economies. That sum exceeds the combined GNP of more than half the nations in this room. These groups threaten to undermine confidence in fragile new democracies and market economies that so many of you are working so hard to see endure.

Two years ago, I called upon all the members of this Assembly to join in the fight against these forces. I applaud the U.N.'s recent resolution calling on its members to join the major international antiterrorism conventions, making clear the emerging international consensus that terrorism is always a crime and never a justifiable political act. As more countries sign on, terrorists will have fewer places to run or hide.

I also applaud the steps that members are taking to implement the declaration on crime and public security that the United States proposed 2 years ago, calling for increased cooperation to strengthen every citizen's right to basic safety through cooperation on extradition and asset forfeiture, shutting down gray markets for guns and false documents, attacking corruption, and bringing higher standards to law enforcement in new democracies.

The spread of these global criminal syndicates also has made all the more urgent our common quest to eliminate weapons of mass destruction. We cannot allow them to fall or to remain in the wrong hands. Here, too, the United Nations must lead, and it has, from UNSCOM in Iraq to the International Atomic Energy Agency, now the most expansive global system ever devised to police arms control agreements.

When we met here last year, I was honored to be the first of 146 leaders to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, our commitment to end all nuclear tests for all time, the longest sought, hardest fought prize in the history of arms control. It will help to prevent the nuclear powers from developing more advanced and more dangerous weapons. It will limit the possibilities for other states to acquire such devices. I am pleased to announce that today I am sending this crucial treaty to the United States Senate for ratification. Our common goal should be to enter the CTBT into force as soon as possible, and I ask for all of you to support that goal.

The United Nations' second core mission must be to defend and extend universal human rights and to help democracy's remarkable gains endure. Fifty years ago, the U.N.'s Universal

Declaration of Human Rights stated the international community's conviction that people everywhere have the right to be treated with dignity, to give voice to their opinions, to choose their leaders; that these rights are universal, not American rights, not Western rights, not rights for the developed world only but rights inherent in the humanity of people everywhere. Over the past decade, these rights have become a reality for more people than ever, from Asia to Africa, from Europe to the Americas. In a world that links rich and poor, north and south, city and countryside in an electronic network of shared images in real time, the more these universal rights take hold, the more people who do not enjoy them will demand them. Armed with photocopiers and fax machines, E-mail and the Internet, supported by an increasingly important community of nongovernmental organizations, they will make their demands known, spreading the spirit of freedom which, as the history of the last 10 years has shown us, ultimately will prevail.

The United Nations must be prepared to respond not only by setting standards but by implementing them. To deter abuses, we should strengthen the U.N.'s field operations and early warning systems. To strengthen democratic institutions, the best guarantors of human rights, we must pursue programs to help new legal, parliamentary, and electoral institutions get off the ground. To punish those responsible for crimes against humanity and to promote justice so that peace endures, we must maintain our strong support for the U.N.'s war crime tribunals and truth commissions. And before the century ends, we should establish a permanent international court to prosecute the most serious violations of humanitarian law.

The United States welcomes the Secretary-General's efforts to strengthen the role of human rights within the U.N. system and his splendid choice of Mary Robinson as the new High Commissioner. We will work hard to make sure that she has the support she needs to carry out her mandate.

Finally, the United Nations has a special responsibility to make sure that as the global economy creates greater wealth, it does not produce growing disparities between the haves and have-nots or threaten the global environment, our common home. Progress is not yet everyone's partner. More than half the world's people are 2 days' walk from a telephone, literally disconnected from the global economy. Tens of millions lack the education, the training, the skills they need to make the most of their God-given abilities.

The men and women of the United Nations have expertise across the entire range of humanitarian and development activities. Every day they are making a difference. We see it in nourished bodies of once starving children, in the full lives of those immunized against disease, in the bright eyes of children exposed to education through the rich storehouse of human knowledge, in refugees cared for and returned to their homes, in the health of rivers and lakes restored.

The United Nations must focus even more on shifting resources from hand-outs to hand-ups, on giving people the tools they need to make the most of their own destinies. Spreading ideas in education and technology, the true wealth of nations, is the best way to give people a chance to succeed.

And the U.N. must continue to lead in ensuring that today's progress does not come at tomorrow's expense. When the nations of the world gather again next December in Kyoto for the U.N. Climate Change Conference, all of us, developed and developing nations, must seize the opportunity to turn back the clock on greenhouse gas emissions so that we can leave a healthy planet to our children.

In these efforts, the U.N. no longer can and no longer need go it alone. Innovative partnerships with the private sector, NGO's, and the international financial institutions can leverage its effectiveness many times over. Last week, a truly visionary American, Ted Turner, made a remarkable donation to strengthen the U.N.'s development and humanitarian programs. His gesture highlights the potential for partnership between the U.N. and the private sector in contributions of time, resources, and expertise. And I hope more will follow his lead.

In this area and others, the Secretary-General is aggressively pursuing the most far-reaching reform of the United Nations in its history, not to make the U.N. smaller as an end in itself but to make it better. The United States strongly supports his leadership. We should pass the Secretary-General's reform agenda this session.

On every previous occasion I have addressed this Assembly, the issue of our country's dues has brought the commitment of the United States to the United Nations into question. The

United States was a founder of the U.N. We are proud to be its host. We believe in its ideals. We continue to be, as we have been, its largest contributor. We are committed to seeing the United Nations succeed in the 21st century.

This year, for the first time since I have been President, we have an opportunity to put the questions of debts and dues behind us once and for all and to put the United Nations on a sounder financial footing for the future. I have made it a priority to work with our Congress on comprehensive legislation that would allow us to pay off the bulk of our arrears and assure full financing of America's assessment in the years ahead. Our Congress' actions to solve this problem reflects a strong bipartisan commitment to the United Nations and to America's role within it. At the same time, we look to member states to adopt a more equitable scale of assessment.

Let me say that we also strongly support expanding the Security Council to give more countries a voice in the most important work of the U.N. In more equitably sharing responsibility for its successes, we can make the U.N. stronger and more democratic than it is today. I ask the General Assembly to act on these proposals this year so that we can move forward together.

At the dawn of a new century, so full of hope but not free of peril, more than ever we need a United Nations where people of reason can work through shared problems and take action to combat them, where nations of good will can join in the struggle for freedom and prosperity, where we can shape a future of peace and progress and the preservation of our planet.

We have the knowledge, we have the intelligence, we have the energy, we have the resources for the work before us. We are building the necessary networks of cooperation. The great question remaining is whether we have the vision and the heart necessary to imagine a future that is different from the past, necessary to free ourselves from destructive patterns of relations with each other and within our own nations and live a future that is different.

A new century and a new millennium is upon us. We are literally present at the future, and it is the great gift, it is our obligation, to leave to our children.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in the General Assembly Hall at United Nations Headquarters. In his remarks, he referred to Minister of Foreign Affairs Hennadiy Udovenko of Ukraine, President, U.N. General Assembly; U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan; President Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe; Mary Robinson, U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights; and Ted Turner, vice chairman, Time Warner, Inc.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty With Documentation

September 22, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (the "Treaty" or "CTBT"), opened for signature and signed by the United States at New York on September 24, 1996. The Treaty includes two Annexes, a Protocol, and two Annexes to the Protocol, all of which form integral parts of the Treaty. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State on the Treaty, including an Article-by-Article analysis of the Treaty.

Also included in the Department of State's report is a document relevant to but not part of the Treaty: the Text on the Establishment of a Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization, adopted by the Signatory States to the Treaty on November 19, 1996. The Text provides the basis for the work of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization in preparing detailed procedures for implementing the Treaty and making arrangements for the first session of the Conference of the States Parties to the

Treaty. In particular, by the terms of the Treaty, the Preparatory Commission will be responsible for ensuring that the verification regime established by the Treaty will be effectively in operation at such time as the Treaty enters into force. My Administration has completed and will submit separately to the Senate an analysis of the verifiability of the Treaty, consistent with section 37 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended. Such legislation as may be necessary to implement the Treaty also will be submitted separately to the Senate for appropriate action.

The conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is a signal event in the history of arms control. The subject of the Treaty is one that has been under consideration by the international community for nearly 40 years, and the significance of the conclusion of negotiations and the signature to date of more than 140 states cannot be overestimated. The Treaty creates an absolute prohibition against the conduct of nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosion anywhere. Specifically, each State Party undertakes not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion; to prohibit and prevent any nuclear explosions at any place under its jurisdiction or control; and to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion.

The Treaty establishes a far reaching verification regime, based on the provision of seismic, hydroacoustic, radionuclide, and infrasound data by a global network (the "International Monitoring System") consisting of the facilities listed in Annex 1 to the Protocol. Data provided by the International Monitoring System will be stored, analyzed, and disseminated, in accordance with Treaty-mandated operational manuals, by an International Data Center that will be part of the Technical Secretariat of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization. The verification regime includes rules for the conduct of on-site inspections, provisions for consultation and clarification, and voluntary confidence-building measures designed to contribute to the timely resolution of any compliance concerns arising from possible misinterpretation of monitoring data related to chemical explosions that a State Party intends to or has carried out. Equally important to the U.S. ability to verify the Treaty, the text specifically provides for the right of States Parties to use information obtained by national technical means in a manner consistent with generally recognized principles of international law for purposes of verification generally, and in particular, as the basis for an on-site inspection request. The verification regime provides each State Party the right to protect sensitive installations, activities, or locations not related to the Treaty. Determinations of compliance with the Treaty rest with each individual State Party to the Treaty.

Negotiations for a nuclear test-ban treaty date back to the Eisenhower Administration. During the period 1978–1980, negotiations among the United States, the United Kingdom, and the USSR (the Depositary Governments of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)) made progress, but ended without agreement. Thereafter, as the non-nuclear weapon states called for test-ban negotiations, the United States urged the Conference on Disarmament (the "CD") to devote its attention to the difficult aspects of monitoring compliance with such a ban and developing elements of an international monitoring regime. After the United States, joined by other key states, declared its support for comprehensive test-ban negotiations with a view toward prompt conclusion of a treaty, negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban were initiated in the CD, in January 1994. Increased impetus for the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty by the end of 1996 resulted from the adoption, by the Parties to the NPT in conjunction with the indefinite and unconditional extension of that Treaty, of "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament" that listed the conclusion of a CTBT as the highest measure of its program of action.

On August 11, 1995, when I announced U.S. support for a "zero yield" CTBT, I stated that:

> ". . . As part of our national security strategy, the United States must and will retain strategic nuclear forces sufficient to deter any future hostile foreign leadership with access to strategic nuclear forces from acting against our vital interests and to convince it that seeking a nuclear advantage would be futile. In this regard, I consider the maintenance of a safe and reliable nuclear stockpile to be a supreme national interest of the United States.
>
> "I am assured by the Secretary of Energy and the Directors of our nuclear weapons

labs that we can meet the challenge of maintaining our nuclear deterrent under a CTBT through a Science Based Stockpile Stewardship program without nuclear testing. I directed the implementation of such a program almost 2 years ago, and it is being developed with the support of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This program will now be tied to a new certification procedure. In order for this program to succeed, both the Administration and the Congress must provide sustained bipartisan support for the stockpile stewardship program over the next decade and beyond. I am committed to working with the Congress to ensure this support.

"While I am optimistic that the stockpile stewardship program will be successful, as President I cannot dismiss the possibility, however unlikely, that the program will fall short of its objectives. Therefore, in addition to the new annual certification procedure for our nuclear weapons stockpile, I am also establishing concrete, specific safeguards that define the conditions under which the United States can enter into a CTBT . . ."

The safeguards that were established are as follows:

- The conduct of a Science Based Stockpile Stewardship program to ensure a high level of confidence in the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons in the active stockpile, including the conduct of a broad range of effective and continuing experimental programs.
- The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology that will attract, retain, and ensure the continued application of our human scientific resources to those programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends.
- The maintenance of the basic capability to resume nuclear test activities prohibited by the CTBT should the United States cease to be bound to adhere to this Treaty.
- The continuation of a comprehensive research and development program to improve our treaty monitoring capabilities and operations.
- The continuing development of a broad range of intelligence gathering and analytical capabilities and operations to ensure accurate and comprehensive information on worldwide nuclear arsenals, nuclear weapons development programs, and related nuclear programs.
- The understanding that if the President of the United States is informed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy (DOE)—advised by the Nuclear Weapons Council, the Directors of DOE's nuclear weapons laboratories, and the Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command—that a high level of confidence in the safety or reliability of a nuclear weapon type that the two Secretaries consider to be critical to our nuclear deterrent could no longer be certified, the President, in consultation with the Congress, would be prepared to withdraw from the CTBT under the standard "supreme national interests" clause in order to conduct whatever testing might be required.

With regard to the last safeguard:

- The U.S. regards continued high confidence in the safety and reliability of its nuclear weapons stockpile as a matter affecting the supreme interests of the country and will regard any events calling that confidence into question as "extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty." It will exercise its rights under the "supreme national interests" clause if it judges that the safety or reliability of its nuclear weapons stockpile cannot be assured with the necessary high degree of confidence without nuclear testing.
- To implement that commitment, the Secretaries of Defense and Energy—advised by the Nuclear Weapons Council or "NWC" (comprising representatives of DOD, JCS, and DOE), the Directors of DOE's nuclear weapons laboratories and the Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command—will report to the President annually, whether they can certify that the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile and all critical elements thereof are, to a high degree of confidence, safe and reliable, and, if they cannot do so, whether, in their opinion and that of the NWC, testing is necessary to assure, with a high degree of

confidence, the adequacy of corrective measures to assure the safety and reliability of the stockpile, or elements thereof. The Secretaries will state the reasons for their conclusions, and the views of the NWC, reporting any minority views.

- After receiving the Secretaries' certification and accompanying report, including NWC and minority views, the President will provide them to the appropriate committees of the Congress, together with a report on the actions he has taken in light of them.
- If the President is advised, by the above procedure, that a high level of confidence in the safety or reliability of a nuclear weapon type critical to the Nation's nuclear deterrent could no longer be certified without nuclear testing, or that nuclear testing is necessary to assure the adequacy of corrective measures, the President will be prepared to exercise our "supreme national interests" rights under the Treaty, in order to conduct such testing.
- The procedure for such annual certification by the Secretaries, and for advice to them by the NWC, U.S. Strategic Command, and the DOE nuclear weapons laboratories will be embodied in domestic law.

As negotiations on a text drew to a close it became apparent that one member of the CD, India, would not join in a consensus decision to forward the text to the United Nations for its adoption. After consultations among countries supporting the text, Australia requested the President of the U.N. General Assembly to convene a resumed session of the 50th General Assembly to consider and take action on the text. The General Assembly was so convened, and by a vote of 158 to 3 the Treaty was adopted. On September 24, 1996, the Treaty was opened for signature and I had the privilege, on behalf of the United States, of being the first to sign the Treaty.

The Treaty assigns responsibility for overseeing its implementation to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization (the "Organization"), to be established in Vienna. The Organization, of which each State Party will be a member, will have three organs: the Conference of the States Parties, a 51-member Executive Council, and the Technical Secretariat. The Technical Secretariat will supervise the operation of and provide technical support for the International Monitoring System, operate the International Data Center, and prepare for and support the conduct of on-site inspections. The Treaty also requires each State Party to establish a National Authority that will serve as the focal point within the State Party for liaison with the Organization and with other States Parties.

The Treaty will enter into force 180 days after the deposit of instruments of ratification by all of the 44 states listed in Annex 2 to the Treaty, but in no case earlier than 2 years after its being opened for signature. If, 3 years from the opening of the Treaty for signature, the Treaty has not entered into force, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in his capacity as Depositary of the Treaty, will convene a conference of the states that have deposited their instruments of ratification if a majority of those states so requests. At this conference the participants will consider what measures consistent with international law might be undertaken to accelerate the ratification process in order to facilitate the early entry into force of the Treaty. Their decision on such measures must be taken by consensus.

Reservations to the Treaty Articles and the Annexes to the Treaty are not permitted. Reservations may be taken to the Protocol and its Annexes so long as they are not incompatible with the object and purpose of the Treaty. Amendment of the Treaty requires the positive vote of a majority of the States Parties to the Treaty, voting in a duly convened Amendment Conference at which no State Party casts a negative vote. Such amendments would enter into force 30 days after ratification by all States Parties that cast a positive vote at the Amendment Conference.

The Treaty is of unlimited duration, but contains a "supreme interests" clause entitling any State Party that determines that its supreme interests have been jeopardized by extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the Treaty to withdraw from the Treaty upon 6-month's notice.

Unless a majority of the Parties decides otherwise, a Review Conference will be held 10 years following the Treaty's entry into force and may be held at 10-year intervals thereafter if the Conference of the States Parties so decides by a majority vote (or more frequently if the Conference of the States Parties so decides by a two-thirds vote).

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is of singular significance to the continuing efforts to stem nuclear proliferation and strengthen regional and global stability. Its conclusion marks the achievement of the highest priority item on the international arms control and nonproliferation agenda. Its effective implementation will provide a foundation on which further efforts to control and limit nuclear weapons can be soundly based. By responding to the call for a CTBT by the end of 1996, the Signatory States, and most importantly the nuclear weapon states, have demonstrated the bona fides of their commitment to meaningful arms control measures.

The monitoring challenges presented by the wide scope of the CTBT exceed those imposed by any previous nuclear test-related treaty. Our current capability to monitor nuclear explosions will undergo significant improvement over the next several years to meet these challenges. Even with these enhancements, though, several conceivable CTBT evasion scenarios have been identified. Nonetheless, our National Intelligence Means (NIM), together with the Treaty's verification regime and our diplomatic efforts, provide the United States with the means to make the CTBT effectively verifiable. By this, I mean that the United States:

- will have a wide range of resources (NIM, the totality of information available in public and private channels, and the mechanisms established by the Treaty) for addressing compliance concerns and imposing sanctions in cases of noncompliance; and
- will thereby have the means to: (a) assess whether the Treaty is deterring the conduct of nuclear explosions (in terms of yields and number of tests) that could damage U.S. security interests and constraining the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and (b) take prompt and effective counteraction.

My judgment that the CTBT is effectively verifiable also reflects the belief that U.S. nuclear deterrence would not be undermined by possible nuclear testing that the United States might fail to detect under the Treaty, bearing in mind that the United States will derive substantial confidence from other factors—the CTBT's "supreme national interests" clause, the annual certification procedure for the U.S. nuclear stockpile, and the U.S. Safeguards program.

I believe that the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is in the best interests of the United States. Its provisions will significantly further our nuclear nonproliferation and arms control objectives and strengthen international security. Therefore, I urge the Senate to give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and its advice and consent to ratification as soon as possible.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 22, 1997.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With Foreign Minister Yevgeniy Primakov of Russia and an Exchange With Reporters in New York City

September 22, 1997

The President. Let me briefly say that it's a pleasure for me to see Foreign Minister Primakov here and to renew our relationship and our dialog. You also know that the Vice President is now in Moscow for his regular meeting with Prime Minister Chernomyrdin. And we have a lot of work to do. But I am very encouraged at the progress in our relationships and in our partnership over the last year or so.

I had a great meeting with President Yeltsin in Helsinki. We were together again in Paris and, of course, in Denver. And among other things, Mr. Primakov and I will be discussing our partnership in Bosnia and our partnership for arms control today—places where we look forward to greater progress.

So I'm glad to see him, and I'm delighted to have this chance to visit.

Would you like to say anything?

Foreign Minister Primakov. Thank you very much for receiving me, Mr. President. It is a great honor for me and also a chance to discuss the issues that you have just mentioned. I've brought for you a message from President Yeltsin. This is the reply to your latest message to him. You will see that, for yourself, it mentions our very big interest in having our relations with the United States develop further on many tracks, not just our desire to do so but also our willingness.

Last night we had a very exciting, very productive talk with the Secretary of State. And already, based on that talk, I got a signal coming from Moscow—Madam was asking why I am not being authorized to do certain things. Well, most probably what is at issue is the protocol, because that's something that your Vice President already mentioned. [*Laughter*] This is to indicate the rapid way the United States operates, and we are far removed, as yet, from that. [*Laughter*]

The President. Thank you very much.

1996 Campaign Financing

Q. Mr. President, the Justice Department now says it apparently has memos that indicate you were urged to make another 40 fundraising calls. Sir, what do you recall of these memos, and were the calls made or were they not?

The President. Well, I've already said I don't know—I haven't read—I don't know what you're talking about on the memos because I haven't seen them, so I can't comment on that. I've already answered about the calls.

Let me just say this. I believe what the Vice President did and what I did was legal, and I am absolutely certain that we believed we were acting within the letter of the law. And I'm going to cooperate however I can to establish the facts, but I think that's important that you and the American people understand that, that I certainly—I believed then and I believe now what we did was legal. But I am absolutely positive that we intended to be firmly within the letter of the law when we were out there campaigning and raising funds as we should have been doing. We had to do that.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:45 p.m. in the U.S. Mission at the United Nations. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin and President Boris Yeltsin of Russia. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Luncheon Hosted by United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan in New York City

September 22, 1997

President Udovenko, members of the U.N. Secretariat, my fellow leaders. First let me thank the Secretary-General for his remarks. As some of you may know, after work today I will have the pleasure of attending the opening of the Metropolitan Opera. And I thought I would get into the spirit by singing the praises of our host today. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Secretary-General, it would be hard to find someone more appropriate to lead this great organization at this time. Your work and your life have taken you from your native Ghana to Egypt, Ethiopia, Switzerland, and to Minnesota where you first learned about America. For over three decades, you have given every waking hour to the United Nations. Better than anyone, you know how this organization works, from its highest office down to the grassroots.

Most importantly, you have earned your reputation as a peacemaker. From Africa to Iraq to Bosnia, your remarkable efforts to turn people from conflict to cooperation have saved thousands of lives.

You have seen revolution, war, and starvation, and you have always risen to fight the suffering they bring. You have witnessed the collapse of the old colonial empires, the end of the cold war, the beginning of this new era of great possibility. I hope future historians will look back and say this was a time when the high principles that led to the founding of the United Nations at last were realized—not simply by avoiding bloodshed and war but also by bringing freedom

and opportunity to men and women on every continent, from every background.

Today, through your strong leadership and quiet diplomacy, you are serving also as a different kind of peacemaker, bridging the gaps between the sometimes unruly members of the United Nations—a group that even on occasion, I must admit, includes the United States.

We have applauded your efforts to reform the United Nations, and we have particularly appreciated your efforts to explain those reforms to the American people. Deep down, our people care deeply about the U.N., and with you at the helm, we are moving ahead to a new era of partnership.

Finally, let me note that article one of the charter calls the United Nations a center for harmonizing. I would like to ask all of you to join me in a toast to Kofi Annan, Secretary-General of the United Nations. May we always act in concert to achieve the harmony the founders dreamed of, the harmony he has worked so hard to realize.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2 p.m. in the North Delegates Lounge at the United Nations.

Message on the 50th Anniversary of the National Security Council
September 22, 1997

To Past and Present Members of the NSC Staff:

I congratulate you on the 50th anniversary of the National Security Council.

During the more than forty years of the Cold War, you guided our country's leaders through the brinksmanship of East-West confrontation. In the almost ten years since communism's collapse, the NSC Staff has helped identify the possibilities and protect against the perils of our new era.

Indeed, at a time when the world's increasing interdependence challenges us all to new patterns of thought and action, the NSC's role is more important than ever. Your sound judgment, advice, and dedication are a key part of our ability to seize the opportunities of the 21st century. Because of your work, our lives are safer, our economy stronger, and our country more secure. On behalf of a grateful nation, congratulations and thank you.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this message.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Iraq's Compliance With United Nations Security Council Resolutions
September 23, 1997

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

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1) and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). This report covers the period from July 9 to the present.

Saddam Hussein remains a threat to his people and the region, and the United States remains determined to contain the threat posed by his regime. Secretary of State Albright stated on March 26 that the United States looks forward to the day when Iraq rejoins the family of nations as a responsible and law-abiding member but until then, containment must continue. Secretary Albright made clear that Saddam's departure would make a difference and that, should a change in Iraq's government occur, the United States would stand ready to enter rapidly into a dialogue with the successor regime.

In terms of military operations, the United States and its coalition partners continue to enforce the no-fly zones over northern Iraq under Operation Northern Watch and over southern Iraq through Operation Southern Watch. We have not detected any confirmed, intentional Iraqi violations of either no-fly zone during the period of this report. We have repeatedly made clear to the Government of Iraq and to all other relevant parties that the United States and its partners will continue to enforce both no-fly zones, and that we reserve the right to respond appropriately and decisively to any Iraqi provocations.

In addition to our air operations, we will continue to maintain a strong U.S. presence in the region in order to deter Iraq. United States force levels include land- and carrier-based aircraft, surface warships, a Marine amphibious task force, a Patriot missile battalion, and a mechanized battalion task force deployed in support of USCINCCENT operations. To enhance force protection throughout the region, additional military security personnel have been deployed for continuous rotation. USCINCCENT continues to monitor closely the security situation in the region to ensure adequate force protection is provided for all deployed forces.

United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 949, adopted in October 1994, demands that Iraq not use its military or any other forces to threaten its neighbors or U.N. operations in Iraq and that it not redeploy troops or enhance its military capacity in southern Iraq. In view of Saddam's accumulating record of unreliability, it is prudent to retain a significant U.S. force presence in the region in order to maintain the capability to respond rapidly to possible Iraqi aggression or threats against its neighbors.

Since my last report, the Government of Iraq has continued to flout its obligations under UNSC resolutions. During the last 60 days, the Government of Iraq has continued to fail to fully disclose its programs for weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Without such full disclosure—mandated by Security Council Resolutions 687, 707, and 715—the U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) cannot effectively conduct the ongoing monitoring and verification mandated by relevant UNSC resolutions. UNSCOM and the IAEA continue to provide Iraq every opportunity for full disclosure. What Iraq will not disclose, UNSCOM and IAEA will try to discover, in an effort to fill in the huge gaps in Iraq's declarations.

Iraqi threats, lying, and hiding during the past 6 years have not deterred UNSCOM and IAEA dedication to their mandates. While some nations have begun to display sanctions-fatigue, the United States remains committed to sanctions enforcement. We shall continue to oppose any suggestion that the sanctions regime should be modified or lifted before Iraq demonstrates its peaceful intentions by complying with its obligations under UNSC resolutions.

We anticipate the UNSCOM and IAEA 6-month reports to the Security Council, due October 11, which will record their conclusions regarding whether the Government of Iraq has provided the "substantial compliance" called for in UNSCR 1115 of June 21, 1997—especially regarding immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to facilities for inspection and to officials for interviews.

The United States is committed to providing first-class professional support to UNSCOM and the IAEA in the conduct of their highly technical work in Iraq, so that both organizations are staffed and equipped to conduct objective and accurate inspections in order to determine whether Iraq has, or has not, complied with its obligations in the field of WMD.

Implementation of UNSCR 1051 continues. It provides for a mechanism to monitor Iraq's effort to reacquire proscribed weapons capabilities by requiring that Iraq notify a joint unit of UNSCOM and the IAEA in advance of any imports of dual-use items. Similarly, U.N. members must provide timely notification of exports to Iraq of dual-use items.

Regarding northern Iraq, the United States continues to lead efforts to increase security and stability in the north and minimize opportunities for Baghdad or Tehran to threaten Iraqi citizens there. An important part of this effort has been to work toward resolving the differences between the two main Iraqi Kurd groups, the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP), led by Massoud Barzani, and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK), led by Jalal Talabani. Talabani visited the United States in late July to meet with National Security Advisor Sandy Berger, Under Secretary of State Thomas Pickering, and U.N. Ambassador Bill Richardson. At these sessions, he reaffirmed his interest in the "Ankara process" of ongoing reconciliation talks jointly

sponsored by the United States, the United Kingdom, and Turkey. Recently, the KDP's Barzani has also accepted our invitation to Washington.

As part of the Ankara process, the United States provides political, financial, and logistical support to the neutral, indigenous Peace Monitoring Force (PMF), comprised of Iraqi Turkomans and Assyrians. The PMF has demarcated and monitors the cease-fire line established between the two Kurdish groups in October 1996. United States support takes the form of services and commodities provided in accordance with a drawdown that I directed on December 11, 1996, and funds for other nonlethal assistance provided in accordance with a separate determination made by former Secretary of State Christopher on November 10, 1996.

The PMF also helps the Iraqi Kurds move forward on other confidence-building measures, including joint committee meetings to address a range of civilian services and humanitarian issues affecting all residents of the north. Local representatives of the two Kurdish groups, the three co-sponsors of the Ankara process and the PMF continue to meet at least biweekly in Ankara to discuss, *inter alia,* other confidence-building measures.

The PMF began full deployment in mid-April 1997 and its size is expected to double later this year to more than 400. The PMF continues to investigate and resolve reported cease-fire violations. Its work has become more difficult as elements of the terrorist Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) have moved from the Turkish border toward the PUK–KDP cease-fire line. The KDP alleges that PKK elements have been operating across the cease-fire line to attack the KDP. The KDP also alleges that the PUK has joined in some of these attacks, a charge that the PUK denies. The United States, together with the United Kingdom and Turkey, continues to stress the importance of strict observance of the cease-fire.

Another important aspect of our commitment to the people of northern Iraq is in providing humanitarian relief for those in need. As part of this commitment, AID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance will direct an additional $4 million for relief projects to the region. These supplemental programs, announced July 31, will provide emergency health and nutritional support to 80,000 displaced women and children and improve water supplies and sanitation, particularly in the PUK-controlled province of Suleymaniyah.

The oil-for-food arrangement under UNSCR 986 was reauthorized by UNSCR 1111 on June 4, 1997, and went into effect on June 8, 1997. Under UNSCR 1111, Iraq is authorized to sell up to $1 billion worth of oil every 90 days, for a total of $2 billion during a 180-day period (with the possibility of UNSC renewal for subsequent 180-day periods). Resolution 1111, like its predecessor, requires that the proceeds of this limited oil sale, all of which must be deposited in a U.N. escrow account, will be used to purchase food, medicine, and other material and supplies for essential civilian needs for all Iraqi citizens and to fund vital U.N. activities regarding Iraq. Critical to the success of UNSCR 1111 is Iraq's willingness to follow through on its commitments under the resolution to allow the U.N. to monitor the distribution of humanitarian goods to the Iraqi people. Although UNSCR 1111 went into effect on June 8, Iraq unilaterally suspended oil sales until a new distribution plan was submitted and approved. The U.N. Secretary General approved a distribution plan on August 13 and oil sales have resumed.

Iraq continues to stall and obfuscate rather than work in good faith toward accounting for the hundreds of Kuwaitis and third-country nationals who disappeared at the hands of Iraqi authorities during the occupation. It has also failed to return all of the stolen Kuwaiti military equipment and the priceless Kuwaiti cultural and historical artifacts that were looted during the occupation.

The human rights situation throughout Iraq remains unchanged. Iraq's repression of its Shi'a population continues, with policies that are destroying the Marsh Arabs' way of life in southern Iraq and the ecology of the southern marshes. The U.N., in its most recent reports on implementation of UNSCR 986, recognized that the Government of Iraq continues forcibly to deport Iraqi citizens from Kirkuk and other areas of northern Iraq still under the Iraqi government's control. The Government of Iraq shows no signs of complying with UNSCR 688, which demands that Iraq cease the repression of its own people. The effort by various Iraqi opposition groups and non-governmental organizations to document Iraqi war crimes and other violations of international humanitarian law, known as INDICT, continues.

The Multinational Interception Force (MIF) continues its important mission in the Arabian Gulf. The United States Navy provides the bulk of the forces involved in the maritime sanctions enforcement authorized under UNSCR 665, although we receive much-needed help from a number of close allies. In recent months, ships from The Netherlands, Canada, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom have participated in MIF operations. We continue active pursuit of broad-based international participation in these operations.

Illegal smuggling of Iraqi gasoil from the Shatt Al Arab waterway continues to increase at an alarming rate. We now estimate that over 150,000 metric tons of gasoil each month is exported from Iraq in violation of UNSCR 661. The smugglers use the territorial waters of Iran with the complicity of the Iranian government that profits from charging protection fees for these vessels to avoid interception by the MIF in international waters. Cash raised from these illegal operations is used to purchase contraband goods that are then smuggled back into Iraq by the same route. We continue to brief the U.N. Sanctions Committee regarding these operations and have pressed the Committee to compel Iran to give a full accounting of its involvement. We have also worked closely with our MIF partners and Gulf Cooperation Council states to take measures to curb sanctions-breaking operations. A recent spill of illegal Iraqi gasoil caused the desalinization plant in Sharjah, United Arab Emirates (UAE), to suspend operation for 2 days, highlighting the environmental threat these activities pose to Gulf states. Recent announcements by the Government of the UAE that it intends to crack down on smugglers who operate UAE-flagged vessels has been backed up by strong actions against violators detained by the MIF.

The United Nations Compensation Commission (UNCC), established pursuant to UNSCR 687, continues to resolve claims against Iraq arising from Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. The UNCC has issued almost 1.1 million awards worth approximately $5.9 billion. Thirty percent of the proceeds from the oil sales permitted by UNSCR 986 have been allocated to the Compensation Fund to pay awards and to finance operations of the UNCC, and these proceeds will continue to be allocated to the Fund under UNSCR 1111. To the extent that money is available in the Compensation Fund, initial payments to each claimant are authorized for awards in the order in which the UNCC has approved them, in installments of $2,500.00.

Iraq remains a serious threat to regional peace and stability. I remain determined to see Iraq comply fully with all of its obligations under U.N. Security Council resolutions. My Administration will continue to oppose any relaxation of sanctions until Iraq demonstrates its peaceful intentions through such compliance.

I appreciate the support of the Congress for our efforts and shall continue to keep the Congress informed about this important issue.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Message to the Senate Transmitting a Protocol to the Canada-United States Taxation Convention

September 23, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for Senate advice and consent to ratification the Protocol Amending the Convention Between the United States of America and Canada with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital Signed at Washington on September 26, 1980 as Amended by the Protocols Signed on June 14, 1983, March 28, 1984 and March 17, 1995, signed at Ottawa on July 29, 1997. This Protocol modified the taxation of social security benefits and the taxation of gains from the sale of shares of foreign real-property holding companies.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

September 23, 1997.

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

September 23, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Extradition Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of India, signed at Washington on June 25, 1997.

In addition, I transmit, for the information of the Senate, a related exchange of letters signed the same date and the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty. As the report states, the Treaty will not require implementing legislation.

The provisions in this Treaty follow generally the form and content of extradition treaties recently concluded by the United States.

Upon entry into force, this Treaty would enhance cooperation between the law enforcement authorities of both countries, and thereby make a significant contribution to international law enforcement efforts. With respect to the United States and India, the Treaty would supersede the Treaty for the Mutual Extradition of Criminals between the United States of America and Great Britain, signed at London December 22, 1931, which was made applicable to India on March 9, 1942, and is currently applied by the United States and India.

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

September 23, 1997.

Remarks to the AFL–CIO Convention in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

September 24, 1997

Thank you very much. I am delighted to be here. Thank you for the warm welcome. Thank you for the fast introduction. [*Laughter*]

The last time I spoke at your convention it was 2 days before you elected John and Rich and Linda. And I must say, from the outside, it seems to me that they have done a remarkable job, and I know that you must be very, very proud of them.

I am delighted to be here with Secretary Herman and Deputy Secretary Kitty Higgins and Secretary Slater, a number of other members of the administration. I should mention one other, the successor at the White House to Alexis Herman, former Assistant Secretary of Labor for Wage and Hours Maria Echaveste. We're all glad to be here.

I also want to say right at the outset that I am very glad that you voted to support campaign finance reform. Now there will be a vote on the Senate floor, and that will be a time of testing. But I have made clear where I stand. All 45 of our Democratic Senators have made clear where they stand. You have now made clear where you stand. We will soon see where the Senate stands and then where the House stands. This is a good time to make our campaign finance laws better, and I thank you for your crucial role in it.

On a very personal word, I might say, I came in a few moments ago, and I was able to hear

Sandy Feldman and hear your tribute to our friend Al Shanker. And I cannot tell you how much I appreciate that. Under his leadership and Sandy's, the AFT has been a constant supporter of educational opportunity and educational excellence—a clear signal that working professionals can be organized for the objectives, the legitimate objectives of the union movement. And one of these objectives would be excellence on the job. And there is no more important place to have excellence on the job than in educating our children. So I'm very, very grateful for the AFT and for Sandy Feldman.

With your new leadership team and the new energy I feel, of the presidents who are here on this great stage and all of you in the audience, your members back home, it is clear that American labor once again has a clear voice, and you are making it heard. You made it heard loud and proud in the boardrooms of United Parcel Service. You made it heard in the halls of the Capitol, standing up to a barrage of antiworker legislation. You're making it heard in the strawberry and mushroom fields of California, in the fiery tones of Arturo Rodriguez, with noble echoes of Cesar Chavez. You're making it heard in nursing homes in Minnesota, giving new strength to women workers. And you're making it heard right here in Pittsburgh through the steelworkers' biggest organizing campaign in more than 60 years. This must be a proud time for the men and women of the AFL–CIO.

Our Nation can clearly see and hear that American labor is back. Thanks in no small part to your leadership in the workplace and your involvement in the political process, America is back, too.

Six years ago, when I announced my candidacy for President, I said that America had a vital mission for the 21st century: to keep the American dream alive for every person responsible enough to work for it; to keep America the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity; and to bring our people together, across all the lines that divide us, into one America. America's oldest, most incandescent ideals—opportunity for all, responsibility from all, a community of all—that is what has to illuminate our path as we stride forward to address the challenges of a new era.

I pledged then to take America in a new direction—toward the future, not the past; toward unity, not division; with America leading, not following; putting people and values, not power politics, first; reforming Government, not to do everything or do nothing but to give all our people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives; and beginning by building an economy that works for all, not the few.

We started with a new economic policy for the new economy, putting in place a bold new strategy to shrink the deficit and balance the budget, invest in our people, and lower unfair trade barriers to our goods and services. The philosophy was solid and simple: Remove the impediments that have restrained the American people and give them the tools and training to help them race ahead. By reducing the Nation's massive deficits, we could free our people of the deadweight that slowed their every step from the early 1980's. By investing in their education and health, we would enable them to run fast and strong over the long run. By reducing trade barriers, we would knock down the unfairly high hurdles that we have had to leap over for far too long, and build bridges to new democracies with growing economies to ensure our leadership for peace and freedom well into the next century.

The strategy has succeeded: nearly 13 million new jobs; America leading the world in auto production once again; unemployment below 5 percent; over a million new construction jobs, a half a million transportation jobs, a half a million new jobs for machine operators, auto jobs having the fastest increase since Lyndon Johnson's administration; the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history, with welfare reform that is tough on work, but pro-child and pro-family; dramatic drops in crime year after year, putting 100,000 more community police officers on the street and the Brady bill preventing 250,000 sales of handguns to people with criminal or mental health histories that indicates they should not have them. We know we have more to do, but together we have made progressive government work again.

Let's look at three crucial elements of our economic strategy, reducing the deficit, investing in our people, expanding exports. First, deficit reduction. Back in 1993, when I introduced our first deficit reduction plan, we both knew it was important to get our fiscal house in order, and we did it the right way. We did it while increasing investments in our people. And we did it without a single Republican vote, cutting

the huge deficit of $290 billion 87 percent before the new balanced budget law passed.

After a new majority took control of Congress in 1994, they tried to cut the deficit in the wrong way. They sent me a budget that made unjustifiably deep cuts in Medicare, that increased taxes on working Americans, that allowed corporations to raid their workers' pensions, that cut enforcement of worker safety laws, that slashed funding for education and training by $30 billion. With your support, I vetoed that budget and the veto was upheld.

Later, when they pushed a balanced budget with a harmful independent contractor provision, a misguided privatization scheme for Medicaid, and a shameful plan to deny workfare participants the minimum wage, you and I stood firm together. We stood firm together. And I thank you for your support for that opposition.

I believe this balanced budget that I signed honors our workers and our values and our future. And I will explain by going to the second element of our economic strategy, investing in our people. In the new economy, the most precious resources America has are the skills and securities of working Americans. Here, too, we are succeeding. After decades of working harder and longer for lower wages, millions of working Americans finally are getting a raise. And it's about time.

Since I took office, the yearly income of the typical family is up $1,600. Wages are rising again. In 1995 and 1996, over half the new jobs created in this economy paid above the average wage. With your strong support, we also increased the minimum wage and dramatically increased the earned-income tax credit. It is now worth about $1,000 a year to the typical family of four with an income of less than $30,000. And this summer, I signed into law a $500-per-child tax credit that will mean $1,000 in take-home pay for a typical family with two children. And I didn't sign the bill until we made it work for rookie police officers, teachers, and others of modest means the Republican majority would have left out of their budget and tax cut plans.

From 1945 until the mid-1970's, all of us grew together in America. Each group of our economy, from the lowest 20 percent to the highest, increased their incomes. But actually, in percentage terms, those in the bottom 40 percent grew slightly faster than those in the upper 40 percent. And that was as it should have been. We were sharing our prosperity and growing together.

Then, unfortunately, we began to grow apart, partly because of developments in the global economy, historic developments that could not be reversed and offer us great opportunity if we seize them, partly I believe, because of wrong-headed policies in the United States Government throughout the 1980's.

Fortunately, now it looks like our hard work and your hard work is paying off and America is starting to grow together again. I believe the general sense that this should be so is one of the reasons for the renewed success and receptivity of the efforts that you are making all over America.

But we cannot rest. We cannot rest until every single American has a fair chance to reap the rewards of the American economy. That is why, above all, investing in people means giving every American the best education in the world.

Our balanced budget includes the largest increase in aid to education since 1965, when President Johnson was in office, and the biggest increase to help people go on to college since the GI bill was passed 50 years ago. The budget has a billion dollars more for Head Start; more money to help our schools achieve excellence; the America Reads program to mobilize a million volunteers, organized by our national service program, AmeriCorps, which has already given 70,000 young people a chance to work and serve in their communities and earn the money for college. It contains money to help connect every classroom and library in this country to the Internet by the year 2000. It also contains a new HOPE scholarship to guarantee access to all Americans to at least 2 years of college; other tuition tax credits for all college and skills training; an IRA you can withdraw from, tax-free, to pay for your own education or your children's education; the biggest increase in Pell grants in two decades; a million, total, work-study slots now; and doubling aid for dislocated workers.

When you put all this together, we can really say for the first time in the history of this country, we have opened the doors of college education to every American who is willing to work for it. Money will not be an obstacle again.

There is still a lot to do. First of all, we have to pass every year for the next 5 years the funds necessary to make good on the budget agreement. Secondly, we have got to increase the quality of education in our public schools.

I have sought to provide more options to parents in public school through public school choice and allowing teachers to organize new charter schools within public school districts. But I also know we need national standards. Every other major economy in the world educates its children according to national academic standards. And I have called for national standards and voluntary national exams to begin with fourth grade reading and eighth grade math to see how our children are doing—voluntary exams developed not by politicians but by a non-political board, not by the Department of Education but financially supported by the Department of Education.

There are those who say no to this, no to standards, no to the idea that we ought to have accountability. Some of them, frankly, don't believe all our children can learn. Some of them see some dark plot to take over local schools. All I see is, reading is the same in Minnesota as it is in Maine, and mathematics is the same in Washington as it is in Florida. And our children had better know it if they expect to compete in the world of the 21st century.

There are also those in the Congress who say no to every effort we make to expand educational opportunity—those who failed to close the Department of Education but would still like to cut it down; those who still would reduce our commitment to scholarships and grants and shut down completely innovative initiatives, like America Reads, even though we know—we know—that 40 percent of our third graders still cannot read independently on their own. We know that, and we cannot afford to back up. We need to bear down.

So I need to ask your help again on education in the tough days ahead. With your help we can open up opportunity, build up education, and shake up the status quo crowd that fights every effort we make to lift up our children.

We are making progress in this country in education. The teachers of this country are doing a better job; the principals are doing a better job; parents are steadily getting more involved. We are learning how to come to grips with all the social problems that our kids bring to school. This year, on international exams, a representative sample of our children by race, by region, by income—for the first time the fourth graders scored above the global average in mathematics and science. So I know all children can learn, and I know we've got people who can do the job. We just have to support them and bear down and do more of the kinds of things that we know will work.

Al Shanker, for his whole adult life, advocated national standards and meaningful measures and then all the efforts necessary to give every kid in this country a chance to learn. And I am not going to back away from this if it takes me every last minute of the next 3 years and however many months and days I've got left. And you ought to be there, too, because there's nothing more important for the future of this country than giving our kids a decent education.

Investing in our people also means protecting the rights of workers, to demand their rights. Over the past 4 years, we've defeated callous attempts to repeal prevailing wage laws, to bring back company unions, to weaken occupational safety laws. We cracked down on sweatshops and fought to protect your pension funds and make pensions more portable. I have vetoed every piece of antilabor legislation that has crossed my desk, and I will continue to do so. [*Applause*] Thank you.

A lot of the people pushing these bills have missed the main point. The key to success in tomorrow's economy is people, and you cannot move into the 21st century by restoring the labor policies of the 19th century. I will oppose it, you will oppose it, and we will prevail.

In that context, let me just say one more word about the UPS strike. I and, indeed, my entire administration believe deeply in the collective bargaining process. In the UPS strike, collective bargaining worked. UPS and the Teamsters reached an historic settlement that recognizes that companies have to invest in their workers in order to be competitive in the 21st century. I did the right thing to let the process work. The parties got together, they worked through it, and we got a good result. [*Applause*] Thank you.

Investing in people also means expanding access to health care, quality health care. The family and medical leave law that you worked so hard for, the very first bill I signed as President, ensures that millions of people don't have to choose between being good parents and good workers. I still hear from citizens as I travel across the country and just stop at airports, or in crowds in communities and shake hands—people still come up to me and say, "That law changed my life, saved my family, has meant more to me than anything the Government has

done in my life." It is a good thing, and I thank you for your support of it.

The Kennedy-Kassebaum law helps millions to keep their health care if they take a new job or if someone in their family gets sick. The new balanced budget spends $24 billion to expand health care to 5 million of the most vulnerable Americans—5 million children, almost all in working families, without health insurance. That is the largest investment in health care since the creation of Medicaid in 1965. Never—never—would this have happened unless you had helped me wage the fight we waged and lost to give health insurance to every American family that doesn't have it. And sometimes you have to lose a battle. I'm glad we fought for it. I'm proud that you helped me. And those kids are going to get insurance because of the issues we raised in 1994.

Finally, I ask for your support to help me pass sweeping legislation to keep tobacco, our number one health problem, out of the hands of our children. The health of our children is my bottom line, and I believe it should be the bottom line of the tobacco industry as well.

The final component of our three-part economic strategy, one that is just as essential for the future growth and the future wage growth of our economy, is our continuing work to open new markets and give American workers a fair break. I know we don't see eye-to-eye on fast track, but I think I owe it to you to tell you exactly why I feel so passionately about it. And I think I've earned the right to be heard on it.

Fast-track authority is a tool that has been given by Democratic Congresses to Republican Presidents and Presidents, indeed, of both parties for more than 20 years now. It simply says that if the President or his representative, his trade representative, negotiates a trade agreement, then the Congress has to vote on it if it rises to the level of comprehensive agreement, but must vote it up or down, so that the other country does not believe it is having to negotiate with 535 people in addition to the person with whom they negotiated.

We cannot create enough good jobs and increase wages if we don't expand trade. There's a simple reason why. Indeed, about a third of the economic growth that has produced 13 million new jobs over the past 4½ years has come from selling more American products overseas. Here's why: We have 4 percent of the world's population and we enjoy 22 percent of the world's wealth. If we want to keep the 22 percent of the wealth we have as 4 percent of the world's people, we have to sell something to the other 96 percent.

And this did not happen by accident. There were over 220 trade agreements signed in the first 4 years of this administration. In the over 20 agreements signed with Japan, in those areas, our exports went up by over 80 percent.

The information technology agreement that we just signed, worldwide, covering 90 percent of information technology services in the world, under residual fast-track authority that covered that area, amounts to a $5 billion tax or tariff cut on American products—high value-added products, many of which are made by union workers.

Now, in the next 15 years, the developing countries in Latin America and Asia will grow three times as fast as the United States, Europe, and Japan. As I told the United Nations a couple of days ago, early in the next century, about 20 nations comprising half of the world's people will move from the ranks of low income nations to middle income nations. They are going to grow in a world economy. We are going to participate in that growth to a greater or lesser extent. The more fair trade deals we have to allow us entry into their markets, where we've been at a significant disadvantage for too long, the more we will participate.

You know that our own markets are among the most open in the world. We were able to get 220 trade agreements in the first 4 years because we made people know that if they wanted access to our open markets, they were going to have to open theirs. We have to insist upon this treatment. If we don't act and we don't lead, nobody else will level the playing field for us.

Indeed, our competitors in the other wealthy countries, in Europe and Japan, would just as soon we not make these trade agreements. They can make them because they read the same predictions we do; they know that their economies are only going to grow a third as fast as the ones in Latin America and Asia as well, and they are looking for some way in to protect their workers and their longtime economic security.

We can compete if given a fair chance. Last year, I had a chance to visit the Jeep Cherokee plant in Toledo, a UAW plant producing tens

of thousands of right-wheel-drive Jeeps for export to Japan and other markets we thought hard to open up for them. They have 700 new jobs at that plant, and I think it's the oldest auto plant in the United States of America still operating. The global economy is working for them. I am determined to see that it works for everyone.

Should we ask other people to adhere to global standards on the environment? Of course we should. I think you could make a strong case that no administration has done more to preserve and protect the environment against onslaughts than ours has. Should we acknowledge that global trade can pull the rug out from some of our people? Of course it could. At every period of economic change in our country's history, that has happened to people. The difference is that we have to be committed to give more aid, to do more for people who are suffering, who are displaced. Because nobody should be left behind in the global economy—nobody. That's why we double funding for displaced workers. That's why I know we have to do more. We don't have to leave people behind. Everybody should have the right to keep a good job and to go into tomorrow.

But we can only do that with a growing population if we continue to grow the economy. So the trick is to get the right economic growth package, to create the right mix of new jobs, to try to make sure always more than half of your new jobs are paying above average wage, and not leave people behind. It's not easy to do, but this administration is committed to doing it. And I think we have demonstrated that commitment time and again.

We also have to recognize that the global economy is on a fast track. It is changing amazingly. For example, every month—every month—millions and millions of new contacts are made on the Internet—every single month. It's exploding like nothing ever has, creating all kinds of networks of commerce and bringing people close together in new and unusual ways. We have to figure out how to make this work for us. If it doesn't work for us, it will work against us.

I believe leaving our trade relations on hold with the fastest growing economies in the world will not create a single job in America, and it certainly won't raise environmental standards or labor standards in other countries. This year—this year alone, so far, two-thirds of the increase in America's trade has come from Canada to the southern tip of South America, our neighbors—two-thirds. We could do better. This year, leaders from Europe have gone to South America to tell them that the United States no longer cares about their markets or the cooperation and leadership that goes along with working with them. They say that their future should be with Europe, and they should organize to give Europe considerations and breaks in opening their markets and leave us out.

Now, think about it. Think about Chile or Brazil or Argentina. Their markets are more closed to us than ours are to them. We still are selling more just because they're growing so much. But we know they'll grow a lot more over the next 10 to 20 years. They now need things that we sell and things that your people produce better than any other group of people in the world.

This is not about NAFTA or factories moving there to sell back to here. I think all of us agree it is highly unlikely anyone will move a factory to Chile to sell back to here. This is about how we can best seize our opportunities in the economy that is emerging and how 4 percent of the world's people can continue to maintain 20 to 22 percent of the world's wealth and continue to grow the economy so incomes can rise and new jobs can be created.

Now, I know this is a difficult debate, and I know we disagree about it. But the debate over fair trade and fast track should itself be fair. It should also be open and honest. I have personally sat alone in the White House and listened to talk shows where your representatives were on the shows, because I wanted to hear the arguments and hear the concerns and know the things that you want. And you know we have had exhaustive numbers of meetings between the administration and leaders of the labor movement. We ought to have an open, fair, and honest debate. We are trying to move as much as we can on a lot of the concerns that you have raised.

But I also want to say that I think we share too many values and priorities to let this disagreement damage our partnership. You just think of all of the things that I reeled off that we've done together and all of the things we've stood against in the last 5 years. I have worked to make this economy work for middle class Americans. I care about making sure everybody has a chance and making sure nobody is left

behind. But I can't build a better future without the tools to do the job, and America can't lead if it's bringing up the rear. At the moment of our greatest economic success in an entire generation, we shouldn't be reluctant about the future. We ought to seize it and shape it.

And I think I also have to say to you that there are a lot of good Members of Congress who agree with me about our trade policy who also stood for the minimum wage. They agree with me about our trade policy, but they fought to provide health care for 5 million more kids. They support open trade, but they also fought to protect Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment and to open the doors of college to all Americans. And when the majority in Congress wanted to do so, they stood against them and fought with you against the contract on America. They fought with you against attempts to repeal the prevailing wage laws, to weaken unions and workplace health and safety laws. They did so in the face of intense pressure. They have fought for you and for all working people, and they deserve our support. If they were to lose their positions because they stood up for what they believe was right for America's future, who would replace them and how much harder would it be to get the necessary votes in Congress to back the President when he stands by you against the majority?

America is far better off when the friends of working people stand together without letting one issue trump all the others. Friends and allies don't participate in the politics of abandonment. They band together, disagreeing when they must but banding together.

I pledge to do that and hope you will, too. We've got a lot to do in education, in making sure Medicare and Social Security are there for the next generation of parents, in bridging the divide of race and all of the differences that are now taking place in this country. That's an area where you've always been out front, and I want to close with that, because you can help, perhaps more than almost any other group in America, to bridge the divides and to preserve the bonds of community.

When I leave you, I'm going home to Arkansas, and tomorrow I will try to focus our Nation on a haunting but hopeful moment in our country's struggle to make America the Nation live up to America the idea—a day, 40 years ago, when nine brave African-American boys and girls, shielded from a hateful crowd by United States Army paratroopers, walked through the doors of Little Rock Central High School for the first time. I will honor the courage and vision of those whose eyes were fixed on the prize of equal educational opportunity without regard to race.

There are still a lot of doors we have to open. There are still some doors we have to open wider. And now, unfortunately, there are some doors we've got to work hard from being shut again. There is also a new reality we're all going to have to come to grips with that very few Americans have thought about. It will change the workplace. It will change communities. It will change the way we do our business as citizens. That reality is that we are not simply a black/white nation; we are not simply a black/Hispanic/Native-American/white nation. Instead, we are a nation now of nearly all the peoples of the world, with greater diversity in how we work and live together and greater integration in how we work and live together than virtually any other democracy on Earth. And within the ranks of Caucasians and blacks and Latinos and Asians, there is increasing ethnic and cultural diversity.

As we become the most diverse democracy on Earth—and make no mistake about it, we are becoming that. Today, only Hawaii has no majority race. Within a decade, probably within 4 or 5 years, California, our largest State with 13 percent of our population, will have no majority race. And sometime before the next century is half done, America will have no majority race. Are we going to embrace this? Are we going to say that we celebrate our diversity, but we're united by something more important? Or are we going to let it get away from us and drift off into little enclaves and weaken our country and our future and our children's future? You're in a unique position to help.

Labor has a tradition here, established by visionaries like A. Philip Randolph and Walter Reuther. Labor has helped generations of African-Americans and new immigrants to gain dignity and respect. Your members reached across racial and ethnic lines to fight for a common future and personal dignity. Few institutions in America can claim anything like the record of the labor movement in fighting for equal opportunity.

It was for that reason and for her own merit that I appointed your executive vice president,

Linda Chavez-Thompson, a member of my race advisory commission. She has seen discrimination firsthand. She knows discrimination is not a thing of the past, but she is determined to see that it has no place in our future. I am grateful for her help, and I ask you for yours.

A century ago, the working men and women of labor imagined an America where older people had health security, where African-Americans enjoyed equal protection under the law, where working people had the right to organize and fight for a better life. Because they imagined it and because they worked for it, it's the America we're living in today.

Now it is up to us to imagine the America of the 21st century. And on every issue I discussed today, that is all I ask you to do. Imagine it, based on what we now know. Imagine an America in which every child has a world-class education, in which every family can fairly balance the demands of work and childrearing, in which we lift living standards here and around the world, in which we learn to grow our economy and preserve the common environment which is our home, in which our oldest values of opportunity, responsibility and community guide us into a new time of greatest opportunity.

As American working men and women have shown time and time again, if we imagine it and we work at it, we will build it, an America for our children, always eager for tomorrow. You have brought new energy to the labor movement. You have brought new energy to America. Let us work to build that into a future we can be proud of.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:25 a.m. in the Convention Hall at the David Lawrence Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to John J. Sweeney, president, Richard Trumka, secretary general, and Linda Chavez-Thompson, vice president, AFL-CIO; Sandra Feldman, president, American Federation of Teachers; and Arturo Rodriguez, president, United Farm Workers of America.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Luncheon in Pittsburgh
September 24, 1997

That was an interesting introduction. [*Laughter*] You know, I have to begin by saying, when my friend of more than 30 years now, David Matter, made that reference to Henry Kissinger's joke about it's the 90 percent of the politicians that give the other 10 percent a bad name, I think it's only fair to tell you that he succeeded me as the president of our class at Georgetown. [*Laughter*] He was in the 90 percent. [*Laughter*] I never said anything like that until this event was already put together and organized and successful.

Thank you, David. I want to thank Phil and Diann. I want to thank my good friend John Connelly; it's wonderful to see him up and about, so trim, young looking. [*Laughter*] Audrey; and Mr. Mayor, thank you; and thank you, Mike, for what you said. And Commissioner Cranmer, we're glad to have you here.

I was hoping there would be at least one Republican here because when I came in here, I said, "This is a pretty nice club. It makes me feel almost like a Republican." [*Laughter*] And one of the people at the table said, "If we had held this dinner a few years ago, you would have had to be one to get in." [*Laughter*] So it's nice to see that even that barrier of discrimination is being broken down. [*Laughter*]

I'd like to thank all the other folks who are here: Judge Del Sol; former State Treasurer Catherine Baker Knoll; former Lieutenant Governor, Chairman Singel; your former mayor, Sophie Masloff—we had a lot of fun together in Pittsburgh. Mayor, I have fun with you, too, but it's not quite the same, you know. [*Laughter*] And Senator Mellow, Senator Bodak, and all of you, thank you for coming.

I love coming here. I like western Pennsylvania; I love Pittsburgh. It's one of those towns where I can walk up to anybody on the street and ask them what the score was in last night's Pirates game, and they'll all know. It's a place where people are proud of their roots, proud of their ties, proud of their community.

I'm delighted that you have some ties to Arkansas—my good friend Lazar Palnick there—

even though I'm a Southern Baptist, I used to refer to his father as my rabbi. And I've always felt a certain affinity for this community and an affinity for western Pennsylvania. And you've been wonderful to me now through two elections for President. And this is really the first opportunity I've had since the '96 election just to say simply, thank you. And to all the people of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, thank you for being so supportive of what we have tried to do together.

This is a proud time for America. The economy is in the best shape it's been in in a generation. We're working hard to make the world a more peaceful, more prosperous place. And we're proving once again that we can constructively deal with our problems.

It's the sort of time that I dreamed about in 1991 when I declared for President. And the country seemed drifting; it seemed divided to me; it seemed—it was clearly in difficult economic shape. And the thing that bothered me most— you know, we'll always have bad times as well as good times. No course of life ever runs smooth; it's part of human nature and the inherent rhythm of events. But what bothered me in '91 was, it seemed to me that we had no strategy, no clear vision that a strategy could be developed to support. And when I think of how fast the world is changing, how fast—the way we work, the way we live, the way we relate to each other and people indeed all across our Nation and all across the world, I still have the same simple vision I had when I declared for President.

When I leave office in the 21st century, I want this to be a country where everybody who is responsible enough to work for it has an opportunity to live out his or her dreams. I want this to be a country that is celebrating its diversity but coming together as one America, not being divided as so many other places in the world are divided today, by race or religion or culture. And I want us still to be the world's leading force for peace and freedom and prosperity, not meddling around the world and trying to solve all the problems but being a beacon of hope, an example and, yes, being involved where we can make a difference. That's what I want for America.

And I've worked hard for that for the last 5 years. None of it would have been possible if it hadn't been for people like you all across this country. But every one of you know that this area of Pennsylvania has been especially good to me and to the Vice President and to our efforts.

Now, in order to achieve that, it seemed to me we needed to say, "Well, what kind of policies would you develop to achieve that? What would they be like?" And I'll tell you what we talked about back in '91, before I ever announced for President. I think it's a mistake to run for President before you have a general idea about what you're going to do if you get there. It's kind of—the Presidential election is this vast job interview. It's pretty scary; 100 million people can want to hire you, and you can still get fired. It's pretty disorienting. [*Laughter*]

But it seemed to me we needed policies that focused on the future, not the past; on unity, not division; on the interest of people and our basic values in this country, not power politics; that focused on America leading, not America following; that focused on the need for a certain kind of Government, not a Government to do everything and certainly not a Government to do nothing but a Government whose primary mission would be to give people the tools to make the most of their own lives; and finally, that we had to begin with a new economic strategy that would make the economy work for everybody, not just for a few people.

And we began with the economic strategy. I used to say it's a stool with three legs: We have to reduce the deficit until we balance the budget; we still have to find the money to invest in people and in technology and in research, the things that will build our future; and we have to expand American trade in our products and services, because we only have 4 percent of the world's population, but we enjoy a high standard of living because we produce 22 percent of the world's wealth. And in a world becoming increasingly competitive, increasingly open, increasingly interconnected, you cannot expect to maintain 20 percent of the wealth with 4 percent of the people unless you go where the business is.

So that's what we've tried to do, hard, for 5 years. And the results have been what you know they are: unemployment under 5 percent, 13 million new jobs, over a million new construction jobs—a lot of you helped to create them in this room—half a million new machine tool operators, half a million new people working in transportation. The last 2 years, over half

the new jobs paid above average wages, something that was not the case for new jobs for many years in the 1980's.

The average income is beginning to rise, and that gap which had been widening for 20 years seems like it may be coming back together now between the middle class, lower income working people, and upper income people. From World War II to the mid-1970's, we all grew together. And then as the economy began to change and we didn't develop an effective response to it, we began to grow apart, so that those of us that were in a very good position to take advantage of the emerging world economy did just fine, and those of us that weren't got hurt. And now we're beginning to turn that around, partly because of the second part of the strategy, investing in people. If people are the most important part of the new economy, it follows by definition, their health, their education, and their ability to raise strong families are the most important parts of our strategy there.

So we've worked hard to do what we could to stabilize the health care situation for Americans, to help do things that would lower the rate of inflation without eroding the quality of care, pass the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill which says you can't lose your health insurance if you change jobs or somebody in your family gets sick.

We had a dramatic increase in research and support for diabetes in this last budget, which the American Diabetes Association said was the most important thing since the discovery of insulin in 1927. We've worked hard on breast cancer, prostate cancer, a lot of the other major health problems this country faces. We've worked hard to do something to put a stop to the marketing and sales of cigarettes to teenagers, still our number one public health problem.

In this last budget, $24 billion was allocated to provide health insurance to 5 million children, half the children who don't have health insurance in this country. Almost all of them, by the way, are in working families whose place of work does not provide them health insurance.

In education, we now have had from 1993 to the present an enormous increase in Federal support for education. This last balanced budget had the biggest increase in Federal support for education since Lyndon Johnson was the President of the United States in 1965, and the biggest increase in helping people to go to college since the GI bill was passed 50 years ago. And it's going to change the future of America.

Now, with the things that were in this last budget, we will have a million work-study positions for people who go to college; the biggest increase in Pell grants in 20 years; an IRA where people can save in an IRA and then withdraw from it without penalty if they use it for their education or their children's education; a tax credit of up to $1,500 a year for the first 2 years of college; a HOPE scholarship to open the doors of 2 years of college to everybody; and continued tax credits for any kind of education, undergraduate or graduate, or job training after high school.

We can now say for the first time in the history of the country—when all these tax credits kick in next year, we'll be able to say for the first time that any American who's willing to work for it can have a college education. That's never been true before. And that's something all of you can be proud of, because if it hadn't been for you and people like you, we in Washington would never have been in a position to do it. It was the central pledge I made to the American people in the 1996 campaign.

So we're moving along. Crime has dropped every year the last 5 years. Part of the reason is we're supporting local strategies that work—more community police in the street. The Brady bill has kept 250,000 people with criminal or mental health histories who shouldn't have handguns from buying them. And there was a study released just last week which said that illicit gun dealers have had terrible difficulty operating in places where it's vigorously enforced. This is a safer country than it was 5 years ago.

We have the lowest percentage of our population on welfare than we've had since 1970, in spite of 20 years of the most active immigration in our country's history. Why? Because we pursued a welfare reform policy that was tough on work, but pro-family and pro-child.

So you can be proud of where we are because all of you had a role in it. But it only sort of indicates where we have to go. Now, as I look to the future both this year and the years beyond, we've still got to do things to keep this economy growing. That's why I want this fast-track trade authority that I went to the AFL–CIO to talk about today. And we differ about it.

But we're not going to save any jobs by leaving our trade relations as is with countries a long way from here, when our markets are more open than theirs. But if they open their markets to us, we can sell more. Seventy percent of the growth in America's overseas trade this last year came from Canada to the tip of South America and our own backyard. And the further you go away from here, the less likely it is that any of you or anybody else would want to shut a plant down in America and move it down there to sell products back here. Labor is becoming an increasingly smaller part of manufacturing costs anyway. This is about selling America's goods and services, and it's also about partnerships with new democracies, to keep us the world's leading force for peace and freedom.

We've got an education fight going that's a real doozie in Washington now over whether the Congress will prohibit me and the Secretary of Education from spending any tax money to have a nonpolitical board, established by Congress years ago, with Republicans and Democrats on it and educators on it, develop a national examination for reading for fourth graders and math for eighth graders, to be given voluntarily and with no mandated consequences to every fourth and eighth grader in the country in 1999. Why? We are the only advanced economy in the world that does not have a national set of academic standards, a definition for academic excellence, even a definition for academic adequacy.

This has nothing to do with local control of the schools. Reading and math are the same in Michigan and Montana and south Florida and San Diego and northeastern Maine and northwestern Washington. It's about whether we believe our kids can learn and whether we're going to expect them to. I can tell you this: All the evidence is they can. Our schools are getting better. This last year, for the first time ever, America's fourth graders scored above the international average in math and science. And we had a few thousand kids take it, but they were representative by race, by region, and by income.

So our kids can learn what they need to know to do well, but we've got to measure it to see whether they do or not. Any of you running any enterprise here, if I suggested that you stop measuring it tomorrow, you would be without profits before long. If you didn't keep up with your performance, if you didn't define success in some way, if you had no way to know whether you were up or down, truly, measured against the competition which is global in nature, you would have difficulty. That's all I want to do.

We're going to try to deal with some of the most difficult issues in the world over the next several months in trying to reconcile our need to grow the economy and the environmental problems that are developing around the globe and the requests that have been made of all of us, Europe, Japan, all the advanced economies, to try to do something about greenhouse gas emissions. Can we do it without hurting economic growth? Of course we can, if we do it right. It's going to be something that all of you will have to be concerned about and involved in.

We have to reform the entitlements for the baby boom generation so the next generation will have Social Security and Medicare. It is wrong for us not to make modest changes now that will save Social Security and Medicare over the long run. We've already made some modest changes in Medicare that I believe will add more than a decade to the life of the Trust Fund. But you can't expect all these young people to support those of us who are in the baby boom generation, when there will be barely two people working for every one person retired, without making some changes. We cannot raise the payroll tax any more on ordinary people or small businesses. There are ways—modest changes that can be made over the next 2 to 3 to 4 years, very modest changes which will avoid that, and we have to deal with that.

Just one or two other things I wanted to mention. We are finally, it looks like, going to get a vote in the Senate for the first time in 5 years on campaign finance reform, and I think that's a good thing. But I want everyone to understand, who is here at this dinner today, the real problem with campaigns is how much they cost. The amount of money raised is a direct relationship with the perceived requirements of how much they cost. So if you want to have campaign finance reform, particularly if this country is not prepared to go to taxpayer-financed elections, like many nations do across the board, except we just do it for Presidents now, then we must do one thing: You must give people access to mass communications for free or reduced rates if they adhere to the standards of the campaign finance laws. That must be done. And we're looking into that.

But the Senate has got a good bill before it. They're going to debate it. They're going to vote on it, and that's a good thing. And I'm proud that it was precipitated at least in part by the unanimous vote of the members of my caucus in the Senate—our party's caucus—to support the McCain-Feingold bill.

Finally, let me say this. If you look to the future and you ask, what is the issue most likely to define America in the 21st century—of all the many issues we can deal with, what is the issue most likely to define us? Well, what has defined us for 200 years? People think this is a place uniquely devoted to freedom and opportunity, where every person gets his chance at the brass ring.

They know that we've been imperfect. I'm leaving you to go home to Little Rock to observe the 40th anniversary of the Little Rock Central High School crisis, a glaring, timeless example of the imperfection of America the nation not living up to America the idea. But we also know that from the beginning, when we started out with a Constitution that said African-Americans equal six-tenths of a person, we have come a long way. We have steadily pushed back the barriers that bore down on people, people of color, on women, all the groups of people that have ever been discriminated against. We are steadily pushing back those barriers.

But if you really think about what's likely to define us, you imagine what's the world going to be like. It's going to be a high-tech world dominated by information technology where distances will be shortened, millions—that's no exaggeration; I talked to the people who set it up last week—millions of new contacts are happening on the Internet every month, probably every week. They can't be measured. Literally it's growing by millions and millions and millions a month and probably a week. That is the world we're going to live in. Now, if we in the United States have the most multiethnic, multiracial functioning democracy, where we don't just live in the same country but in little different places, and then we vote on election day, and that's all we have in common, but we actually live and work together and learn together and grow together, then we will be the most well-positioned country in the world for the 21st century.

It is, therefore, in our self-interest to rid ourselves of the last vestiges of the poison which seen in its darkest form can destroy a place like Bosnia; can bedevil the home of many of us in this room, including Mayor Murphy, in Ireland—we think we're making some progress there; can keep the Middle East in constant turmoil—and they've got all kinds of social problems in a lot of those countries there. If they were all working together, they could turn the whole region around in a matter of a decade. And on and on and on—you know the stories.

If we are the polar opposite of that, in a world where we have the world's finest system of higher education, where we're on the cutting edge of technology, where we're committed to all the things we've been talking about today, and we're all getting along together, this country is going to do very well, and the next 50 years will be the best 50 years in American history.

Now, I was raised to believe that's what we owe our children. And I was raised to believe that none of us—it is not given to any of us to solve all the problems or to transform human nature; it is our responsibility to leave the world better than we found it. It is our responsibility, in the great stream of human existence, to make our contribution to the right direction. That's what we've got a chance to do. And we owe it to our children.

And from the day I started running for this job, all I ever wanted to do was to make sure that, when it was all said and done, people like you, who share the same values and ideas I did, could actually say together, we gave opportunity to everybody responsible enough to work for it; we are coming together as one country, not being divided; and we are the strongest force in the world for peace and freedom. I still think we're moving in that direction, and we have another 3 years. And I'm going to give you every day I can to make sure we get there.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:39 p.m. in the Walnut Room at the Duquesne Club. In his remarks, he referred to David Matter and Phil and Diann Stout, State Democratic Party trustees; John Connelly, president, J. Edward Connelly Associates; Mayor Tom Murphy of Pittsburgh; Mike Dawida and Bob Cranmer, Allegheny County commissioners; Audrey Dawida, wife of Commissioner Dawida; Judge Joseph A. Del Sol, Democratic candidate for Pennsylvania State Supreme Court; Mark Singel, chairman, Pennsylvania Democratic Party; State Senators Robert J. Mellow and Leonard Bodak; and Pittsburgh attorney Lazar M. Palnick, originally from Arkansas.

Message to the Congress on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to UNITA

September 24, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA") is to continue in effect beyond September 26, 1997, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on September 26, 1993, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions and policies of UNITA pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. United Nations Security Council Resolution 864 (1993) continues to oblige all Member States to maintain sanctions. Discontinuation of the sanctions would have a prejudicial effect on the Angolan peace process. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure to UNITA to reduce its ability to pursue its aggressive policies of territorial acquisition.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 24, 1997.

NOTE: The notice is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Ireland-United States Taxation Convention With Documentation

September 24, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith for Senate advice and consent to ratification the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Ireland for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital Gains, signed at Dublin on July 28, 1997, (the "Convention") together with a Protocol and an exchange of notes done on the same date. Also transmitted is the report of the Department of State concerning the Convention.

This Convention, which is similar to tax treaties between the United States and other OECD nations, provides maximum rates of tax to be applied to various types of income and protection from double taxation of income. The Convention also provides for resolution of disputes and sets forth rules making its benefits unavailable to residents that are engaged in treaty shopping.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to this Convention, with its Protocol and exchange of notes, and that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 24, 1997.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Angola (UNITA)

September 24, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of April 4, 1997, concerning the national emergency with respect to Angola that was declared in Executive Order 12865 of September 26, 1993. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On September 26, 1993, I declared a national emergency with respect to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA"), invoking the authority, *inter alia,* of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c). Consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 864, dated September 15, 1993, the order prohibited the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related material of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. The order also prohibited such sale or supply to UNITA. United States persons are prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies, or from attempted violations, or from evasion or avoidance or transactions that have the purpose of evasion or avoidance of the stated prohibitions. The order authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

1. On December 10, 1993, the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) issued the UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations") (58 *Fed. Reg.* 64904) to implement my declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against UNITA. The Regulations prohibit the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to UNITA or to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. United States persons are also prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies to UNITA or Angola, or from any transaction by any United States persons that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in the Executive order. Also prohibited are transactions by United States persons, or involving the use of U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, relating to transportation to Angola or UNITA of goods the exportation of which is prohibited.

The Government of Angola has designated the following points of entry as points in Angola to which the articles otherwise prohibited by the Regulations may be shipped: *Airports*: Luanda and Katumbela, Benguela Province; *Ports*: Luanda and Lobito, Benuela Province; and Namibe, Namibe Province; and *Entry Points*: Malongo, Cabinda Province. Although no specific license is required by the Department of the Treasury for shipments to these designated points of entry (unless the item is destined for UNITA), any such exports remain subject to the licensing requirements of the Departments of State and/or Commerce.

There has been one amendment to the Regulations since my report of April 3, 1997. the UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR Part 590, were amended on August 25, 1997. General reporting, recordkeeping, licensing, and other procedural regulations were moved from the Regulations to a separate part (31 CFR Part 501) dealing solely with such procedural matters. (62 *Fed. Reg.* 45098, August 25, 1997). A copy of the amendment is attached.

2. The OFAC has worked closely with the U.S. financial community to assure a heightened awareness of the sanctions against UNITA—through the dissemination of publications, seminars, and notices to electronic bulletin boards. This educational effort has resulted in frequent

calls from banks to assure that they are not routing funds in violation of these prohibitions. United States exporters have also been notified of the sanctions through a variety of media, including via the Internet, Fax-on-Demand, special fliers, and computer bulletin board information initiated by OFAC and posted through the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. Government Printing Office. There have been no license applications under the program since my last report.

3. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from March 26, 1997, through September 25, 1997, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to UNITA are approximately $50,000, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel) and the Department of State (particularly the Office of Southern African Affairs).

I will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 24, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 25.

Remarks on the 40th Anniversary of the Desegregation of Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas

September 25, 1997

The President. Governor and Mrs. Huckabee; Mayor and Mrs. Dailey; my good friend Daisy Bates; and the families of Wiley Branton and Justice Thurgood Marshall. To the cochairs of this event, Mr. Howard, and all the faculty and staff here at Central High; to Fatima and her fellow students; to all my fellow Americans: Hillary and I are glad to be home, especially on this day. And we thank you for your welcome.

I would also be remiss if I did not say one other word, just as a citizen. You know, we just sent our daughter off to college, and for 8½ years she got a very good education in the Little Rock school district. And I want to thank you all for that.

On this beautiful, sunshiny day, so many wonderful words have already been spoken with so much conviction, I am reluctant to add to them. But I must ask you to remember once more and to ask yourselves, what does what happened here 40 years ago mean today? What does it tell us, most importantly, about our children's tomorrows?

Forty years ago, a single image first seared the heart and stirred the conscience of our Nation, so powerful most of us who saw it then recall it still: a 15-year-old girl wearing a crisp black and white dress, carrying only a notebook, surrounded by large crowds of boys and girls, men and women, soldiers and police officers, her head held high, her eyes fixed straight ahead. And she is utterly alone.

On September 4th, 1957, Elizabeth Eckford walked to this door for her first day of school, utterly alone. She was turned away by people who were afraid of change, instructed by ignorance, hating what they simply could not understand. And America saw her, haunted and taunted for the simple color of her skin, and in the image we caught a very disturbing glimpse of ourselves. We saw not "one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," but two Americas, divided and unequal.

What happened here changed the course of our country here forever. Like Independence Hall, where we first embraced the idea that God created us all equal; like Gettysburg, where Americans fought and died over whether we would remain one Nation, moving closer to the true meaning of equality; like them, Little Rock is historic ground, for surely it was here at Central High that we took another giant step closer to the idea of America.

Elizabeth Eckford along with her eight schoolmates were turned away on September 4th, but the Little Rock Nine did not turn back. Forty years ago today, they climbed these steps, passed through this door, and moved our Nation. And for that, we must all thank them.

Today we honor those who made it possible, their parents first—as Eleanor Roosevelt said of them, "To give your child for a cause is even harder than to give yourself"; to honor my friend Daisy Bates and Wylie Branton and Thurgood Marshall, the NAACP, and all who guided these children; to honor President Eisenhower, Attorney General Brownell, and the men of the 101st Airborne who enforced the Constitution; to honor every student, every teacher, every minister, every Little Rock resident, black or white, who offered a word of kindness, a glance of respect, or a hand of friendship; to honor those who gave us the opportunity to be part of this day of celebration and rededication.

But most of all, we come to honor the Little Rock Nine. Most of us who have just watched these events unfold can never understand fully the sacrifice they made. Imagine, all of you, what it would be like to come to school one day and be shoved against lockers, tripped down stairways, taunted day after day by your classmates, to go all through school with no hope of going to a school play or being on a basketball team or learning in simple peace.

[*At this point, there was a disturbance in the audience.*]

The President. Speaking of simple peace, I'd like a little of it today.

I want all these children here to look at these people. They persevered, they endured, and they prevailed. But it was at great cost to themselves. As Melba said years later in her wonderful memoir, "Warriors Don't Cry," "My friends and I paid for the integration of Little Rock Central High with our innocence."

Folks, in 1957 I was 11 years old, living 50 miles away in Hot Springs, when the eyes of the world were fixed here. Like almost all southerners then, I never attended school with a person of another race until I went to college. But as a young boy in my grandfather's small grocery store, I learned lessons that nobody bothered to teach me in my segregated school. My grandfather had a sixth grade education from a tiny rural school. He never made a bit of money. But in that store, in the way he treated his customers and encouraged me to play with their children, I learned America's most profound lessons: We really are all equal. We really do have the right to live in dignity. We really do have the right to be treated with respect. We do have the right to be heard.

I never knew how he and my grandmother came to those convictions, but I'll never forget how they lived them. Ironically, my grandfather died in 1957. He never lived to see America come around to his way of thinking. But I know he's smiling down today, not on his grandson but on the Little Rock Nine, who gave up their innocence so all good people could have a chance to live their dreams.

But let me tell you something else that was true about that time. Before Little Rock, for me and other white children, the struggles of black people, whether we were sympathetic or hostile to them, were mostly background music in our normal, self-absorbed lives. We were all, like you, more concerned about our friends and our lives, day-in and day-out. But then we saw what was happening in our own backyard, and we all had to deal with it. Where did we stand? What did we believe? How did we want to live? It was Little Rock that made racial equality a driving obsession in my life.

Years later, time and chance made Ernie Green my friend. Good fortune brought me to the Governor's office, where I did all I could to heal the wounds, solve the problems, open the doors so we could become the people we say we want to be.

Ten years ago, the Little Rock Nine came back to the Governor's Mansion when I was there. I wanted them to see that the power of the office that once had blocked their way now welcomed them. But like so many Americans, I can never fully repay my debt to these nine people. For with their innocence, they purchased more freedom for me, too, and for all white people—people like Hazel Brown Massery, the angry taunter of Elizabeth Eckford, who stood with her in front of this school this week as a reconciled friend. And with the gift of their innocence, they taught us that all too often what ought to be can never be for free.

Forty years later, what do you young people in this audience believe we have learned? Well, 40 years later, we know that we all benefit—

all of us—when we learn together, work together, and come together. That is, after all, what it means to be an American.

Forty years later, we know, not withstanding some cynics, that all our children can learn, and this school proves it. Forty years later, we know when the constitutional rights of our citizens are threatened, the National Government must guarantee them. Talk is fine, but when they are threatened, you need strong laws faithfully enforced and upheld by independent courts.

Forty years later, we know there are still more doors to be opened, doors to be opened wider, doors we have to keep from being shut again now. Forty years later, we know freedom and equality cannot be realized without responsibility for self, family, and the duties of citizenship, or without a commitment to building a community of shared destiny and a genuine sense of belonging.

Forty years later, we know the question of race is more complex and more important than ever, embracing no longer just blacks and whites, or blacks and whites and Hispanics and Native Americans, but now people from all parts of the Earth coming here to redeem the promise of America.

Forty years later, frankly, we know we're bound to come back where we started. After all the weary years and silent tears, after all the stony roads and bitter rides, the question of race is, in the end, still an affair of the heart.

But if these are our lessons, what do we have to do? First, we must all reconcile. Then we must all face the facts of today. And finally we must act.

Reconciliation is important not only for those who practice bigotry but for those whose resentment of it lingers, for both are prisons from which our spirits must escape. If Nelson Mandela, who paid for the freedom of his people with 27 of the best years of his life, could invite his jailers to his inauguration and ask even the victims of violence to forgive their oppressors, then each of us can seek and give forgiveness.

And what are the facts? It is a fact, my fellow Americans, that there are still too many places where opportunity for education and work are not equal, where disintegration of family and neighborhood make it more difficult. But it is also a fact that schools and neighborhoods and lives can be turned around if, but only if, we are prepared to do what it takes. It is a fact that there are still too many places where our children die or give up before they bloom, where they are trapped in a web of crime and violence and drugs. But we know this too can be changed, but only if we are prepared to do what it takes.

Today, children of every race walk through the same door, but then they often walk down different halls. Not only in this school but across America, they sit in different classrooms. They eat at different tables. They even sit in different parts of the bleachers at the football game. Far too many communities are all white, all black, all Latino, all Asian. Indeed, too many Americans of all races have actually begun to give up on the idea of integration and the search for common ground. For the first time since the 1950's, our schools in America are resegregating. The rollback of affirmative action is slamming shut the doors of higher education on a new generation, while those who oppose it have not yet put forward any other alternative.

In so many ways, we still hold ourselves back. We retreat into the comfortable enclaves of ethnic isolation. We just don't deal with people who are different from us. Segregation is no longer the law, but too often separation is still the rule. And we cannot forget one stubborn fact that has not yet been said as clearly as it should: There is still discrimination in America.

There are still people who can't get over it, who can't let it go, who can't go through the day unless they have somebody else to look down on. And it manifests itself in our streets and in our neighborhoods and in the workplace and in the schools. And it is wrong. And we have to keep working on it, not just with our voices but with our laws. And we have to engage each other in it.

Of course, we should celebrate our diversity. The marvelous blend of cultures and beliefs and races has always enriched America, and it is our meal ticket to the 21st century. But we also have to remember, with the painful lessons of the civil wars and the ethnic cleansing around the world, that any nation that indulges itself in destructive separatism will not be able to meet and master the challenges of the 21st century.

We have to decide—all you young people have to decide—will we stand as a shining example or a stunning rebuke to the world of tomorrow? For the alternative to integration is not isolation or a new separate but equal, it is disintegration.

Only the American idea is strong enough to hold us together. We believe, whether our ancestors came here in slave ships or on the *Mayflower,* whether they came through the portals of Ellis Island or on a plane to San Francisco, whether they have been here for thousands of years, we believe that every individual possesses the spark of possibility, born with an equal right to strive and work and rise as far as they can go, and born with an equal responsibility to act in a way that obeys the law, reflects our values, and passes them on to their children. We are white and black, Asian and Hispanic, Christian and Jew and Muslim, Italian- and Vietnamese- and Polish-Americans and goodness knows how many more today. But above all, we are still Americans. Martin Luther King said, "We are woven into a seamless garment of destiny. We must be one America."

The Little Rock Nine taught us that. We cannot have one America for free, not 40 years ago, not today. We have to act. All of us have to act. Each of us has to do something. Especially our young people must seek out people who are different from themselves and speak freely and frankly to discover they share the same dreams.

All of us should embrace the vision of a colorblind society, but recognize the fact that we are not there yet and we cannot slam shut the doors of educational and economic opportunity. All of us should embrace ethnic pride and we should revere religious conviction, but we must reject separation and isolation. All of us should value and practice personal responsibility for ourselves and our families. And all Americans, especially our young people, should give something back to their community through citizen service. All Americans of all races must insist on both equal opportunity and excellence in education. That is even more important today than it was for these nine people, and look how far they took themselves with their education.

The true battleground in education today is whether we honestly believe that every child can learn and we have the courage to set high academic standards we expect all our children to meet. We must not replace the tyranny of segregation with the tragedy of low expectations. I will not rob a single American child of his or her future. It is wrong.

My fellow Americans, we must be concerned not so much with the sins of our parents as with the success of our children, how they will live, and live together, in years to come. If those nine children could walk up those steps 40 years ago all alone, if their parents could send them into the storm armed only with schoolbooks and the righteousness of their cause, then surely together we can build one America, an America that makes sure no future generation of our children will have to pay for our mistakes with the loss of their innocence.

At this schoolhouse door today, let us rejoice in the long way we have come these 40 years. Let us resolve to stand on the shoulders of the Little Rock Nine and press on with confidence in the hard and noble work ahead. Let us lift every voice and sing, till Earth and Heaven ring, one America today, one America tomorrow, one America forever.

God bless the Little Rock Nine, and God bless the United States of America. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. on the front steps of Central High School. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Mike Huckabee of Arkansas and his wife, Janet; Mayor Jim Dailey of Little Rock and his wife, Patti; Daisy Bates, NAACP attorney in 1957; Rett Tucker and Gail Reede Jones, event cochairs; Rudolph Howard, principal, and Fatima McKendra, student body president, Central High School; and the Little Rock Nine: Elizabeth Eckford, Melba Pattillo Beals, Ernest Green, Gloria Ray Karlmark, Carlotta Walls LaNier, Thelma Mothershed-Wair, Terrence Roberts, Jefferson Thomas, and Minnijean Brown Trickey.

Remarks at a Reception for the Congressional Medal of Honor Society in Little Rock

September 25, 1997

Thank you very much, Secretary Gober, President Bucha, Mayor Dailey, Mayor Hays, Senator Beebe. Governor McMath, it's wonderful to see you here tonight, sir.

I thank Secretary Gober for his introduction. It was overly generous but a good illustration of Clinton's first law of politics: Whenever possible, try to have yourself introduced by someone you have appointed to high office. [*Laughter*] Did you hear the story Secretary Gober said about he was in the Army, then he was in the Marine Corps, and his wife was in the Navy and then the Air Force. They're the only people I ever knew who organized a 30-year campaign to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs. [*Laughter*] It worked. He has done a wonderful job.

And thank you, Secretary Togo West, for the job you do for the United States Army, sir. I'd also like to thank the United States Military Academy Cadet Glee Club. I thought they did a terrific job. Go ahead and give them a hand. [*Applause*] And I think we can forgive them if there was just a little more zip in the Army song than the others. [*Laughter*] That, after all, is befitting.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be here with you. I thank you for coming to my native State. I hope you have enjoyed it. I'm especially honored to be in the presence of people who are in what has been described as the most exclusive club in America, the Congressional Medal of Honor Society. Along with every other American, I feel a profound admiration for all of you for your acts of valor and heroism. I am especially gratified that several who wear the medal and who are in this room tonight are my fellow Arkansans, including Nick Bacon, director of veterans affairs here; Scooter Burke; Clarence Kraft; and Nathan Gordon.

No one could live in this country for very long without being especially impressed with how genuinely patriotic most of our fellow citizens are. We are a nation of immigrants, proud of our roots, proud of what is distinctive about us, but there's an extraordinary amount of love in this country for our Nation, felt by almost every single citizen.

Indeed, there's so much love in our country that, as you know, we very often have people join the United States military even before they're naturalized as citizens. I never will forget, when we welcomed the Pope to Denver for the first time and I was escorting His Holiness down the line of all the well-wishers there at Regis University, we got to a young man in a United States Army uniform, and he broke into this elaborate conversation with the Pope in Polish. And I thought to myself, we could have had a Haitian-American speaking to the Pope in Creole; we could have spoken to the Pope in Spanish and Chinese and Japanese and any number of languages in the world. This is the only country in the world where you can say that. When we turned back the dictators and restored the duly elected leaders in Haiti, America was the only country in the world where we were able to send 200 United States citizen soldiers to Haiti who spoke the native language, Creole. But we are united by this almost mystical love of our country and its history and what it means.

Nonetheless, we know that in every generation there will be a few who stand out, who are called upon to do things of such selfless heroism that their patriotism shines above all the others.

Twice since I have been President, I have bestowed the Medal of Honor. First, very sadly, to Master Sergeant Gary Gordon and Sergeant First Class Randall Shughart posthumously, two men who bravely lost their lives in Somalia trying to save the lives of their fellow soldiers. Then, this year, because so much time had passed, a much happier occasion: Fifty years after the fact, we recognized seven African-American heroes of World War II who were prepared to sacrifice everything for our freedom, even though they didn't have full freedom when they came back home. That was a wonderful day.

One painful, one wonderful, I will never forget either one, because both of them were examples of the truly extraordinary heroism which all of you who wear this medal have demonstrated in your service. When the battle was

darkest, when the fortunes of war often favored an unforgiving enemy, somehow those of you who won the Medal of Honor and who earned the Medal of Honor found the strength, the will to fight more valiantly and turn the tide, to save the lives of your comrades, to save the day for America.

Your president spoke a moment ago about the event we commemorated at Little Rock Central High School. Forty years ago, something happened here that none of us who are native to this State are especially proud of. Our former Governor, Governor McMath, who also was a major general in the Marine Corps, tried to stop it. And I'll always be grateful to him. But in the end, those children were not denied admission to our high school, because the law of the land said we were all created equal. A Federal court issued an order to carry out the law, and the President of the United States and the Attorney General of the United States and the 101st Airborne Division of the United States Army did exactly that, and they stood up for the Constitution. They were heroes in that day, as well.

And somehow I think it's fitting that you are here on this day, and we can celebrate your heroism, and you can participate in a moment of unique citizen heroism in the history of America. Think what it was like for those nine kids to show up and face a jeering mob, armed only with their notebooks and their schoolbooks. Think what it was like for their parents to send them into the storm not knowing whether they would come home.

But if you look at the whole history of America, and if you look at the whole history of our military services, we see an unbroken chain in the continuing struggle to make our historic commitment to freedom and equality more real in each succeeding generation.

Every American knows about our military's vital role in protecting our national interest and our values around the world. But the Armed Forces also has reflected and protected our values here at home. Our military promotes equality by rewarding merit without regard to race or gender and sets an example for every American and for every American institution where two or more people work together.

And as I said, you cannot talk to any person who was alive and well in Little Rock 40 years ago who doesn't remember that it was the Army paratroopers who ultimately stood as a bulwark of protection for those nine little children, who were there for them because their President ordered them to stand up for the law of the land here at home.

So I hope that you will always remember, throughout all your conventions and all your meetings, that you happened to come to Little Rock on a special day for America and a special day for America's military, a special example of personal patriotism and bravery by civilians, and that all of us—all of us—are profoundly grateful that you're here, for your valor and your sacrifice, for being there when your country needed you the most.

Thank you for what you have done, and thank you, too, for what you continue to do as living examples of everything we love most about America.

God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:44 p.m. at the Aerospace Education Center. In his remarks, he referred to Paul Bucha, president, Congressional Medal of Honor Society; Mayor Jim Dailey of Little Rock; Mayor Patrick Henry Hays of North Little Rock; State Senator Mike Beebe; former Arkansas Governor Sid McMath; and Mary Lou Keener, wife of Secretary of Veterans Affairs Hershel Gober.

Statement Urging House of Representatives Action on Campaign Finance Reform

September 25, 1997

I am greatly encouraged by the statements calling for House action on campaign finance reform legislation made earlier today by Democratic Leader Gephardt, and yesterday by House Majority Leader Armey. I applaud these two

House leaders for their commitment to scheduling a House floor debate on this critical issue before Congress adjourns for the year.

This bipartisan call for action is a promising sign that we are moving forward in our response to America's demand for reform. I urge the Members of the House to take the next step and give their full support for the meaningful bipartisan campaign finance reform offered by Representatives Shays and Meehan. This measure is both balanced and effective, and it addresses many of the most pressing needs for reform.

Congress faces the best opportunity in a generation to enact campaign finance reform. Let us work together in a bipartisan spirit to enact the Shays-Meehan legislation and answer the public's call for reform.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Future Free Trade Area Negotiations

September 25, 1997

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with section 108(b)(4) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3317(b)(4)), I transmit herewith the report containing recommendations on future free trade area negotiations.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Bill Archer, chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, and William V. Roth, Jr., chairman, Senate Finance Committee.

Interview With Tom Joyner, Tavis Smiley, and Sybil Wilkes on the Tom Joyner Morning Show in Little Rock

September 26, 1997

Mr. Joyner. Mr. President, good morning.

The President. Good morning. You're having a lot of fun there for this early in the morning. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Joyner. And you're having a lot of fun, too, aren't you? Now that Chelsea is gone, you all are having some fun, aren't you, Mr. President? [*Laughter*]

The President. That's what Hillary says.

Mr. Joyner. See, Sybil? See, Tavis? I told you. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Wilkes. But he's the President. He can say that. You can't say that about him.

Desegregation of Central High School

Mr. Joyner. Mr. President, when this happened 40 years ago, how old were you?

The President. Eleven.

Mr. Joyner. And what was going through your mind when you saw all this that was happening here in Little Rock?

The President. I thought it was a bad thing. I didn't understand why people were so upset. But as I said yesterday, most of the white kids didn't think about it one way or the other until it actually happened. Until the Little Rock Nine were turned away, I think most people didn't think about it one way or the other. Children are basically self-absorbed in their own lives. It's part of the privilege of childhood.

But then, all of a sudden, kids that had never thought about it before, it's all they talked about for weeks. And everybody then had to decide really how they felt about it. It seemed obvious to me that sooner or later this was going to have to be done; it might as well be done sooner.

But I also—I was always amazed at how there was an element in the South and probably in the rest of the country, too, of people that were—they always just needed somebody to hate, needed somebody to look down on. But it's no way to run a country and no way to run a life. Sooner or later, to me, it was obvious it had to change.

Ms. Wilkes. Mr. President, there seems to be so much symbolism to the fact that you were opening the door yesterday for the members of the Little Rock Nine coming through, as well as this year that you have stepped before the Nation, before the world, and telling them that you are taking this step into the 21st century and making a difference in terms of race relations. This is a year in which you are just really making us aware and bringing these things out to us. And I commend you for that.

The President. Well, thank you. I think part of the symbolism yesterday was that—[*applause*]—thank you very much. I think yesterday part of the importance of the symbolism was that political leaders closed the doors and stood in the doors in the fifties and the sixties and kept people out of the doors. And apparently, that idea to open the door came from the students at Central High themselves. It was a great, wonderful idea, and I was glad to be a part of it.

Mr. Joyner. First of all, to the affiliates of 93 stations around the country on the Tom Joyner Morning Show, as you can tell, we are running long. We're going to go right through the break. We want you to hang with us.

Mr. President, you said that what happened 40 years ago really developed your idea of what race relations in this country should be about. At 11 years old, you were thinking race relations?

The President. Well, it was discussed in my home because my grandparents were interested in it. That's what I said yesterday. So I had a chance to think about it earlier just because my grandfather expressed himself very strongly about it. He had once been a grocer and had a lot of black customers, and he knew a lot about black people as human beings and about the troubles they were facing and the problems in their lives and the potential they had. He thought it was wrong.

My grandmother was a nurse and she had a lot more contact with black people in the fifties than most white people did, and she thought it was wrong. And they just had a big impact on me, and they talked about it a lot. And even though my grandfather died in 1957, and everybody was talking about this happening in the 2 years coming up to that, I still remember as a little boy, 9, 10 years old, sitting around the table, having him walk through this with me and telling me that this was something that had to be done.

School Choice and Integration

Mr. Smiley. Mr. President, Sybil asked you a moment ago about the symbolism of yesterday—this is Tavis—and I want to ask you about the substance, if I can. As you know, the two issues that are facing this country, certainly facing black America, with regard to education as we talk about this incident 40 years ago are the issue of school vouchers and this whole issue of resegregation of schools. You know, the NAACP was even considering earlier this summer reassessing their position on school integration. What are your thoughts specifically on how the issue of school vouchers and the issue of school integration are impacting the African-American community? Where do you come down on that debate on those issues?

The President. Well, let me say, first of all, school vouchers—that is, giving people money that used to go to the school district that they can then use and spend in the school district or they can use it to defray the cost of tuition to private schools—school vouchers are the most extreme version of more school choice for parents and students. I have supported for years and years giving students and parents more choice for the public schools their kids attend, and also the national charter school movement which allows groups of teachers and parents to organize schools on their own and be more loosely affiliated with public school districts and to meet the special needs of the community, and then they can have a lot of freedom from the rules and regulations of the school districts and the State as long as they meet high standards. I support the school uniform movement which a lot of private schools have and which have made a big difference in a lot of school districts.

The reason I have opposed school vouchers is that I think if you look at the facts, it's a relatively small financial contribution to give somebody, for example, what the Federal Government gives to a school district, but if you

take it away, you can have a big adverse impact on the school districts without helping any individual children very much.

Now, I will say this: I believe that sooner or later there will be a lot of people who will try it, going beyond Milwaukee and, I think, Cleveland, unless we can prove that the public schools can work for children again. But I think from my point of view, particularly with the Federal dollars, I simply don't believe that we should be diverting resources when our schools have been relatively underfunded on the whole. Instead, we ought to be concentrating on making them excellent.

On the other hand, there ought to be some competition there. The parents ought to have some say, which is why I think they ought to have more choice over the schools their kids attend, and they ought to have the right to participate in new schools that are outside a lot of the bureaucratic rules that burden school districts.

On the resegregation, I think that my own view is that we ought to continue to try to have integrated schools. We ought to recognize that segregated neighborhoods and different patterns in who has children of school age in various places have led to a resegregation of a lot of our schools. We still ought to try to integrate these neighborhoods and mix them not only racially but economically. We still ought to have, where reasonable, transportation plans that work and aren't too burdensome for the kids. But we shouldn't use the fact that a school is not especially integrated at this moment as an excuse not to give those kids an excellent education and do the very best we can.

Desegregation of Central High School

Mr. Joyner. Ten years ago, Mr. President, there was a 30-year celebration for the Little Rock Nine that you helped organize when you were Governor here in the State of Arkansas. It was a lot smaller celebration than the one we've had this week, huh?

The President. It was a lot smaller. I think they enjoyed it, but some of them—I'm not sure, you'd have to ask them—but I think there were a couple that hadn't been back to Arkansas very much before then. But everybody gathered. I wanted them to be able to come to the Governor's Mansion because it was the symbol of opposition to their efforts, and it was the place where a lot of the plotting was done to keep them out of school. I thought it would be a good thing if they came into the house that had once shut them out.

Mr. Joyner. If you were one of them back then, do you think you could have had the courage to do what they did, in all that adversity?

The President. I don't know. Boy, I'd like to think I would have. I think we all would like to think we would have. But I think, to be honest, none of us can know. You don't know until you're in a situation like that. I wish I could say yes, because I certainly would like to have been a part of it. And I can tell you this: I'm glad they did. I'm certainly glad they did.

Mr. Smiley. That's why he's the President, Tom, he's smooth, ain't he?

Mr. Joyner. That's right.

Mr. Smiley. He's smooth.

Ms. Wilkes. And you know, Mr. President, I think your grandfather would be very proud of you for what you have done in terms of stepping forward not only yesterday but, as I said before, with taking people and making us take stock of ourselves and our relationships with others, people that don't look like us. And you've done that certainly in your Cabinet and on your staff of people who look like a lot of us that listen to the Tom Joyner Morning Show as African-Americans.

Mr. Smiley. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Joyner. And we're all FOB's.

Ms. Wilkes. Yes, we are.

Mr. Joyner. We're FOB's.

The President. Thanks, Tom. [*Laughter*]

Ms. Wilkes. That would be a Fan of Bill.

Chelsea Clinton

Mr. Joyner. So how is Chelsea doing in school? Has she called for money?

The President. Well, not for money yet. We've talked to her a couple of times, and she's having a good time.

Miss Dupree. Well, tell her if she needs some campus fashion, Miss Dupree got some little cousins who can hook her up. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Joyner. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you for being a guest on the show, and thank you for being a part of all of the celebration here for the 40th anniversary of the Little Rock Nine. Thank you, sir.

The President. Thank you. Goodbye, everybody. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 8:45 a.m. The President spoke from a private residence to the interviewers in the Clinton Ballroom of the Excelsior Hotel in Little Rock. Comedienne Jedda Jones also participated in the interview, using her on-air name, Miss Dupree.

Remarks at San Jacinto Community College in Houston, Texas
September 26, 1997

Thank you. Well, Esmerelda may be getting a degree in mathematics, but today she got an "A" in public speaking. [*Laughter*] Let's give her another hand. I thought she was great. [*Applause*]

Mayor and Mrs. Lanier, Mayor Isbell, and Commissioner Mauro, Chancellor Horton. I also see out there Mr. George Abbey, the Director of the Johnson Space Center, something that's very close to my heart. I've tried to promote the space program as President. I think Ellen Ochoa may be here as well. But I thank them for their work. And weren't you proud when we landed that little vehicle on Mars, and we got to see those pictures? I loved it.

I'd like to say a special word of appreciation, too, to Congressman Ken Bentsen. He has done a very, very fine job for you in the United States Congress, and he has steadfastly supported our efforts to balance the budget, to restore health to the economy, but to do it in a way that kept educational opportunities increasing, not decreasing, for the people of this country and the people of this district. And I thank him for that.

I'm very excited to be here today for a couple of reasons. First of all, I know we're actually close to the place where the battle of San Jacinto occurred. Right? And Sam Houston, in addition to having an interesting life which was amazing—he lived with the Cherokees; he led the Texas army in the battle for independence; he was a president of the Republic of Texas and a United States Senator; he also was a teacher. And if you have read much about Sam Houston, you may have seen that he—and I quote—he said that his time as a classroom teacher was, quote, "the most satisfying time of my life." I think that I would be remiss if I did not say to all the educators who are here, as I look at this sea of young people, I thank you for your devotion to education, and I hope that it will always be something that brings you great satisfaction.

Here, so near the site where Texas fought a battle to win its political independence, you are all gaining your economic independence by being in this marvelous institution. And the way the community college system works here in Texas and across America, in my view, is a model of the way America ought to work.

You think about it. This place, first of all, is open to all. Nobody gets turned away because they're too old or too young or because of the color of their skin or because of their gender or anything else. If you're willing to work and take responsibility for yourselves and your course of study, it's open to all—first thing.

Secondly, it very much focuses on results, not rhetoric, because the graduates of community colleges, they either succeed—that is, they get a job, or they go on further with their education—or they don't get a job based on what they studied, and so you have to change the curriculum. So there is not much room for a lot of hot air and talk. You either produce or you don't.

The third thing about the community colleges is that they're always about change, not the status quo. Because of the way they're hooked into the economy of every area in our country, they are—much more than educational institutions or institutions of any kind—supersensitive to what's going on in people's lives, because otherwise the students wouldn't show up after a while if the institution weren't relevant to the future, to their future, and to the community's future.

So, open to all; rhetoric, not results; change, not the status quo; and the last thing that I think is very important is, it's much more about partnerships than politics. Nobody asks you whether you're a Democrat or a Republican. Nobody asks you whether you like or dislike some person or thing. The whole thing only

works when people are working together to build a community. I say that because I really believe, as I have said all over this country, that America would be better if we all worked in the way the community colleges of our country work, in the way San Jacinto works.

Almost 6 years ago, I started my candidacy for President with a vision for what I wanted America to look like in the 21st century and a commitment to prepare us for that. And it's a pretty simple thing. When the century turns, when all of you younger people in this audience have your own children coming up, I want to know that the American dream is still alive for everybody who will work for it. I want to know that our country will still be leading the world for peace and freedom and prosperity. And I want to know that we are coming together across all the lines that divide us into one America. Opportunity for all, responsibility from all, a community of all: That's what I believe we should be doing.

I knew then, and now I know even better than I did 6 years ago, that that would require both new policies and a new kind of Government. Policies that would be focused on the future, not the past; on unity, not division; on partnerships more than politics; on people and values, not power; on keeping America leading, not following; and that we had to start with a good economic policy because in 1991 the economy wasn't working for most of the people.

I also felt then, and I feel more strongly now, that we have to change the very way our Government works. We'd have to make it smaller and less bureaucratic and more flexible. And therefore, we would have to liberate it from the ability of very powerful interests to cripple us and keep us from doing things.

Now, we've made a lot of progress. We passed the first balanced budget this year since President Lyndon Johnson's last budget, the first balanced budget in a generation. The Federal Government is now smaller than it was when Lyndon Johnson took office. It's the smallest it's been since John Kennedy was President. We've gotten rid of 16,000 pages of Federal regulations and turned over a lot more things to working with States and local governments and the private sector. We passed a lobby reform bill to at least disclose what the lobbyists in Washington are doing and to limit their ability to do certain things with Members of Congress and the Government.

But one of the biggest problems we have with our political system—I just want to change the subject just for a moment because I know it's of concern to almost all Americans, and it should be—is that, with the advent of modern communications and the growth of our country, the costs of political campaigns have soared astronomically, and with it, the burdens of raising money, and with it, the questions raised about how much money has to be raised to run for office and how it's raised.

And I ask you all to think about your role in this. You might say, on the one hand, "Well, I don't like those people raising all that money," and then ask yourself, how many times did you vote for a candidate who had the best television ads or the candidate whose ads you saw the most. Or did you ever vote against someone who was attacked in a television ad, and you never saw another television ad responding to the attack, so you thought, "Well, what they said might be true. I don't want to take any chances."

The point I want to make is, we desperately need to reform the way we finance our campaigns, and a part of that has to be changing the cost of the campaigns. And I have worked very hard to do that. But we have to do both.

Now, just today the United States Senate began debate on a very important bill, the campaign finance reform bill sponsored by Senator John McCain of Arizona, a Republican, and Senator Russ Feingold of Wisconsin, a Democrat, working together to curb special interest money in politics. I called on Congress to stay in session and not go home until it acts on reform. And I'm delighted the debate has begun. But I want to say to you, we have debated this before, and every time we debate it—at least since I have been President—every year we've had a good campaign finance reform bill before the Senate, I have supported it. And every year it has died under the parliamentary tactic that allows one more than 40 Senators to keep any bill from being voted on—called the filibuster—so that you never really know.

Now, maybe this year there will be a different strategy. But I pledge to you, you hide and watch, there will be a lot of efforts to make it look like we're going to do something and nothing will happen, unless we all work hard and demand that something happen.

So if you're worried about this and you'd like to see a system where you felt greater confidence in the way campaigns are financed, you should do two things. One is, you should say to your Congressmen and Senators, "Pass good campaign finance reform this year, and do it, and we want it." And secondly, you should support our efforts to lower the cost of campaigns by saying that people who follow these limits and don't abuse the system should be given reduced cost for access to you on television, on radio, in the newspapers, and other ways of communications. We have to lower the cost if we're going to clean up the way it's financed. And I hope you'll support them both.

I want to go back now to the economy and talk about the role of education in it, and especially your role in community colleges. We decided that we needed a new economic strategy for the new economy that had three components: one, reduce the deficit; two, find a way even while you're cutting the deficit to invest more money in people, in technology, and the future; and three, expand markets for American products and services abroad.

By removing the deficits, we could free our people of this huge deadweight of high interest rates and other problems that have been on us since the early 1980's. We did that in 1993 when we passed our first deficit reduction plan that had cut the deficit by 87 percent before we passed the balanced budget amendment. And I'm very proud of all the Members of Congress who supported that.

By investing in education and health, we knew we would enable more Americans to actually win the race over the long run that the global economy imposes on all of us. And we did. We've expanded funding for Head Start, for public school programs like putting more computers in the schools and trying to hook up every classroom and library to the Internet by the year 2000, by expanding Pell grants and work-study programs, even before this last budget.

By reducing trade barriers, we thought we could knock down unfairly high hurdles that Americans have had to leap for too long. There's a lot of big debates about trade in Washington, and out here in the country every poll says all Americans always believe we're being treated unfairly. And we do have the most open markets in the world, on the whole, but you should know that we're now the biggest exporter in the world—220 trade agreements in the last 5 years. We're the number one exporter in the world. We're the number one producer of automobiles again in the world. And we're number one in computers in the world.

And I'm in a big struggle now to try to get Congress to renew my authority to make these kind of trade agreements because we have 4 percent of the world's population and 22 percent of the world's income. And one more fact, every expert says that in the next 10 years the developing economies in Asia and Latin America will grow at 3 times the rate—now they're much poorer, but they'll grow at 3 times the rate of Europe, Japan, and the United States.

Now, if we have 4 percent of the population and 22 percent of the income and other economies are going to grow 3 times as fast as we are, is there any way that you can think of for us to maintain our standard of living and improve it if we don't sell more to the other 96 percent of the people in the world? I think not. That's my simple case, and I hope you will support my continuing to be able to make these kinds of trade agreements to raise our incomes and give us a better future.

You know that this strategy has worked, that the American people have produced 13 million jobs almost—just under 13 million jobs in the last 4½ years. Unemployment is below 5 percent. We've had the largest drop in welfare in our history. We now have the smallest percentage of people living on welfare in America we've had since 1970, after two decades of immigration, bringing a lot of people in from around the world. A lot of our poorest communities are experiencing a renewal.

We also have seen dramatic drops in the crime rate, nationally, in no small measure because we adopted a strategy pioneered in Houston by Mayor Lanier of putting more police on the streets, putting them on the streets in the areas where they are most needed, supporting their communities. We've done that now for 100,000 police. We need to do it until every American community is safe for children to play in and walk the streets in and be in school in again.

The balanced budget adopted in July reflects these priorities: cut the deficit, balance the budget, expand investment in people. It has, for example, enough funds—$24 billion—to insure half the kids in this country who don't have health insurance. Almost all of them are

in working families where the mother or the father or both can't get health insurance on the job. It provides tax relief for working families, $500 tax credit a child. It's worth about $1,000 in income to the typical family with two children.

It also has some other important programs. The America Reads program—we're going to try to mobilize one million volunteers—I hope some of them will be here at this community college—organized by AmeriCorps, our national service program, which has been very active in Texas, and others to get a million volunteers to make sure every 8-year-old can read independently in this country. That's very important with all the diversity we have.

But the most important part of the budget, in my judgment, over the long run, will be the work we did so that we could finally say, for the first time in history, we have opened the doors of college to all Americans who are willing to work for it.

After all, the new economy is a knowledge economy. In the 19th century, opportunity came from access to a land grant, like one that gave many of your ancestors here in Texas a little bit of land to start their homes. In the 21st century, instead of a land grant, people will want a Pell grant, because they know that what they know is their key to the future, not what they own but what they know and what they can learn.

Our goal is simple. By the end of this century, we want education in a community college like this, the 13th and 14th years of education, to be as universal when we start the new century as a high school diploma is today. That is a simple goal, and if we achieve it, it will explode opportunity in the United States and change the future of every young person in this room and in this country. And I hope you'll support us in achieving it.

Now, let me just briefly explain how this budget supports that goal. We issued a report from the Department of Education today explaining it, but let me just go through it. First and foremost, this balanced budget gives nearly 6 million students a $1,500 a year HOPE scholarship. That's a tax cut for the first 2 years of college. Here at San Jacinto and community colleges across Texas and in six other States, that means that your tuition and your fees will be completely covered by the tax cut you will get because of this program. But in fact, all across America, those who get the maximum HOPE scholarship will find that it covers about 90 percent of the national average, not only of full-time tuition but also of fee costs for community colleges. It is a great thing.

Now, the budget also gives further higher education and training tax cuts after the first 2 years to 7 million Americans who are juniors and seniors in college, who are graduate students, or who are older workers who went back to school to take classes to upgrade their skills, because we want to continue education for a lifetime.

What my objectives are here are number one, open the doors of college to all; number two, make the first 2 years of college as universal as high school is today; number three, make it possible for everybody to keep on learning for a lifetime, so they never have to stop. That's what we're trying to do.

Now, in addition to the tax cuts, because not everybody has enough income to pay income tax, we also had the biggest increase in Pell grants in 20 years. The average Pell grant will be about $2,000 a year for 1.4 million community college students. We created another 100,000 work-study positions. We created 200,000 more last year. So in 2 years, we will have gone from 700,000 to a million work-study positions. All these things are very, very important.

In addition to that, we have created an IRA, individual retirement account, that you can put money in every year, and then you can withdraw from it tax-free, penalty-free, if the money is being used for education, health care, or to buy a first-time home. So these are the options that are there.

So I say to you, this, I think—when people look back on this budget 30, 40, 50 years from now, if they can say about it, "This is the first time they opened the doors of college to all. They made the first 2 years of college as universal as a high school diploma. They created a system where people could keep on learning for a lifetime," that is a legacy that Congressman Bentsen and everybody in the United States Congress who supported this can be proud of, because they are giving you the tools you need to make the most of your own lives and your future. And I think they did a great job, and I'm very proud of them.

Let me also make one other point about education. Everyone now accepts—you can go anywhere in the world and people would accept the fact that America has the finest system of higher education in the world, the community colleges, the universities, the graduate work, research institutions—people would say that. Also, people would say their education, kindergarten through 12, is not as good as it ought to be. Now, they would admit that we have more challenges than most people. We have more racial and ethnic diversity. We have more income diversity. We have more challenges. But that cannot be an excuse for us not to achieve high standards. In fact, the poorer the children are, the more they need high academic standards in the early years—the more they need that.

And so I advocated in my State of the Union Address something I have been out there advocating for a decade now, which is that we ought to have national academic standards, at least in the basic courses. What should a fourth grader be able to know in reading? What should an eighth grader be able to know in math? Those are two places to start. And I have advocated that we set up these voluntary standards and have voluntary exams and give them to the students and not have anybody punished who doesn't do well but at least give every school, every district, and every parent some idea about whether their children know what they're supposed to know at an early time so if something needs to be done they can do something about it.

Now, the community colleges—think about how they work. You know if what you're doing doesn't work—why?—because your graduates won't get jobs. If either you don't give them a good education, they won't be able to produce, that reputation will get out, and people won't hire you, or if you get trained in the wrong things, then you will be a mismatch so you won't get hired. So you have a check, right? We need a check for our children.

The United States is the only major country in the world without a set of national academic standards. Now, because virtually all of our teachers and principals are dedicated, because virtually all of our parents care, a lot of people get a good education anyway, but it is very uneven. So I hope you will support that.

Earlier today I learned that 43 Democratic Senators have signed a letter supporting my standards and saying that they would either stop or vote to uphold a veto if there was a bill passed in Congress to keep us from participating. But the House of Representatives last week passed a bill saying the Federal Government can't have any funding of these exams. I think that's a mistake.

So I hope—most of you—you're up on—in community college now, a lot of you here are out of that. But don't forget those kids coming behind. And don't forget what a challenge it's going to be. And having high expectations of people does not put them down; it lifts them up. It does not put people down; it lifts them up. So I ask you to help.

Here's the last point I want to make, and some of you may think I'm meddling here, but I plead guilty. [*Laughter*] We need an economy that works for everybody. We need an educational system that works for all. We still have to make sure our country works for everybody. Texas knows all about diversity. This has always been a diverse place. After all, it was Mexico first. So we know about this here. And I might say, I really have appreciated the fact that attitudes toward immigration in Texas, among both Democrats and Republicans, generally have been more constructive here than in many other places in the country.

But even you may not have any idea about just how diverse this country is becoming. In the Fairfax County school district, just across the river from Washington, DC, in one public school district there are students from 182 nations whose native languages number more than 100.

Now, because of all the upheavals in the world and because of what America means, more than ever people seek to come here to redeem the promise of this country. We need to find a way to say we value all this diversity. In a global economy—in a global economy—two things will pay off like crazy: one, high levels of education and skills; and two, being able to relate to everybody else. You know, you can go to any continent, and you will find people who are eager to do business with America and have closer ties with America, for one thing because they have kinfolks in America. You can go to any country and find that.

So we have to ask ourselves, are we going to be united or divided in this? Yesterday—you may have seen the news—we celebrated the 40th anniversary of the integration of Little Rock Central High School yesterday. It was a

wonderful day. Nine children, 40 years ago, put their necks on the line to do this and really were in danger. Their parents had to undergo the agony of sending their children out the door armed only with their schoolbooks, and they were all threatened with the loss of their jobs. It was a difficult time, but it helped to make us more one America.

Look around the world today. When you see—just pick up the paper on any given day and see what kind of foreign policy problem I'm dealing with. Is it Bosnia? Is it Northern Ireland? Is it the Middle East? Is it tribal slaughter in Rwanda or Burundi? You will be amazed the number of foreign policy problems your President is called upon to deal with because people in other parts of the world insist upon killing each other or hating each other because of their racial, their ethnic, or their religious differences. It is stunning.

There is something almost endemic to human nature which makes people want to be at odds with folks who are different from them, just like there is something in the human heart that causes people to reach beyond that and want to embrace people who are different once you realize that down deep we're all the same. So this is a huge thing.

I want to start with a story to get to where I may be meddling. A half a century ago—a half a century ago—Mayor Bob Lanier was a law student at the University of Texas. The school then still denied admission to African-Americans. So he volunteered to go over to a tiny one-room classroom that had been set up for black law students in a basement several blocks from the law school and teach constitutional law to students who had been unconstitutionally barred from the university.

One of his students was a man named Heman Sweatt, who went on to become the first African-American admitted to the University of Texas law school, after the Supreme Court decision of *Sweatt* v. *Painter*. Then the Supreme Court decided *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, which basically said that the schools of this country, the public schools, had to be integrated. It was that case that gave the basic power to those nine children who walked up the steps at Little Rock Central High School 40 years ago yesterday.

Well, 50 years later, Bob Lanier, who is about to end his service as the mayor of Houston, continues to open doors, reaches out to everybody in the community. Businesses that were run by minorities and women that were once shut out of city hall now have an opportunity to compete for the city's business. And I just want to say that I'd hate to see Houston turn back the clock on the progress of the last 50 years and the progress that Mayor Lanier has made in the last few years.

I'd also like to compliment the work of a group called Houston Together that includes a number of citizens, but including Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee and Phil Carroll of Shell and Ken Lay of Enron. By drawing strength and diversity, this whole area is on a remarkable track to the 21st century. Again, the city and the county should work the way San Jac does. That's what you've got to do. You've got to have—everybody has got to feel like they've got a part in this, a voice that will be heard, an interest that will be taken account of, and then in the end, a way of coming to a unified decision. I think that is terribly important.

Now, let me just close with this thought. A lot of you clapped when I mentioned the 40th anniversary of the Little Rock Central High School. Those little children had a simple vision; they just wanted a decent education. And they literally were able to imagine that they ought to get one in spite of the fact that they were black—simple vision that required all of us to move mountains and requires things of us, still. But because they imagined it, it happened for millions of people who otherwise it would not have happened for—in all probability, including some people who are in this room today.

Now, what you have to do, all of you who are students at this college, you've got to imagine what you would like your country to look like 30 or 40 years from now. And there is a very good chance that if you have the right imagination, and then you live according to the vision you are trying to achieve, that you will get there. And things that may seem impossible today might wind up being much easier than you ever imagined just by the dint of continuous daily effort.

It all begins with having the economy work for people, making sure everybody's got a chance to get the kind of education you're getting, and never forgetting that we have to go forward as one America.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2 p.m. in the auditorium. In his remarks, he referred to Esmerelda Hernandez, San Jacinto Community College student who introduced the President; Mayor Bob Lanier of Houston and his wife, Elyse; Mayor Johnny Isbell of Pasadena, TX; Garry Mauro, Texas State land commissioner; Chancellor James F. Horton, Jr., San Jacinto College District; and astronaut Ellen Ochoa. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Houston
September 26, 1997

Thank you very much. I told Tilman he should have just made the speech. [*Laughter*] He's about to get the hang of this. [*Laughter*] I'd like to thank Tilman and Paige for having me back. I thank Ken and John Eddie and all the others who made this night such a success. And I thank Alan Solomont for coming down here to be with us. Thank you, Governor Richards, for being here. And thank you, Garry Mauro and Bill White. And thank you, Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee.

I had a good day in Texas, and I've had a kind of interesting 2 weeks. Someone asked me when I got here if I knew what State I was in, because I've been traveling around. We took Chelsea to college in California last week, and then I went back to New York for the opening of the United Nations. And then I went to Pittsburgh to speak to the AFL–CIO. And then I came to—I went home to Arkansas for a magnificent day yesterday. We celebrated the 40th anniversary of the Little Rock Central High School crisis. And then before I came here, I went out to San Jacinto Community College, where I got to talk a little bit about the education provisions of the balanced budget act, some of the issues we are dealing with in Congress now, and a little about the whole issue of affirmative action, and I understand you've got a local initiative here you're dealing with on that.

And so I've had a very full and fascinating week. Tomorrow I'm going back home, and I'm going to the town where I graduated from high school, and we're trying to save our old high school. So I'm dealing with issues big and not so big. The older I get, the so-called little issues seem bigger to me. I want to save my high school, you know. I think it's important.

I was here with many of you exactly one year ago tomorrow. And I think we ought to make this an annual thing. I don't know—[*laughter*]—and maybe we could have another baby every year, too. And we could just celebrate a new birth. That ends my invitations coming here. [*Laughter*] I'm delighted to be back.

Let me make a couple of very brief points. First of all, I said something at the community college today I'd like to reiterate. These community colleges work the way I think America ought to work. You think about it. We're living in a time of dramatic change in the way we work and live and relate to each other and the rest of the world. The economy is new and emerging with all kinds of possibilities. And these community colleges all across our country are open to people of all ages looking for a way to better themselves.

First of all, they're open to everybody and you get treated the same, whether you're a man or woman, without regard to your age, without regard to your racial or ethnic background or your economic standing when you get in.

Secondly, they're very much oriented toward change, not the status quo. Why? Because if they don't change, then they'll be educating people for jobs that don't exist anymore, and they'll go out of business.

Thirdly, they're oriented toward results, not rhetoric, something I wish we could have even more of in Washington. I work on it all the time. Why? Because if they don't educate you well, no matter how much they exhort, people won't be functional and they won't be hired and they'll go out of business.

And third, they're oriented toward partnerships, not political division. Why? Because there's no Republican or Democratic way to run a machine tool operation or to understand how sophisticated manufacturing processes work, so

people have to work together. As a result, they become the kind of dynamic community organizations that really are taking this country into a new century in good shape.

And I got to thinking about it because I love the community colleges, and as you know, one of the major parts of the budget that I was so proud of fulfilled my commitment to open the doors of college to every American for the first time and to make it possible for us to make the 13th and 14th years of education just as universal by the year 2000 as a high school diploma is today, because we give a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college which will cover the average cost of tuition and fees of 90 percent of the community colleges in the country. That's very important. And we give further tax credits for the junior and senior year, for graduate study, for older people who come back for job training, an IRA that people can withdraw from tax-free if it's used for education, more work-study slots, the biggest increase in Pell grants in 20 years. This is a huge deal that is in this budget.

And I think perhaps the most—30 years from now when people look back at this, I think two things will live out of this budget more than anything else. One is that we balanced the budget for the first time since President Johnson's last budget. And the second was that we opened the doors of college to all and gave the American people a chance to make 2 years of college as universal as a high school education is today and, therefore, that we made the country far more competitive. And I'm very proud of that.

But in general, that is the sort of thing I have been trying to do since I went to Washington 6 years ago. I can't believe it, it's been almost 6 years since I announced for President. I don't know where the time went. But a lot of you spent a lot of it with me, and I appreciate that. And I said then I had a simple but I believe profound vision of what I wanted our country to look like. When I leave this office and we start a new century I want every American who is willing to work for it to be able to get the American dream. I want our country still to be leading the world for peace and freedom and prosperity. And I want us to be one America across all these lines that divide us.

Now, to do that, we have to sort of be like the community colleges. I have said this many times over the last 6 years, but I'll say it again: We need to be oriented toward the future, not the past; toward unity, not division; toward change, not the status quo; and we need to lead, not follow. I believe that. And I hope you believe it. And that means a lot. We also need to be oriented toward people, not just existing power institutions.

Let me just give you some examples. What does that mean for the Democratic Party? Well, we gave the country the family and medical leave law. Everyplace I go, some ordinary person comes up and says, "If it hadn't been for that law, my life would have been diminished considerably, because I got to take a little time off when my baby was sick, when my spouse was sick, when my father was dying"—or whatever—"and I didn't lose my job."

We gave the country the economic plan of 1993, completely without any votes from the other side. And what that meant was, by the time we got ready to pass this balanced budget law, the deficit had already been reduced by 87 percent from the level it was when I took office.

We gave the country the crime bill over the bitter opposition of the Republican leadership in 1994. They said it was not going to do any good, putting 100,000 people on the street. What's happened? The crime rate has gone down in virtually every community in America. The Brady bill kept 250,000 people with criminal or mental health histories from getting handguns and ended a lot of illegal gun trafficking. And as far as I know, not a single Texas hunter lost her rifle. [*Laughter*]

When I went up to New Hampshire in '96—it was unusual for a Democrat to carry New Hampshire, and they voted for me in '92. Then they rebelled in '94. The NRA had them all in a lather. And I went up there and talked to a bunch of hunters, and I said, "Do you remember what they told you in '94 about us coming after your guns?" I said, "I want every one of you that lost your gun to vote against me. But if you didn't, they lied to you, and you need to get even." [*Laughter*] It was an interesting experience, and we carried again.

Why am I saying this? It makes a difference. The parties have honestly different views. We ought to be free to bring our views to the table. In this last session where we had the balanced budget, the system worked as it should. Heavy majorities in both parties honestly wanted a balanced budget and realized that the record of

the eighties could not be sustained and we had to go on and balance the budget to keep interest rates down and the economy rolling. But we had drastically different ideas about how to do it. Thank goodness we were able to get it done, because we argued and compromised in good faith and on principle, in a principled way.

What was the Democratic contribution to this balanced budget? I'll give you three. Number one, we made sure that we had a $500-per-child tax credit and that it extended even to lower income working people like rookie police officers and beginning teachers and others who have children who needed the tax benefits, even if their income tax liability was very low. Number two, we got $24 billion in there to provide health insurance to 5 million—half of the children of this country that don't have health insurance—$24 billion over the next 5 years. Number three, we got the biggest increased investment for education since 1965, and all these tax credits and IRA's and Pell grants for college; it's the biggest increase in aid for ordinary Americans seeking college education since the GI bill 50 years ago. That's what our party contributed to that budget agreement. I am proud of that, and I think that is worth supporting, and I feel very good about it.

So I just say to you, this matters. And I associate myself with the remarks that Mr. Solomont made. I think that our friends in the Republican Party can stand a fair fight, and I'd like to see us have a fair fight, because I think we can in the end put people ahead of politics and have principled agreement, as long as we have both parties able to take their ideas to the people and to make their case to the American people and to put their positions forward. You are making that possible, and for that I'm grateful.

Now, as you look ahead, I'd just like to mention a couple of things. Let's look into the future, short term and long term. What it's going to take to make this country work over the long term I think is continued success of the economic policy, dramatically improving the quality and reach of our educational efforts, figuring out a way to reconcile our obligation to preserve the environment and still grow the economy, and continuing to expand American trade. And this is one area where I think we have got to make a decision as Democrats where we're going to stand on the trade issue.

And I'd like to talk just briefly about each of those and one or two other things. One, let me just make this case. We're having this fast-track debate in Congress. Let me tell you, if you don't know what it is, fast track is simple. It sounds strange; it's basically normal trade authority for the President or his representative to make an agreement with another country about tearing down trade barriers, which then the Congress gets to vote on, but they have to vote it up or down.

Why? Well, if you were making a business deal with somebody and you signed on the dotted line, would you sign on the dotted line—and then it was contingent on its approval by the board of directors—you might sign that deal. If they said, "Everybody this person works for, every employee in the company can put an amendment on the deal" that you just made if you wanted to, you probably wouldn't sign the deal. You wouldn't know what it was.

All fast track is, it's just a power that's been given to Presidents over the last 20 years, mostly from Democratic Congresses to Republican Presidents, to go meet with other countries, make an agreement, and then be able to tell the other country, "My word is good. I'll deliver if the Congress approves it or if the Congress does not disapprove it." That's all it is. But if you don't have it, the other countries don't think you're serious, and they're not all that interested in doing business.

Why is it important to America? Number one, as a practical matter, our markets are more open than most other countries, so nearly anybody we can make a trade agreement with we'd wind up ahead because when they dropped their barriers and we dropped ours, they'd be dropping more than we would.

In a larger sense, what is the economic issue? We have 4 percent of the people in the world. You can look around this house tonight and tell that most of us have been very fortunate. And we as a people have 22 percent of the world's wealth, with 4 percent of the world's people. The developing countries, principally in Asia and Latin America but also increasingly in Africa, are going to grow at 3 times the rate of the wealthy countries, Europe, Japan, the United States, and Canada. Now, you tell me, if they grow 3 times as fast as we're going to grow in the next 10 years, and we have 4 percent of the world's people and 22 percent of the income, I do not believe we can keep

22 percent of the income unless we sell more of what we produce to them. And no one has been able to describe to me how we can do that. It can't happen.

Furthermore, if we want to lead the world for peace and freedom and we want to have more countries that are success stories on their own and fewer countries like Bosnia where we have to intervene to stop people from killing each other, then we need to be in a position to have political influence and form political partnerships with countries that are democracies and committed to free market economics. And you can't do that, you can't lead, if you are bringing up the rear.

So this is a big issue in the Congress. I hope I will prevail. I do believe that when we trade with other countries in the right way, we help to lift their labor standards. I think that if we have to honor environmental standards, they should, too. But the bottom line is, we got 4 percent of the folks. If we want 22 percent of the income, we have to sell to the other 96 percent. It is not complicated. And I hope that you will all support that position.

The second big issue we've got to face is the campaign finance reform issue. And there are two issues to campaign finance, not one. One is how much money we raise and how it's raised. The second is, how much money you have to spend to get elected.

And I saw on one of the networks tonight—maybe it was CNN—a clip where I was asking the students at San Jacinto—I said, "Most of you probably thought at some time or another that it was a terrible thing that politicians spent so much time raising money and the elections were so expensive." I said, "Let me ask you something. How many people have you voted for because you thought they had the best television ads? How many people have you voted for because you saw more of their ads? How many people have you voted against because you saw a negative campaign ad against them, and you didn't see them answer it on television so you thought you'd better not take a chance on that, and you voted for somebody else?" And they all started laughing as we rocked along, you know.

The fundamental problem in campaigns is the cost of communications has exploded and, therefore, the demand for the funds to raise that and to keep communicating for political parties and for candidates has been severe.

So I hope that this debate we're having on the McCain-Feingold bill will produce a bill that will, in effect, alleviate some of the pressures that have been on some of you in this room but will also keep you heavily involved in the process and get you to involve other people. I personally don't think it's a bad thing for a person who has done well in this country and believes in politics and wants to contribute something back to be able to do that. I think it's a good thing you're here tonight, not a bad thing, and I'm proud of you for doing it.

But I do think we ought to have a system that the American people as a whole have confidence in. Now, we can pass the McCain-Feingold bill. I hope we do. But in addition to that, I ask you also to recognize we have to cut the cost of the campaign. And the only way to do that in our country is to give people the benefit of free or reduced television, radio, newspaper, other communications time in return for cutting the cost of their campaign.

So when our friends in the media say that we ought to do something to clean up our house, I say, "You're going to have to help us. You can't say, 'Give me your money on the one hand, and stop raising it on the other.'" We have to do both these things, and I think we can together.

The second thing I want to say is, we're in a huge debate in Washington over education standards. Nearly everybody says we've got the best higher education system in the world. Most people concede we can improve our public education, and we have to. We are the only advanced country that has no national education standards and, therefore, no way of measuring whether all kids are meeting them.

So I have suggested we start with a reading test for fourth graders and a math test for eighth graders that would be voluntary, that could not be used against the children but would tell you how every child, every class, every school, every school district is doing against national standards. It is very important that our children be able to read and do basic math if you want them all to go to college. And I believe this is a good beginning.

There are areas of—a curious set of opposition to this, but I think that lower income kids, kids from difficult backgrounds, I think they need high educational standards in their schools even more than the rest of us do, because they have very few opportunities to make up for it

if they don't get it. And I am determined to see this fight through. But I hope you'll support me. It is not right for us not to have national academic standards of excellence.

So campaign finance, academic standards, fast track. The last point I want to make is, I want to encourage those of you in Houston who are involved in trying to find a way to bring your community together and not divide it by race. What I said in Little Rock yesterday is true: This country is a lot better than it was 40 years ago. It's better in terms of less discrimination. It's better in terms of more economic opportunity. In percentage terms, African-American family income rose faster than white American family income did in the last 4 years. We are building a middle class of minorities. That's the good news.

The bad news is that the disparities are still profound and access to credit and to being able to build businesses and to being able to be full participants in the American dream still show disparity in our country. And we have got to keep working to find fair ways not to give anything to anybody for which they are not qualified but to give everyone who is qualified a chance to fully participate in the American way of life and to give us a chance to work together across racial lines. I can't tell you how important I think that is.

Let me just ask you, before I sit down, you just think about this and think about this when you go home. Think about how much time I, as your President, have had to spend these last 5 years as your President working on your behalf dealing with countries where people could not get along because of their racial, religious, or ethnic differences.

In Bosnia, you have three groups of people who are ethnically, biologically indistinguishable, who are in different religious and ethnic groups by accident of history. Think about the Middle East. Think about my people, the Irish, where I'm hopeful we will have some real progress this year, arguing over what happened 600 years ago in battles. Think about Rwanda, where most of us might not be able to tell without being there a while a Hutu from a Tutsi, where hundreds of thousands of people were killed. How much time I have to spend on your behalf trying to keep people from literally killing each other because of their differences.

And here we have our—the school district across the river from me, that I get up and look at every morning when I get up in the White House, Fairfax County school district, has kids from 182 nations, speaking over 100 languages in one school district. We have 5 school districts with people from over 100 countries in it. But 2 years from now we'll have 12. People still believe in this country. They're still looking to come here to redeem the promise of America.

And I think that if we can figure out how to take a charitable but honest and open attitude toward working with people—which I must say I have seen more in abundance in Texas on questions of immigration and other things across party lines than I have in a lot of other States—if we can figure out how to do that, there is no stopping this country.

We have a sound economic policy, everybody gets an education, and we all work together, then the 21st century will be the time of America's greatest days. And that vision I started with 6 years ago will be protected. And if we can keep working together and finding principled compromises in the Congress, if I can convince the Congress and the Senate to confirm my judges, for example—[*laughter*]—if we can do the things that we ought to do, I believe we're going to be fine. But don't forget that depends upon having two parties that can fight for what they believe in within honorable bounds. And there are differences, and I gave you some of them tonight. When you go home tonight, I hope you will think about it and be glad you came.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:50 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Tilman and Paige Fertitta; special hosts F. Kenneth Bailey and John Eddie Williams; Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee; Ann Richards, former Texas Governor; and William H. White, chair, Texas Democratic Party.

The President's Radio Address
September 27, 1997

Good morning. I want to talk this morning about a very real threat to our judicial system. For more than 220 years, our Nation has remained young and strong by meeting new challenges in ways that renew our oldest values. Throughout our history, our judiciary has given life and meaning to those values by upholding the laws and defending the rights they reflect, without regard for politics or political party. That is the legacy of the judicial system our Founders established, a legacy we recalled this Thursday on the 40th anniversary of the court-ordered desegregation of Little Rock Central High School.

But in the past 18 months, this vital partnership has broken down as the Senate has refused to act on nomination after nomination. And in Federal courthouses across America, almost 100 judges' benches are empty. In 1996 the Senate confirmed just 17 judges. That's the lowest election-year total in over 40 years. This year I've already sent 70 nominations to Congress, but so far they've acted on less than 20. The result is a vacancy crisis in our courts that Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist warned could undermine our courts' ability to fairly administer justice.

Meanwhile, our courts are clogged with a rising number of cases. An unprecedented number of civil cases are stalled, affecting the lives of tens of thousands of Americans, from the family seeking life insurance proceeds, to the senior citizen trying to collect Social Security benefits, to the small business protecting its right to compete. In our criminal courts, nearly 16,000 cases are caught in limbo while criminals on bail await punishment and victims await justice. Our sitting judges are overloaded and overworked, and our justice system is strained to the breaking point.

The Senate's failure to act on my nominations, or even to give many of my nominees a hearing, represents the worst of partisan politics. Under the pretense of preventing so-called judicial activism, they've taken aim at the very independence our Founders sought to protect. The congressional leadership has actually threatened sitting judges with impeachment, merely because it disagrees with their judicial opinions. Under this politically motivated scrutiny, under ever-mounting caseloads, our judges must struggle to enforce the laws Congress passes and to do justice for us all.

We can't let partisan politics shut down our courts and gut our judicial system. I've worked hard to avoid that. And the people I've nominated for judgeships and had confirmed have had the highest rating of well qualified from the American Bar Association of any President since these ratings have been kept.

So today I call upon the Senate to fulfill its constitutional duty to fill these vacancies. The intimidation, the delay, the shrill voices must stop so the unbroken legacy of our strong, independent judiciary can continue for generations to come. This age demands that we work together in bipartisan fashion, and the American people deserve no less, especially when it comes to enforcing their rights, enforcing the law, and protecting the Constitution.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6 p.m. on September 26 in the Presidential Suite of the Westin Oaks Galleria Hotel in Houston, TX, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on September 27.

Remarks at the Hot Springs High School Ultimate Class Reunion in Hot Springs, Arkansas
September 27, 1997

Thank you very much. What a beautiful day. What a beautiful setting. I want to thank all of you for being here. I thank my dear friend David Pryor for his introduction, for continuing to play golf with me. [*Laughter*] And I forgive him for leaving Washington. It is a poorer place

for his absence. He served us so well there, and he graced the United States.

Thank you, Congressman Dickey, for being here today and for reaching across party lines, always with personal kindness, and I might say, always to stick up for our beloved State when it's under assault. We thank you for that.

Thank you, Governor McMath, who was a hero of my childhood, a hero of my young manhood, and he's still my hero. I'd like to be able to give a talk like that today. [*Laughter*] I was just over visiting with my 86-year-old aunt who graduated a year ahead of Sid McMath at Hot Springs High School; she was class of 1930. And I said, "Aunt Janet, do you want to come on over to the high school?" She said, "No, I don't get around all that well, and I've heard you give a lot of speeches." And I said, "Well it's not just me. It's David Pryor and Jay Dickey, and the mayor will be there." And I said, "Oh, Sid McMath is going to be there." And she said, "My God, he's the best-looking man and the best speaker I ever heard in my life." [*Laughter*] She said, "I'll be there." [*Laughter*] I don't know whether she's here or not, but she said she was coming.

I thank Governor McMath. I grew up as a child here living on the stories of how the GI's came home from World War II and took over the city government and the county government and cleaned it up and moved it forward. And I remember how Governor McMath stuck by Harry Truman when he was the first President who really advocated equal rights for all Americans, and he integrated the military, and he said we were going to have to get along together and go forward together. And it is in that tradition, I think, that so many of us try to serve. So I'm glad to see him.

And I want to say a special word of thanks to Helen Selig for being willing to run for mayor and serve as mayor of our hometown, because you have been unbelievable. Thank you so much. We thank you.

I thank David and Keeley for being willing to cochair this effort. Asking people for money is always a thankless effort, but they've made it about as attractive as you could make it, I think, today. If you haven't been through here, I hope you will go.

I want to thank all the members of my class who asked me to get involved in this, but especially the people who were my leaders so often when we were in high school: Phil Jamison, Jim French, and Carolyn Staley. I want to thank all the former teachers who are here. I see Mr. Spurlin and Mrs. Irons and Mrs. Luebben, a lot of other people—I'm sure Paul Root's here—see if I make any mistakes he can quote back to me later on. [*Laughter*] But all the former teachers from Hot Springs High School, thank you for being here. And I'll bet you we have a very good representation from my class. Who's here from the class of '64, raise your hands. [*Applause*] That's the most timid response I ever got. [*Laughter*] Judge Woods, thank you for coming.

Ladies and gentlemen, one of the things that has most bothered me as Hillary and I have worked in education over the last 20 years now, and as I have become President and had the chance to travel around the country and go into schools of all sizes and shapes all across America, is the dramatic decline in the offerings in the arts: in music, in other performing arts, in the visual arts.

We have so much evidence that children who have difficulties in their lives, that children who may come from disadvantaged backgrounds but may have a spark of mathematical ability, for example, do much better if they're given access to a music program. We have so much evidence that children who may have been emotionally scarred in some way may find a healthy and positive and wholesome way to get out of it if they're given a chance to be in a theater program, or to paint, or to do something else that gives some positive outlet to their energies and their feelings.

And we ought to be raising whole people. What we really want—since we know that over 90 percent of society's work can be done by over 90 percent of us—what we really have to raise are people that are whole, that are good, that have good values, but that are at peace with themselves, that are free to make good lives for themselves and, therefore, make a good future for our country.

So I think this is important because it's the kind of thing that ought to be done by people everywhere, to give our children a chance to have a full life. Here, it's even more important because we have so many people with artistic gifts who come here to live. Some of them come here to retire. When I walked in all the rooms there, I saw people of all ages doing all different kinds of things. And it will make us an even

better magnet. It will be a wonderful complement to the music festival, to the documentary film festival, to the school of math and science. It's something that makes, again, our town special. So I thank you for all of that.

Let me also say, the only thing I'm not sure I like about this is, I really don't think I'm old enough to have anything named after me. [*Laughter*] I thought you had to have at least one leg in the grave before they'd name anything for you. [*Laughter*] But if it helps raise another nickel, I accept, and I thank you. I'm profoundly honored.

Let me also say to all of you that if we really want to recover all the resources of this community and you want it to go into the next century with all the things that can happen here—if you go back to the 19th century, there's hardly a community anywhere within 500 miles that has a more unique history and that has more unique manifestations of that history still around, over the last 100 years or so—but if we want it to be that way, we're going to have to find a way to pay to develop it.

And David and Keeley have stuck their necks out, and we need to support them, both individually and corporately. They need help from our businesses and help from people who can afford to do it in accordance with their ability to pay. And I will do what I can to help to raise the funds as well. But we also need a large number of small contributions by people who may just be able to give a modest amount.

But I want this to be the people's house. I want you to feel when we get this done that it's not my name up there, that it's yours, every one of you if you contribute to it, when you go through these doors. And your children and your grandchildren and your parents and your grandparents may be there. That's what we're trying to do.

Finally, I can't help saying after what Governor McMath did that there are a lot of people I'm sure we all wish were here today. I know Governor McMath wishes the men who fought in the Second World War with him who didn't come home were here. All of us wish that our parents were here. We wish our teachers who aren't living anymore were here. I wish our four classmates who died in Vietnam and the others who have died since then were here.

But I guess most of all, I wish Johnnie Mae Mackey were here. And apparently so does Carol Wilson. So I would like to ask Johnnie Mae's incarnation to come up here and lead us in a little round of hullabaloo. [*Laughter*] Thank you all so much. God bless you. Let's make this a success, what do you say?

Cheerleaders, cheerleaders, come on. I swear, this is living evidence of a comment that I made the other day that our cheerleaders still all can fit in their uniforms. Here they are. [*Laughter*] Come on.

Now, for those of us who were here when Johnnie Mae Mackey ran this school—[*laughter*]—you know, everybody that came out of this high school and went in the Marine Corps during the period that Johnnie Mae Mackey ran the school found that it was a step down in discipline and order. [*Laughter*] So try to visualize those magic days now.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:17 p.m. on the front steps of the historic Hot Springs High School which became a junior high school in 1968. In his remarks, he referred to former Senator David Pryor; Sidney McMath, former Arkansas Governor; Mayor Helen Selig of Hot Springs; David French, chair, and Keeley Ardman DeSalvo, co-chair, William Jefferson Clinton Cultural Campus; Phil Jamison, president, Jim French, vice president, and Carolyn Yeldell Staley, secretary, class of 1964; Virgil Spurlin, the President's high school band director; Edith Irons, Lonnie Luebben, and Paul Root, teachers at Hot Springs High School; former Circuit Court Judge Henry Woods; and Carolyn Wilson, who led the cheer following the President's remarks.

Remarks at an Arkansas State Democratic Party Reception in Little Rock, Arkansas

September 27, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. Gosh, I'm glad to see you. Thank you, Chairman Gibson, Congressman Berry. You know, Marion Berry had me in his home and to coon suppers so many times I was practically paying part of the property tax down there. [*Laughter*] Then I got him to come to Washington to work, and he thought he'd gone to a foreign country. [*Laughter*] Now he's going to be there when I'm gone. [*Laughter*] And he's still doing that poor country boy routine, you know. He's just milking it for all it's worth. [*Laughter*] He's a good man and my dear friend, and I'm proud that he's my Congressman.

And Congressman Snyder, I'm glad to be the first constituent. I voted for you, and I just have one question. How come I don't ever get the newsletter? [*Laughter*]

You know, Vic Snyder is an unusual man. He was in the Marine Corps, and sometimes I think he has more courage than is good for him. He's always sticking his neck out. And he's got a medical degree and a law degree, and sometimes I think he knows more than anybody ought to have to carry around. [*Laughter*] But I am very, very proud that we have sent a person of his caliber to the United States Congress from this district. And you should all be proud of him. So I thank you for that.

And, Bynum, I thank you for organizing this, and I thank all of you for being here for the Arkansas legislature. When we had the tornadoes down here and I came down to look at Arkadelphia and College Station and fly over the parts of Benton that were hurt so badly, afterward I had about an hour, and I invited the legislators to come out here and see me at the airport. And there was a whole bunch of stuff going on—I didn't dream anybody would come. And more than half of you showed up, those of you who are legislators here. And I heard something from the Arkansas legislators I never thought I would hear as long as I lived. About 30 of them said, "We really miss you." [*Laughter*] I thought I would never hear it.

And then I made a mistake—I made the mistake they teach you in law school 101. They said, "Never ask a question you don't know the answer to." I made a mistake. I said, "Why?" [*Laughter*] And they said, "Because we could have so much fun when you were here because whenever it got going too far you would always stop us, and now we have to be responsible, and we have to do the right thing for the State of Arkansas." [*Laughter*]

But I think our legislators have done the right thing for the State. And because of the term limits law, all of you know that more than 50 of the seats will turn over. And that's really why we're all here.

I tell you, I've learned a lot of things in the last 5 years, and most of them have been utterly wonderful. Hillary and I have had a magnificent experience. Our daughter, thanks to the media and others, was permitted to have about as normal a childhood as you could have in Washington, living in the White House. And she's off at college now, and when we took her to Stanford, the student speaker to the parents got up and made the following remark—she said, "I don't want any of you to worry, your children will miss you—in November"—[*laughter*]—"for 15 minutes." [*Laughter*] So she's having a great time.

And our country is in better shape than it was 5 years ago when we started this odyssey. And I guess what I would like to say to you is that the country works best when there are two parties with different views that are both strong that are required by the dynamics of the situation to make principled compromise.

You heard what Vic said, that balanced budget we signed is a great thing for America. But I want you to know that the Democrats made some critical contributions to it without which it never would have happened. Number one, in 1993, without a single Republican vote, we took the tough vote on our economic plan, and the deficit had been reduced by 87 percent before the balanced budget act was passed. That's why we could pass one with all the good stuff in it, and you should never forget that.

Number two, what else did the Democrats put in? If it hadn't been for us, there never would have been $24 billion for children's health to give 5 million children, almost all of them

in lower income working families whose parents don't have health insurance on the job, the coverage of health insurance and the dignity and security their families deserve. We put that in there.

The third thing we did—which I think 30 years from now will live, along with the fact that we finally balanced the budget for the first time since Lyndon Johnson was President, will live as the enduring legacy—we literally can now say because of the HOPE scholarship, the $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college which covers the cost of tuition and fees at most of the community colleges in the country, because of the tax credits for the junior and senior year of college and graduate school and adults going back for job training, because you can now have an IRA you can withdraw from tax-free if you spend the money on education or a health insurance policy or to buy a first home, because we've got in the last 2 years 300,000 more work-study positions, and because we've got the biggest increase in Pell grants in 20 years, we can now say, finally, this country has opened the doors of college to every person in the country who is willing to work for it. And I'm proud of that, and you should be proud of that. And that was what our party put in there.

And it was our party that overwhelmingly supported the family and medical leave law and that got the minimum wage law raised for the first time in a very long time and in so many other ways. And it was our party, standing united, these Members of Congress behind me, that enabled us to stop the contract on America from going into effect in 1995, even after the Government was shut down. So it matters. There are differences that are honest in these parties, and it matters what we did.

There is another thing that Vic Snyder said that I don't think we ought to dwell on too much, but it bears repeating. There's a difference in the way we do our business, too. There is a difference in the way we do our business, too. And I came to Washington sick and tired of the politics of personal destruction. And many times over the last 4 years it has broken my heart to see how people tried to put all of you on trial and our whole State on trial. And I went back in my own mind to a chilling phone call I got in 1991 from a man who was kind of a friend of mine in the other party who said, "We can make people believe anything about Arkansas. You're the only guy that can beat us. If you run, we'll take it out on them." And they were as good as their word.

But you did not weaken, and I kept smiling and Hillary kept smiling, and the country kept doing better, and the people that were doing that just got madder and madder and madder and madder. But on the other hand, and against all odds after all you've been through, you came through, and you voted for me overwhelmingly again last time. And I am more grateful than I can say. But I want to tell you something else. It matters who holds these positions. It matters who is in the legislature.

You know, I was a voter. I voted against the term limits amendment. I used to joke with people that whenever John Miller walked in a room I was in, if there were 100 people in the room, the knowledge of State government doubled when he walked in a room. [*Laughter*] I used to say to people—I used to talk about the people that had been around there a long time, and we'd fight sometimes, but I always thought it was a good thing to have elected citizens with the real power reins.

And now we have to be sensitive because all of our newer members are going to have to rely more on permanent staff people, and they're going to have to listen more to the lobbyists because they'll have information they don't have. And so we're going to have to work hard to make adjustments. There is no such thing as a perfect system.

But we need good, knowledgeable, hard-working, honest people to present themselves to serve in the legislature more than ever before. And if there is any good thing about it, we'll have to go to people and say, "Look, you know you don't have to take your whole life doing this because we've got these term limits now, but your State needs you to step forward and serve."

And then I want to see the Democrats out there running positive campaigns. Vic and Marion will tell you, when I was pleading with all of our Democrats to vote for the balanced budget—because of the things that were in it, because it had integrity, it was a good Democratic budget, and I was sick and tired of seeing that Democrats were the party of tax-and-spend, when we took the deficit down all by ourselves—I argued the following: I said, "Look, when I became President, what did you hear

at every election about our party? What did they say? They said we were weak on national defense. They said we didn't really support a strong foreign policy. They said we couldn't be trusted to manage the economy. They said we were weak on crime and weak on welfare." I heard it all like a mantra, over and over again.

Well, they can't say that 5 years later, because our economy is the strongest it's been in a generation; because we have advanced the cause of peace and freedom around the world; because we have the lowest—biggest drop in welfare in history and the smallest percentage of Americans on welfare since 1970. After 20 years of immigration of poor people coming to America, we still have the smallest percentage of people on welfare since 1970. And the crime rate's dropped 5 years in a row.

So what is the subject? The subject is, how are we going to organize this country so that everybody has a chance to live up to his or her God-given capacities? How are we going to organize our lives so that people can work and still do their most important job, which is to raise their children properly? How are you going to balance the demands of work and family? How are we going to grow the economy and preserve the environment? Those are issues that require people with our kind of values and our kind of interests and our kind of insight. And the future depends upon that.

I pledged when I went to Washington I would change the Federal Government. I would make it more active but smaller, and give more power to the States. And we have done that. Now, if the States have more power on everything from education to welfare and a whole range of other issues, it then becomes even more important who is in the legislature.

So I'm telling you—I'm glad you're here. We need the money. [*Laughter*] I'm glad you're here. And I should point out that this fundraiser is completely consistent with the State law, and if we finally get Congress off the dime and pass the McCain-Feingold bill, all the limits here would be way under that bill. So this is the kind of thing that is good for America. I'm glad you're here, but I need two more things.

We need, number one, we need good candidates to come forward. And secondly, we need you to work to win. And let me just ask you for one more thing, and I'll be home to help. We must not—we must not—lose the seat now held by Senator Dale Bumpers in the election. And there are some really wonderful people who have either already made up their mind to run or who may yet decide to run. I ask only one thing, that they have a good, honest, positive debate, that they bring their best ideas forward, that they not cut each other up, and when it's all over—you remember how you felt and how I felt on the morning after the election when I had won this overwhelming victory, and yet for the first time in the history of the State of Arkansas a Democrat had lost a Senate seat. I don't want that to happen again, and we don't need that to happen again. I cannot be effective without a sufficient number of Democrats in the Senate.

I want you to be in a good humor about this. This country is in better shape. And don't worry about us. And the tougher it gets up there—I always know, the better America does, the worse they will try to make it. [*Laughter*] It drives them nuts. [*Laughter*] They just hate it, you know. And I don't understand it. I always thought we should be happy when people had jobs. [*Laughter*] I always thought we should be happy when the country was at peace. I always thought we should be happy when people were advancing peace and freedom, and we were actually marching forward and facing our problems.

But you know, there's a lot of wonderful people in Washington, and then some of it is like another country. [*Laughter*] And they'll be shed of me soon enough. They ought to just relax. [*Laughter*] Let us do our job. Let us go on.

Remember what I said—this was not a one-shot deal, my Presidency. It was a miracle; nobody thought it was going to happen. [*Laughter*]

Audience member. I did!

Audience member. We did!

The President. First—in the beginning, only my mother and my wife thought we were going to win. [*Laughter*] Even my daughter and I had doubts. [*Laughter*] But it's part of something bigger. It's got to be part of something bigger. You have to understand, there are fundamental differences about how we view the future. So that if you like what we've done, keeping Marion and Vic in office is a part of it; electing people to these vacancies in the legislature is a part of it; holding Senator Bumpers' Senate seat is a part of it. You have to see this as a part of our life's work. This is part of what we are as citizens.

Three years from now, I'm going to come home. We're going to have a library. We're going to have a lot of fun. I'm still going to be a citizen. I'm still going to care about this. And I want you to care about it.

Audience member. We all want to hammer 'em——

The President. So thank you for being here, but hammer 'em—hammer 'em. That's a good idea.

God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:45 p.m. on the grounds of Ray Winder Baseball Field. In his remarks, he referred to Bynum Gibson, chair, Arkansas State Democratic Party; and John Miller, Arkansas State representative.

Remarks at a Candlelight Vigil Honoring the Little Rock Nine in Little Rock

September 27, 1997

Thank you very much, Leta. Dr. and Mrs. Titus, members of the board, Tianka Mitchell, and students and faculty. Let me say, I thought Tianka did a fine job representing the students here and spoke very well.

Hillary and I are delighted to be joined by a number of members of our administration, including Secretary of Transportation Rodney Slater, Bob Nash, and Janis Kearney and Carroll Willis. And there may be others here, but I thank them all for coming.

I know there are a lot of officials out there. I see Senator Walker and Mayor Hays, and I'm sure there are others. I thank you for coming. Thank you, Daisy Bates. Reverend clergy, thank you for coming. And especially, of course, to the Little Rock Nine, I'm delighted to see all of you. We're really getting to be old friends now. [*Laughter*]

And you just heard an address from the person I have picked to be chief of the Presidential speechwriting division for the remainder of my term in office. That was a terrific job, not only because he spoke so well but because of what he spoke. And I want to come back to that in a moment.

I love Philander Smith. I used to jog by here most every morning. If it wasn't too early, usually the students would be out walking around and say hello to me. I've seen the physical improvements in the campus, and they're very impressive, and I congratulate you on them. You know Carroll Willis and Lottie Shackelford and my great friend the late Mahlon Martin all were graduates of Philander Smith, so I have been personally benefited by this school. And I thank you for that.

But I have to say a special word of appreciation to the choir, because the choir was the first choir from an historically black college to sing at the Presidential Inauguration—mine, in 1992. And I thank you very much for that. They've been back to Washington quite a few times since, and it's always a better place when they're there.

Let me say, tonight especially we have come, I would hope, to do two things. Nothing we can ever do, I think, will equal the emotional impact that the ceremony the day before yesterday in front of Central High School had not only on our State but, I think, on the entire country. I was in Texas yesterday and person after person after person came up to me, just overwhelmed by what they saw on the television and by the sight of the Little Rock Nine walking through the front doors, unimpeded.

As I understand it, the first thing we wish to do, and one which Dr. Roberts has already spoken about, is to acknowledge that there were others who may never have gotten their names in the newspapers, who had a lot to do with the way these young people turned into successful adults and were able to carry on their courageous struggle: parents and family members who were threatened with the loss of their jobs; neighbors who gave them everything from money to food to transportation; and of course the faculty here at Philander Smith who volunteered to tutor them, an extraordinary gift. And I would say to all of you who were involved

in that, they all turned out pretty well, and I thank you for that.

The second thing that I would like to respectfully suggest is that as we participate in this candlelight vigil, I would like to return to something I said at the end of my remarks. I think it is important, very important in life, perhaps the most important thing of all, obviously, to have a reconciled heart, to do things in the right way for the right reasons. But at some point it's also important that you do the right things, that the things you are doing make sense and move forward in our eternal struggle to open up genuine opportunity and make genuine advances. We can do better.

After the ceremony on Thursday, just for example, I stayed outside quite a long while. And I know a lot of people had to go in, it was very hot, but there were so many people there who had stayed there, and I wanted to shake their hands and listen to them, and there were especially a lot of young people there. And I shook hands, I'll bet, for an hour at the ceremony. And one young man came up to me and said—he appeared to be a high-school-age student—and he said, "Mr. President," he said, "I like this, and I like what you've said. But what are we going to do about all of us who are being dragged into these gangs, and how are we going to save kids' lives and keep them from doing that?"

So that's as good a place to start as any. If we have the right attitude about this and we know that one thing we have to do is to open up genuine access to educational opportunity and make sure whatever educational opportunity any child has in this district, it is excellence personified, how are we going to get all the children there in a position to take advantage of it?

I've worked hard in the last 5 years to make our streets and our neighborhoods and our schools safe. But we're still losing too many of our kids to gangs and to guns and to drugs. We are. You know, in the generation where we grew up, one of the reasons they did so well is that their parents and their grandparents and their neighbors instilled in them a code of conduct which meant if they ever got the least little chance, they would make the most of it. If they ever got the least little chance, they would make the most of it.

How many of our children today are not given that? And are all their neighbors doing everything they can to make sure that if they get the least little chance, they'll make the most of it? Are all of us who are interested in volunteering in the schools equally willing to walk the neighborhoods? Are we equally willing to walk on a street that is unfamiliar and walk into a home that we may not know and do what it takes in a personal way to try to rescue our children?

I spent a day in Boston not very long ago, and I went up there for a particular reason. There has not been a child—not a child—killed by a handgun in the city of Boston for almost 2 years—2 years. Now, it's a bigger city than Little Rock, with a lot of tough neighborhoods and a lot of poor neighborhoods and a lot of problems. But the police there walk the streets, and they walk with parents groups and citizens groups. And the probation officers, they make house calls. And the police officers, they make house calls. Instead of waiting to bust the kids when they get in trouble, they go to the homes and sit down and visit with the parents and say, "Your child needs help. I'm here to help."

And they have a delightful group of people that wear T-shirts, and they call themselves—no offense to the pastors in the audience—Streetwalkers. [*Laughter*] And they're proud of the double meaning because they've turned it on its head, because they're walking the streets to save people's lives, not to waste people's lives.

I say that to make the point that what we owe the Little Rock Nine is to do our part in this time to deal with the new problems of this time and the unresolved problems of their time, so that when our time is done, at least our kids have something else to worry about. At least our kids have something else to worry about.

I'll never—one of the wiser men I ever met in public life was a former Secretary of State, United States Senator, and Governor of Maine, Edmund Muskie. And when he was still living, in 1983, Hillary and I went to Maine to a Governors' meeting. And we were having a very relaxed conversation, and I said, "Mr. Secretary," I said, "of all the jobs you ever held, which one did you like the best?" He said, "I think I liked being Governor the best, because I was close to people and their problems and their hopes and dreams." And I said, "Well, how do you define success for a Governor?" He said, "Success is whether you leave the person who comes after you a new set of problems

or whether they're dealing with the same old problems." He said, "Look," he said, "the Bible teaches us that human nature is inherently flawed and that there will be problems till the end of time, but if you leave your people who come after you the same old problems, then you haven't done your job. Leave it up to God to figure out what the next generation's problems are going to be. Don't saddle them with yours."

And so I say to you, that's what I hope you will think about. Think about the kids in the gangs. Think about whether they could have made it if there hadn't been any neighbors to support them, if there hadn't been a Philander Smith to tutor them, if they had had to worry about going home and getting run over by somebody who just made a big drug sale, if they were estranged from people who were in a violent gang.

Hillary and I have been with children in cities in this country, little children, who said their biggest fear in life was being shot going to and from school. We used to have fire drills when I was in school, and then we used to have drills about what we would do if there were an alert from the Soviet Union dropping a nuclear weapon. These kids used to have gun drills, and they practiced dropping themselves on the floor in case they heard gunshots. Now, that's the problem of our generation. We dare not give that to the next generation.

And I could just tell you, the reason I wanted to have this dialog on race is that I think that our racial diversity is the biggest advantage we've got going into the future if we can get our hearts right, if we can think right, but if we can do the right things.

So my pledge to the Little Rock Nine, and I hope yours will be, is that we can't promise to leave our children with no problems, but let's promise them that we'll get rid of the ones that they're facing today. And they'll do just fine.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:45 p.m. on the lawn of the Administration Building at Philander Smith College. In his remarks, he referred to Leta Anthony, president, Leadership Roundtable, and director of the candlelight vigil program; Myer L. Titus, president, Philander Smith College, and his wife, Constance; Tianka Mitchell, student government president; Arkansas State Senator Bill Walker; Mayor Patrick Henry Hays of North Little Rock; Daisy Bates, publisher and founder, Arkansas State Press newspaper and advocate of the Little Rock Nine in 1957; the late Mahlon Martin, first minority director of the Arkansas State Finance Department; and Carroll Willis, director, communications services division, and Lottie Shackelford, vice chair for women's advocacy, Democratic National Committee. The President also referred to the Little Rock Nine: Jefferson Thomas, Ernest Green, Minnijean Brown Trickey, Carlotta Walls LaNier, Gloria Ray Karlmark, Thelma Mothershed-Wair, Elizabeth Eckford, Melba Pattillo Beals, and spokesperson Terrence Roberts.

Remarks on Presenting the National Arts and Humanities Medals
September 29, 1997

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the White House. I thank the Members of Congress for coming, the members of the councils who stood up and were recognized. I also want to thank the First Lady for that very nice speech and unusual introduction. [*Laughter*]

The spin that was put on my going to the opera at home was slightly different than the one you heard. It went more like, "I've been trying to get you to do this for 5 years now. I know you will like this if you go. And besides, it's 'Carmen,' it's your kind of thing." [*Laughter*] And then afterward I said, "Gosh, I just loved that, and I thought Denyce Graves was great, and it was fabulous." And she said, "I told you. I told you. I told you." So I was glad to have the sort of sanitized version presented to you. But I thought, in the interest of openness, I should tell you the whole story. [*Laughter*]

Let me again say to all of you, you are very welcome here in the White House. And let me

say a special word of thanks to two people: first, to Jane Alexander for her outstanding leadership of the National Endowment of the Arts, thank you; and second, to Sheldon Hackney, who recently left his job as Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, but who did a wonderful job for the United States in the position, thank you.

This morning we honor 20 men and women and one organization for extraordinary achievement in arts and humanities. And in giving these awards, we also applaud the achievements of our country. We celebrate our capacity for individual expression and common understanding, and we rejoice in our Nation's thriving and growing diversity. We take pride in the power of imagination that animates our democracy.

And above all, by giving these awards we declare to ourselves and to the world, we are, we always have been, and we always will be a nation of creators and innovators. We are, we always have been, and we always will be a nation supporting our artists and scholars. It is our heritage. It must be a great gift we give to the future.

As Hillary said, as we work up to the millennium, we will be observing it in many ways over the next 4 years that both honor our past and encourage our people to imagine the future. Today I invite each of you to be partners in that endeavor in the White House Millennium Program, to help us to make sure the millennium is marked by a renewed commitment to the arts and humanities in every community in our Nation.

One of the most important goals for the millennium is to give every child in America access to the universe of knowledge and ideas by connecting every school and library in our country to the Internet by the year 2000. Working together with business leaders, we've made solid progress. And as we work to connect our schools and libraries we must make sure that once our children can log on to the Internet they don't get lost there.

So today I'm pleased to announce that on the 27th of October the National Endowment for the Humanities, in partnership with MCI and the Council of Great City Schools, will throw the switch on a new educational website called EDSITEment—EDSITEment, not bad—[*laughter*]. This exciting new tool will help teachers, students, and their parents to navigate among the thousands of educational websites, and there are literally tens of thousands of them now. Most important, it will expand our children's horizons and instill in them an early appreciation for the culture and values that will be with them throughout their lives.

President Kennedy once said he looked forward to an America that raised the standards of artistic achievement and enlarged cultural opportunities for all citizens. The men and women we honor today have brought us much closer to realizing that vision. More than 30 years later, at the edge of the new millennium, we must pledge ourselves anew to meet this challenge.

Now it gives me great pleasure to present the 1997 National Medal of Arts and National Medal of Humanities awards. First, the National Medal of Arts.

Like Martha Graham and Georgia O'Keeffe, Louise Bourgeois' name is synonymous with innovation, and her life is proof that creative impulse never fails. In 1981 her retrospective at the Museum of Modern Art, the first to be devoted to a woman artist, encompassed 40 years of extraordinary work. Since then, she has created another lifetime of enduring art, and I have no doubt she has more to teach us.

Ladies and gentlemen, Jean-Louis Bourgeois, the artist's son, will accept the award on her behalf. Louise Bourgeois.

[*At this point, the President and the First Lady presented the medal to Mr. Bourgeois, who then gave the President a gift.*]

Don't worry, I'll report this on my gift form. Thank you. [*Laughter*]

When Betty Carter sings "Baby, It's Cold Outside," it makes you want to curl up in front of a fire, even in the summertime. Performing with the likes of Ray Charles, Dizzy Gillespie, Charlie Parker, and Lionel Hampton, she is truly a goddess in the pantheon of jazz. Her greatness comes not only from her unforgettable voice but from her passionate commitment to helping young artists develop their own careers.

Ladies and gentlemen, the incomparable Betty Carter.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Ms. Carter.*]

We can't celebrate art today without celebrating the people who help us to experience it. Aggie Gund has spent a lifetime bringing art into the lives of the American people. With the

"Studio in a School," she forged a new partnership between professional artists and public schools to introduce children to the joys of creative expression.

And I might say, that's even more important today. One of the things that a lot of us who care about our schools are concerned about are the dwindling opportunities too many of our children have in the arts of all kinds, because we know it gives these children, so many of them, a chance to learn, to grow, to find positive means of self-expression. If they never become any kind of artist, the increase in self-understanding, self-control, self-direction, and pure, old-fashioned enjoyment in life is more than worth the effort. And so we are especially grateful to Aggie Gund. As president of the Museum of Modern Art, she is helping to usher in the 21st century of art.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's an honor to present her today.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Ms. Gund.*]

From the National Mall to the National Gallery, Dan Kiley has helped to redefine the American landscape. He's one of those rare artists who join the beauty and variety of nature with the joy and form of design. In his thought-provoking, memorable designs, building and site come together as one, proving that great landscapes and great buildings are part of the same vision.

Ladies and gentlemen, Dan Kiley.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Kiley.*]

It is no mystery—[*laughter*]—why Angela Lansbury deserves this award. From the Royal Shakespeare Theatre to Broadway to television, she has created vivid characters we can't forget. For that work, she has earned three Academy Award nominations, four Tony Awards, and 16 Emmy Awards. To that wall of honors we add this one, for she is her own unforgettable character.

Ladies and gentlemen, Angela Lansbury.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Ms. Lansbury.*]

A hush falls in the Metropolitan Opera as the great chandelier rises and James Levine raises his baton. For 25 years and 1,600 performances of 70 different operas, countless operagoers, television watchers, and radio listeners have shared that experience and shared in the great gift of his talent. His work has renewed the grand tradition of opera and infused it with new life for the next generation of opera lovers.

Ladies and gentlemen, James Levine.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Levine.*]

I really admire him. He was up here looking for his mother. He says, "I know she's out here somewhere." [*Laughter*] Where is she? Good for you. Thank you.

Just hearing Tito Puente's name makes you want to get up and dance. With his finger on the pulse of the Latin American musical tradition and his hands on the timbales, he has probably gotten more people out of their seats and onto the dance floor than any other living artist. For 50 years now, the irrepressible joy of his irreplaceable music has won him four Grammy Awards, countless honors, and a wide world of fans.

Ladies and gentlemen, Tito Puente.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Puente.*]

If anyone has actually given a voice to American dramatic arts, it is Jason Robards. In the great works of our greatest playwrights, Eugene O'Neill, Lillian Hellman, Clifford Odets, Arthur Miller, and in Academy Award performances in great movies like "All the President's Men," he has brought the American experience to life with characters that animate history and illuminate the human condition. And every one of us who has ever had to give a significant number of public speeches has wished at some moment in his life that he had a voice like Jason Robards. [*Laughter*]

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Robards.*]

Edward Villella quite literally leapt onto the world stage of ballet and changed it forever with the stunning grace and muscular athleticism that are his signature style. As principal dancer with the New York City Ballet, he collaborated with the men who defined 20th century ballet, George Balanchine and Jerome Robbins. And as artistic director of the Miami City Ballet, he is attracting the ballet audience of the 21st century.

Ladies and gentlemen, the remarkable Edward Villella.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Villella.*]

There may not be a serious, committed baby boomer alive who didn't at some point in his or her youth try to spend a few minutes at least trying to learn to pick a guitar like Doc Watson. A guitar virtuoso whose unique style merges many musical traditions, he started his remarkable career at age 13, armed with a $12 guitar and a deep love of mountain music. Five Grammy Awards and a lifetime of achievement later, he still lives in the land his great-great-granddaddy homesteaded, and he's still making that old-time mountain music.

Ladies and gentlemen, Doc Watson.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Watson.*]

For our artists to create the kind of works we're here to celebrate, they have to have three things: time, space, and inspiration. For nearly half a century, that is what more than 4,500 artists have found at the MacDowell Colony. On this 450-acre farm in rural New Hampshire, Thornton Wilder wrote "Our Town;" Leonard Bernstein finished his great "Mass." Today, a new generation of artists thrives in the atmosphere created by composer Edward MacDowell and his wife, Marian.

Ladies and gentlemen, the award to the MacDowell Colony will be accepted by the chairman of the MacDowell Colony, a man we all know in other guises, Robert MacNeil.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. MacNeil.*]

Now I have the honor of introducing the recipients of the National Humanities Medal, men and women who keep the American memory alive and infuse the future with new ideas.

First, Nina Archabal. To those who know and work with her, she is a fireball who lets no one stand in the way of her mission to preserve Minnesota's history. To the State of Minnesota, she's a bridge-builder between native peoples and other Minnesotans, helping them share their stories. To America, she exemplifies how tradition informs everyday life and shapes history. And just this morning she told the President that it was high time he high-tailed it out to Minnesota to see exactly what she was doing. [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, Miss Nina Archabal.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Ms. Archabal.*]

David Berry and I share a goal: to strengthen our Nation's 2-year community colleges so that more Americans can get the education they need to succeed in life, no matter how old they are or where they come from. As professor of history at Essex County College in Newark, New Jersey, he's broadened the horizons and expanded the dreams of his students. As director of the Community College Humanities Association, he's helping 2-year colleges all over the country to do the same.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't know how many of you have ever spent any time in these 2-year institutions, but they are exhilarating in the opportunities they offer to people who not so long ago would never have been able to dream of them. And the fact that we are bringing the humanities into them and putting them front and center is a very important part of inspiring the Americans of the 21st century, because more and more of them will find their way to these remarkable institutions.

Ladies and gentlemen, David Berry.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Berry.*]

After a very, very successful career as chairman and CEO of an investment banking firm, Richard Franke could well have rested on his achievements. Instead, he made it his mission to advance the cause of the humanities in everyday life. Through the Chicago Humanities Festival he founded in 1989, he's bringing the pleasures of art and ideas to the people of the great city of Chicago. And his commitment to the humanities extends to the entire Nation.

Ladies and gentlemen, Sir Richard Franke.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Franke.*]

I doubt that there is a more revered force in American education today than Bill Friday. As president of the University of North Carolina, he devoted himself to improving education for all Americans. There is hardly an important

educational task force he has not been a member of. He helped to found the National Humanities Center. He sat on the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the President's Task Force on Education. As executive director of the Kenan Charitable Trust, he continues his life of achievement.

I can tell you that in all the years that I served as Governor and Hillary and I worked to improve education for our children from kindergarten through higher education and to change the horizons of the South in ways that would bring people together and elevate their conditions, no one was more respected or had more influence on how we all thought and what we tried to do than the remarkable Bill Friday.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Friday.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Friday.*]

I think I should say that our next awardee, Don Henley, is not in the wrong category. [*Laughter*] He has already won so many awards for his wonderful, wonderful music, he may think that he doesn't need another. But today we honor him not for another hit record but instead for 7 years of relentless effort to protect a vital part of America's history, the woods that inspired Henry David Thoreau to write his greatest work, "Walden." Through his support of the Thoreau Institute, Don is also keeping Thoreau's great legacy alive for the 21st century.

I've known Don for many years, and I told him today right before we came out here that if I had a nickel for every time he has hit on me to preserve the woods around Walden Pond, I would indeed be a wealthy man. [*Laughter*] He has done his job to preserve a profoundly significant part of our legacy as a larger part of his passionate commitment to preserving our environment and our natural heritage.

Ladies and gentlemen, Don Henley.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Henley.*]

Great writers reveal a world we've never seen but instantly recognize as authentic. Maxine Hong Kingston is such a writer. In her groundbreaking book "The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of Girlhood Among Ghosts," she brought the Asian-American experience to life for millions of readers and inspired a new generation of writers to make their own unique voices and experiences heard.

Ladies and gentlemen, Maxine Hong Kingston.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Ms. Kingston.*]

The great chorus of American voices has also been immeasurably enlarged by the work of Luis Leal. For 50 years he has told the story of the Chicano people, here in America and all over the Latin world. In 16 books he has revealed the unique voice of Latin literature. In 1995, in recognition of his great contributions, the University of California created the Luis Leal Endowed Chair in Chicano Studies, the only one of its kind in our Nation.

Ladies and gentlemen, Luis Leal.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Leal.*]

As we approach the millennium, many Americans are examining their own and our Nation's spirituality, faith, and the role of religion in our Nation's life. No one has thought more deeply about these questions than Martin Marty, a renowned scholar of religious history, the author of 50 books, the director of the Public Religion Project at the University of Chicago which finds common ground in our diverse communities of faith.

Among many things to which he is faithful, he is faithful to his teaching, and he told me he is missing class today, one of the very few times in a very long career of teaching. We have all been enriched by his work, and we thank him for it.

Ladies and gentlemen, Martin Marty.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Marty.*]

Paul Mellon has elevated the great tradition of American philanthropy to an art form. His gifts have immeasurably strengthened the cultural institutions that are at the very heart of our civil society, including, of course, the National Gallery here in Washington. With his sister, he established the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Nation's largest private funder of the humanities. And through his exceptional generosity, he has enriched the libraries of our Nation with precious collections of the world's greatest works.

Ladies and gentlemen, Robert Smith of the National Gallery of Art will accept the award on behalf of Paul Mellon.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal to Mr. Smith.*]

No one has done more to expand the American library of voices than Studs Terkel. He has quite literally defined the art of the oral history, bringing the stories of ordinary people to life in his unique style and letting the everyday experiences that deepen our history speak for themselves. That is why I am very pleased he has agreed to advise the White House Millennium Program on the best way to collect family and community histories, a project we will launch with the NEH this spring.

Ladies and gentlemen, a true American original, Mr. Studs Terkel.

[*The President and the First Lady presented the medal and congratulated Mr. Terkel.*]

He just thanked me for coordinating the medal with his trademark shirt, tie, and socks. [*Laughter*] The rest of our honorees will just have to abide it. We were trying to get the wardrobe right.

Let me again thank all of you for coming and say a special word of thanks to Senator Pell and to Congressman and Mrs. Capps, to Congressman Horn, Congresswoman Maloney, Congresswoman Pelosi, Congressman Serrano, and Congressman Burr. And I thank them. We have talked a lot about all the fights that exist between the President and Congress over the NEH and the NEA. It's important to recognize we've got some good supporters there, too.

Let me invite you to enjoy the Marine Orchestra, to enjoy each other, to enjoy this beautiful day and the rich gifts our honorees have given us.

Thank you very much for coming.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Metropolitan Opera mezzo-soprano Denyce Graves; former Senator Claiborne Pell; and Lois Capps, wife of Representative Walter Capps.

Message on the Observance of National Arts and Humanities Month, 1997

September 29, 1997

America celebrates October as National Arts and Humanities Month to recognize the unique role that the arts and humanities play in the lives of our families, our communities, and our country.

For more than 200 years, the arts and humanities have distinguished us as individuals and united us as a nation. The arts empower us to express ourselves and to understand and appreciate the expressions of others. Through the study of literature, history, and philosophy, we learn to build on the riches of our past to create a firm foundation for a better future. Together, the arts and humanities teach us to celebrate the cultural diversity unique to America, while transcending differences in race, ethnicity, age, or creed.

Each day our world evolves further from our notion of the familiar, and we must adapt to its changing nature. In this challenging time, we look to our artists and scholars to inform our decisions and our actions. Musicians, actors, philosophers, playwrights, painters, writers, sculptors, dancers, and historians share with us their talent and training, inspiring our finest achievements and giving voice to our deepest aspirations.

Because we discover our greatest possibilities through the exploration of the human spirit, we must encourage our young people to build on this cultural legacy and seek their highest potential in the arts and humanities. Children inspired by their own creative achievements excel in other areas of learning, developing the skills and the confidence to create better lives and brighter futures.

As we observe National Arts and Humanities Month this year, let us reflect on the role of these vital pursuits in our individual lives and in the life of our democracy. Today, on the threshold of a new millennium, they are more essential than ever to the endurance of our values of tolerance, pluralism, and freedom; to our understanding of where we are and where we

need to go. Let us remember that the arts and humanities are a necessity, not a luxury, and that every American deserves to have access to them. And let us resolve to sustain America's national commitment to the arts and humanities so that we may preserve for the generations to come the great artistic and intellectual life of our nation.

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 29.

Remarks on the Income and Poverty Report and an Exchange With Reporters

September 29, 1997

The President. I don't know if I can go on. [*Laughter*]

Good morning. This Friday will mark the sixth anniversary of the day I announced my intention to run for President of the United States. On that day, I challenged America to embrace an urgent mission for the 21st century, to preserve the American dream, restore the hopes of the forgotten middle class, and reclaim the future for our children.

As President, I have worked hard to set America on that track, to fulfill that mission, putting in place a bold strategy to shrink the deficit, invest in our people, and expand the sales of America's products and services abroad. I am pleased to announce today that we have more evidence that our economic strategy is succeeding.

This morning the Census Bureau released its annual Survey of Income and Poverty in America. It shows that last year the typical family benefited from a significant increase in income for the third year in a row. Since we launched our economic plan in 1993, the typical family's annual income has risen by nearly $2,200 a year. That's an extra $2,200 that hard-working families can put toward their children's education, a downpayment on a home, or even a much needed vacation. After years and years of stagnant family incomes, today's report proves that America's middle class, no longer forgotten, is rising fast.

It should be noted that these figures do not reflect several other dividends of prosperity we have delivered for the American people. They don't reflect the $500-per-child tax credit, the $1,500 HOPE scholarship, the education IRA's, the real benefits of lower interest rates and mortgage costs worth $1,000 a year or more to millions of homeowners.

And rising incomes are also lifting families out of poverty. The report shows that while there is clearly much more to be done, the African-American poverty rate has fallen to its lowest level ever. The income of the typical Hispanic household grew more last year than in any single year on record. The child poverty rate has dropped, in the past 3 years, more than in any 3-year period since the 1960's. And the earned-income tax credit, which we have dramatically expanded and then fought hard to preserve, has raised more than 4 million people out of poverty last year.

The report also shows we have more to do to extend opportunity to all Americans. Starting in the 1970's, income inequality rose sharply. Now it has stabilized. Since 1993, every income group has seen its income rise, with those in the lowest 20 percent showing the fastest gains, thanks in part to the minimum wage, to more jobs, and to the earned-income tax credit, which is not measured in the statistics. But we still have to do more to grow together in the 21st century.

Let me say that this report also underscores another important challenge, one that I have been concerned about for a long time. Last year there were 800,000 more children without health insurance than the year before. However, thank goodness, many of these children will now be eligible for coverage under the balanced budget's historic $24 billion child health initiative, which takes effect this week.

Two years ago we were fighting hard to save Medicaid's guarantee to 4 million children. Now we're looking forward to extending child health insurance to another 5 million children. We have

to work together to encourage the States to take full advantage of this opportunity and to make sure that the funds are spent actually insuring children who do not have health insurance today.

To ensure that all our people benefit from the growing economy, we also have to make sure that our people have access to the world's best education, with high standards in the basics. And we have to address the pressing issue of child care. That is another thing that would help to alleviate pressures on middle and lower income working families' households. The first-ever White House Conference on Child Care will be held later this fall. It will focus on how we can help parents to succeed at home and work through quality, affordable child care.

In all these ways we can continue to fulfill what I started out to do 6 years ago, preserving the American dream, restoring the middle class, reclaiming the future for our children. But this is good news. And now, Janet Yellen and Gene Sperling will be able to answer questions about the details of the proposals.

Thank you.

Campaign Finance Reform

Q. What do you think is the chance of getting campaign finance reform through this session this year?

The President. Well, I hope it's good. It's certainly better than it was a month ago. Obviously, there is still strong opposition to it in the leadership of the Republican Party, and they're in the majority in Congress. But I've seen some encouraging signs in the Senate, and frankly, I've seen some encouraging signs in the House with some Republican Members willing to speak up and say that we ought to do something. So I'm quite hopeful that we will get something.

I know this—if we just—the way these things work, if we can succeed in keeping the public spotlight on the debate, then the pressure will build to come out with something positive. And I have done what I could, and I'm very proud of our caucus in the Senate for doing what it has done. The Democrats have clearly come out unanimously for some—for campaign finance reform. And we've just got to keep the public spotlight on this and keep going until we get legislation.

Welfare Reform

Q. Mr. President, many States, California, Texas, Florida, acknowledge that they're going to fail the first real test of the new welfare law, the requirement that they have 75 percent of two-parent welfare families in jobs and job training by next week. Will HHS impose the fines that it is allowed to do on the States? And what—does it shake your confidence, this failure—shake your confidence in the new welfare law?

The President. No, because, first of all—let me answer the second question first. It doesn't shake my confidence in the law, because we have succeeded, I think, beyond anybody's expectations, partly from the growing economy and partly from welfare reform efforts, in reducing the welfare rolls more than they have ever been reduced in a comparable time period, ever.

We've had 20 years of immigration in our country at high levels, many of the immigrants coming here come without many resources, and they want to work their way into the American dream. So we've had a lot of people coming in here, and yet we've been successful in having the smallest percentage of our people on welfare since 1970.

So my answer to you is, I want to keep high standards, and I want them enforced, because we block-granted the money to the States they asked for. After all, they supported the law. They said we could keep the Federal guarantee for health care and food stamps, nutrition, which I insisted on, but they pointed out that they already had the freedom to set different welfare reimbursement levels every month, so they wanted control of that pot of money so they would have more flexibility to move people from welfare to work. And in return, they agreed to these targets.

So I think we just need to keep pushing ahead. In terms of what should be done, obviously I want to consult with our people at HHS and others to do what is best. But I think most States really are working hard and in good faith to try to do this. I think that they know that's what the voters want and, most importantly, that's what the people on welfare want. So we don't want to just forget about our high standards, especially when we've proven we can hire a lot more people than we ever thought we could.

Campaign Finance Reform

Q. You mentioned Republicans in the House. This weekend Speaker Gingrich was unusually caustic, accusing your staff and your lawyers of blocking pursuit of the truth in law. Have you looked back at your records and the phone calls that you have made and come to any new conclusion about your own involvement?

The President. First of all, I think—no, I have not come to any new conclusion. But I think the remarks this weekend were an attempt to divert the public attention from the fact that the leadership of the Republican Party in the House opposes campaign finance reform, and has consistently, and continues to do so.

But I am encouraged that along with our Democrats who are supporting it, there are an increasingly vocal band of brave Republicans willing to stick up and be for it. And again, this is our chance to pass this bill, and I think we'd all be making a mistake to be diverted. I don't intend to be.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:03 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Remarks at the National Arts and Humanities Medals Dinner

September 29, 1997

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to begin the dinner by saying a special word of welcome to all of you.

Frequently in this room, it is my privilege on behalf of the people of the United States to offer a toast to a visiting leader of another nation or to showcase our culture to the world. Tonight it is my privilege to honor the leaders of that culture, our artists and scholars and those who support their work.

Our economy is measured in numbers and statistics, and we got some more good numbers today, and for that I'm very grateful. But nonetheless, in our childhood, at the end of our lives, and in the most important moments in between, we know that our own enduring worth and the enduring worth of our Nation lies in our shared values and our soaring spirit.

Lewis Mumford once wrote, "Love, poetry, disinterested thought, the free use of the imagination—here are the sustaining values of a living culture." Through the work you do and the lives you lead, you are sustaining our living culture and swelling the chorus of American voices.

I have to note, sadly, as many of you must doubtless know now, that we lost one of those great voices today when Roy Lichtenstein passed away. Two years ago I had the great privilege of giving him the award that I was able to bestow on several of you today. He was especially valuable and treasured by us here in the White House because of his support for our Arts in Embassies program.

The point I think he would like me to make tonight is that every one of us, each in our own time, has just a little time, whether we live a short or a long life by conventional standards. Therefore, it falls to every one of us to make sure that there is a next generation of artists and scholars who have the opportunity to learn and to create, so that the next generation of ideas can take root and grow.

So tonight, as we celebrate the remarkable accomplishments of the men and women we honor here, let us also rededicate ourselves to that future mission.

Now, I ask you all to join me in raising our glasses in a toast to the 1997 National Medal of Arts and National Humanities Medal recipients.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:43 p.m. on the State Floor at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to artist Roy Lichtenstein, 1995 National Medal of Arts recipient.

Remarks on Congressional Action on Education Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

September 30, 1997

The President. I have said that I had no higher priority than getting our children the best education in the world in the 21st century and that to achieve that politics must stop at the schoolhouse door. I'm committed to making sure every 8-year-old can read, every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old can go on to college, every adult can continue to learn through a lifetime. And we have made significant progress in our efforts to strengthen, improve, and hold more accountable public education.

As Congress continues to debate the education bill this fall, it's become clear that there are some who are waging an effort to undermine our commitment to public education and our public schools. First, the Senate has passed an amendment that would virtually close the Department of Education and abolish some of its most successful efforts to expand school choice and charter schools, to bring computers to every classroom, to create more safe and drug-free schools.

Second, the House of Representatives has actually voted to prevent our country from setting high standards of academic excellence with voluntary national tests to ensure that every child masters the basics in reading and math. I will veto any legislation that damages our commitment to public education and to high national standards. I am pleased that our effort on standards has received strong bipartisan support in the Senate, and I intend to continue this fight for as long as it takes.

Third, in a vote to occur today, some in Congress would diminish our country's commitment to public education by siphoning badly needed funds away from our public schools into a voucher program that would support private academies for a very limited number of students.

Ninety percent of our children in America attend public schools. Our public schools do face a host of challenges. Every city especially faces problems with large numbers of poor children and often old facilities and other difficult challenges. But the answer, the answer is to put competition, change, excellence, accountability back into the public school system, not to take limited funds away from it.

The District of Columbia has some very good public schools, and others that are not performing as well as they should. We can have more competition there and more options for parents and children without abandoning the schools through public school choice and greater use of charter schools. I have worked very hard on these things for the last several years and will continue to support them.

But instead of abandoning our schools, we should continue to support proven reform efforts, including getting more parents involved, improving teaching, getting drugs out of the schools, getting more discipline in the schools, raising the standards so that we can hold teachers and principals, schools, and students accountable.

Public schools are the cornerstone of our democracy. We have always recognized our common responsibility for preparing all our young children for the challenges of the future. I call upon Congress to challenge our public schools, to change our public schools, but not to walk away from them.

Thank you.

Internal Revenue Service

Q. Mr. President, what are your concerns about a credibility or confidence crisis for the IRS, and what do you think about this Republican idea for an independent board for oversight?

The President. Well, first of all, I think some very important things came out of those hearings to which the IRS has to respond. There has been some response already. But let me back up a little bit and say we have been working to professionalize, not to politicize, the IRS for the last several years. I signed the Taxpayer Bill of Rights about a year and a half ago. We established an IRS modernization board to improve technology and customer service.

One of the things that I asked my staff to find out for me after the hearings were held is, how many of the abuses that were reported occurred before the Taxpayer Bill of Rights was

passed? How many, if they occurred after the Taxpayer Bill of Rights was passed, were a violation of those law's requirements? And then, where are we going to go from here? That's the most important thing.

For quite a long while now, the Vice President and Secretary Rubin have been working on a project, part of the Vice President's National Performance Review, to change and improve the IRS, and Secretary Rubin will have some more to say about that later. But we believe that we have to respond to what was said.

There were some difficult issues posed, and you have pointed out some of them in your reporting. But I think that we should continue to press ahead with change. But I think it's very important that all the American people have confidence that they're going to be treated fairly and that taxes will be collected in a fair, nondiscriminatory, and nonburdensome manner, and that we will not have any kind of abuse there. And so we intend to push ahead.

Q. But are you concerned that the Government's tax collecting agency faces credibility and confidence problems because of the specter of those hearings?

The President. Well, I think they raise some legitimate points that ought to be responded to. I believe the IRS is functioning better today than it was 5 years ago. I think it has to improve more. And I think we should not try to sweep any of these problems under the rugs. I followed the hearings with great interest, and I am glad to see that there has been some action based on the evidence that was adduced at the hearings already, and there will be more. But I think it's also important to know that we have done a lot of things to try to make the IRS more accountable, more professional. We can do more. We should not politicize it, and we should not do anything that will in any way call into question whether it's being even-handed or fair in the future.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Remarks at a Meeting With the President's Advisory Board on Race
September 30, 1997

[*John Hope Franklin, Chair of the President's Advisory Board on Race, introduced the President and the Vice President.*]

The President. Thank you very much, Dr. Franklin, members of the board, ladies and gentlemen. First let me, again, thank the board for its willingness to serve. And to those of you who came to Little Rock last week for the 40th anniversary of the integration of Central High, I thank you for coming there. It was a very important occasion, I believe, and one that all of us who were there felt was immensely rewarding.

I want to talk today about how we go forward from here. When I was at Little Rock Central High School, after we had this magnificent ceremony celebrating the 40th anniversary of the event and the original nine students went into the school, I went back outside and spent quite a long while talking to the students and the young people who were there. And all they talked to me about was how we were going to go forward. And I just listened to them.

I think you made a very important beginning by urging that we focus on education and economic opportunity, things which cut across racial lines but are necessary to bring us together.

One of the young men in the audience said to me that—he said, "I don't think they had these gang problems 40 years ago, and I'm worried about that now." It was very touching, you know. So I think it's very important that we throw this into the future now, we begin to focus on it, and I agree that we should begin with education and economic opportunity.

But if I could go back to the original mission of the board, I also think it's important that we have the facts. So this afternoon, I know you're going to hear from noted scientists and demographers who will share their research on our changing population patterns and attitudes on race, and I think that's an important thing.

Secondly, I think it's important that we continue this dialog. I got as much out of the hour

or so I spent after the ceremony in Little Rock just listening to the young people talking as I worked my way down the lines of people who were there as anything else. I'm going to have a townhall meeting on this subject on December 2d, and I will continue to do what I can to support you in reaching out to Americans of all backgrounds and actually discussing this so that we build bridges of mutual understanding and reconciliation.

But finally and in the end, we have got to decide what it is we are going to do. This summer I announced the first of what I hope will be a long series of actions consistent with the work we are doing here with the board when I said that we would have an initiative to send our most talented teachers to our most needy school districts by offering them scholarships for their own education if they would, in turn, teach in those districts for a number of years. I think that will be very helpful.

Later today our Housing and Urban Development Secretary, Andrew Cuomo, will announce new efforts to end housing discrimination in America. First, HUD will issue $15 million in grants to 67 private, nonprofit housing groups, State and local governments to combat housing discrimination and to promote fair housing practices. And then Secretary Cuomo will double the number of housing discrimination enforcement actions over the next 4 years.

It's clear to me now that there is more housing discrimination in America than I had thought there was when I became President, and that that has been kept alive too long in too many neighborhoods, keeping, among other things, too many families from sending their children to the schools of their choice. So I applaud what Secretary Cuomo is doing, and I will strongly support him.

Let me say again, I look forward to today's discussion. I think it's important that we build on that—where I thought we were at the end of the ceremony in Little Rock, where there was a great sense among the people there and I felt around the country who were watching it, a great sense that now we have to do things, and that every individual American just about is interested in this issue and understands how important it is and understands that we'll all have to do our part if we expect to come out where we want to be.

So, Dr. Franklin, I look forward to going on with the discussion. And I think maybe the Vice President might like to say a word or two, and then we could go forward.

[*The Vice President praised the President's initiative on race and thanked the board members for serving. He stated he had learned from Chairman Franklin that the question of race should be addressed by first acknowledging difference and establishing mutual respect, before trying to transcend that difference and reach out for the highest common denominator. He then said that he looked forward to the discussion.*]

Chairman Franklin. Well, there are two things that we could do. One is, we can tell you what we've done. Secondly, we can ask you if you want to raise any questions about what we should do or what we are doing.

The President. Well, why don't you begin by telling us—giving us all a report on what you have done.

[*Chairman Franklin introduced board member Robert Thomas, president and CEO of Nissan U.S.A., who said he had found that the racial issues were indeed real and were greatly exacerbated by issues regarding poverty. Board member William Winter, former Mississippi Governor, noted the diversity in his grandchildren's school and stated that education, particularly of young people, was the key to success in achieving one America. Board member Suzan Johnson Cook, Bronx Faith Community Church pastor, concurred that education and diversity were critical issues. She emphasized that people in the faith community had been energized by the initiative and were eagerly seeking ways to cooperate across denominational lines and also with the corporate community and the labor community. Board member Angela Oh, lawyer and civil rights activist, suggested that the initiative should be guided by compassion, vision, intelligence, and courage, and should welcome input from nontraditional sources. She noted that there were not many vehicles set up for public participation other than townhall meetings but that there was a lot of energy and interest, even among cynics. Board member Linda Chavez-Thompson, AFL–CIO executive vice president, reiterated that a lot of people wanted to participate in the townhall meetings and that the Nation's youth must be involved, and she emphasized the importance of economic*

issues. Board member Thomas Kean, Drew University president, commented that there was no other place in the world where so many different groups had come to live together, resolving race and ethnic issues in a democratic manner, and then stated that dialog on those issues was extraordinarily important in itself. Chairman Franklin explained that the board had been working along two tracks, to emphasize shared aspirations, ideals, and values, and at the same time to discover practical ways to realize overall goals, such as the new HUD efforts to combat housing discrimination.]

The President. I would just say, I think there are, in addition to the kind of town meeting formats and maybe—I think it's very important to try to see, identify, and highlight some laboratory situation—either laboratories because you think that people are doing something that works, it ought to be able to be done somewhere else. And I agree with Suzan—I mean what's going on in the Bronx today, if she'd told anybody 10 years ago that this would be happening in the Bronx, nobody would have believed you. To what extent is that unique to the Bronx, to what extent is it something that could be done anywhere else, how did it happen—those things, I think, are important.

There is another sort of laboratory that I think would be worth looking at, and I'll just give you one example. I believe now that the Fairfax County School District just across the river is now the most diverse school district in the United States. I think it has even more ethnic diversity than the New York or the Los Angeles or the Chicago school districts. I believe that's right. According to the USA Today article on it last week, they have kids from 182 different countries with over 100 different language groups in this one school district.

Now, that goes back to Governor Winter's picture there of his grandchildren. It would be interesting to know, to me, I think—and maybe we should all go there together. I'm just giving you this as an example; we could go somewhere else and do the same thing. How are these differences dealt with within the schools for the children? How are the kids dealing with their diversity and their shared values? Is there an explicit attempt to do this? How do they get along?

Then I would say, is their experience consistent with or inconsistent with their parents' experience in the workplace? What I have seen over time—I hate to use—a much-used buzzword is "empowerment," but what I have seen is that all these racial issues get much worse when people feel like they don't have any basic control over their lives, which is obviously why you asked us and our administration to focus on the economic and educational issues first.

But I think it would be interesting to see how, in a place that is very much—I don't think this should be the only one—but a place that is very much sort of standing out in big capital letters, what the future might become in America: How are the kids doing? How are their parents doing? What is the difference in how their parents are being treated at work and how the kids are treated at school? Are there any differences? What kind of dialog goes on in the homes of these people between the parents and the children about their experiences at school and at work, and are there differences there?

It seems to me that somehow we have to imagine how all of this is going to play out in the real world. And anything the Government does, for example, needs to really make sense in terms of how these folks' lives are playing out. And so I think maybe one of the things we ought to do is try to either organize either a set of expeditions or a confined set of what you might call townhall meetings with people who have actually lived in the kinds of circumstances that we imagine America's future to be. And I think that would be one suggestion that I have, and I'd kind of like to be a part of that, if you don't mind. [*Laughter*]

But anyway, I think about this all the time, because I always think about how we can—and Dr. Franklin and I talked about this the first time we visited—how we finish our sort of unfinished business and still recognize that time is not waiting for us and our children are being thrown into a world that is radically different. So that might be one way to proceed. I think we might learn a great deal if you could get some of these children and maybe even some of their parents together and have an honest talk about how the kids are doing in the schools, how the parents are doing in the workplace and in the larger society, and what that tells us about where we need to go in the future.

[*Chairman Franklin commented that board members had found an enormous number of experiments already going on in various parts of the country that might be helpful.*]

The President. One of the things that I believe this group should strongly consider doing is actually publishing a kind of a compendium of those local efforts with a brief description of how they work, who the leader is, and how you can contact those people and let—one of the things we're trying to do is to replicate what works around the country. And I think that it's obvious that when people have challenges and problems, they're not going to sit around waiting for some—for the President or a national body or anybody else to start talking about it.

So what I would recommend is that one of the things we consider doing is trying to, without pretending to be exhaustive, take—I don't know—20, 50, 100 of the things that you believe work the best, get a brief description of them, have a person who can be contacted, ask them if they would mind our promoting them, and find a way to publish it and widely disseminate this around the Nation so that we can generate more interest among more people in, if not copying, at least adapting what has worked to places where there aren't such efforts going on.

Chairman Franklin. I think that our Executive Director already has some plans in that regard. Judy Winston is planning some how-to kits and various things like that.

The President. Judy will get them well-published. [*Laughter*]

[*Executive Director Winston discussed plans to provide information on promising practices regarding interracial dialogs to the public, not just in published form at the end of the board's year of study but on a website for immediate access and response. The Vice President then asked for examples of unique and particularly promising approaches to dialog or promoting diversity. Board members described various programs operating in California, Mississippi, North Carolina, New York, and New Jersey, and encouraged further efforts by individuals, businesses, and labor organizations. Chairman Franklin then thanked the President and the Vice President for their support and their participation in the discussion.*]

The President. Thank you.

The Vice President. Thank you very much.

The President. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:16 a.m. in the East Room at the Mayflower Hotel.

Remarks on the Retirement of General John M. Shalikashvili in Arlington, Virginia

September 30, 1997

Mr. Vice President, Secretary Cohen, Secretary Albright, Secretary Gober, National Security Adviser Berger, Director Tenet, General McCaffrey; to the Service Secretaries, the Joint Chiefs, the Unified Commanders in Chief, Members of Congress, members of our Armed Forces; to all the friends of General Shalikashvili who are here today, including former Secretary Perry, former Chairmen and members of the Joint Chiefs, former officials of the Department of Defense. We all come together in grateful tribute to John and Joan Shalikashvili.

This is, frankly, a bittersweet day for me. I am full of pride but also some regret. For the last 4 years, I have counted on Shali for his wisdom, his counsel, his leadership. He has become an exceptional adviser and a good friend, someone I knew I could always depend upon when the lives of our troops or the interests of America were on the line. And I will miss him very much.

General Shali is a great American with a great American story. A childhood seared by war, he has given his life to the cause of peace. From an immigrant learning English, he has become the shining symbol of what America is all about. He's never forgotten what his country gave him, nor has he ever stopped giving back to it. His service to our Nation, spanning 39 years, rises

from the ranks of Army private to the highest military office in the land.

Of course, the road even for him has not always been smooth. I am told that after a grueling first day at officer candidate school, Private John Shali sneaked out of his barracks looking for a place to resign. Our Nation can be very grateful that, probably for the only time in his entire career, he failed in his mission.

I am convinced that when future students look upon this time, they will rank John Shalikashvili as among the greatest Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff America ever had.

Greatness is something that cannot be bestowed like a medal, a ribbon, a star. It cannot be taught or bought. It comes in the end only from within. General Shali has said that the three indispensable traits of a great leader are competence, care, and character. He ought to know; he embodies them.

His competence shines in the sterling record of innovation and achievement, managing the downsizing of our forces while upgrading their capability and readiness; upholding the most rigorous standards for the use of those forces in the world, where threats to our survival have faded but threats to our interests and values have not; dramatically improving joint doctrine and training and taking joint planning far into the future for the very first time; and of course, helping bring Europe together at last in liberty, democracy, and peace.

One of the proudest moments of my Presidency was standing with Shali in Warsaw as we celebrated NATO's enlargement and welcomed the people of his original homeland back home to the family of freedom.

And if the baseline measure of a Chairman's competence is successful military operations, Shali has filled a résumé that would turn others olive drab with envy. In the last 4 years, our troops have been tested in more than 40 operations. From Bosnia to Haiti, the Taiwan Straits, Iraq, Rwanda, Liberia, and more, our Armed Forces have performed superbly with Shali at the helm. Our troops trust him because they know how much he cares for them. They have seen that caring in his constant contact with our service men and women, in the way he warms their hearts with his pride in them, in the humility, the honesty, the graciousness, the respect he always shows to others, in the wonderful way he listens, even to bearers of bad news.

Our troops know that he never expects their gratitude or applause, but he does want to sharpen their capabilities, improve their welfare, and lift their morale, and in his most important duty, to make sure that whenever they go into danger, the planning is superb, the risks are minimized, and every reasonable measure is taken to ensure their success and safe return.

For Shali, caring transcends our obligations even to one another. He believes in America's unique ability to help others around the world, sheltering freedom, defending democracy, relieving fear and despair. He knows that what sets our troops apart is not just their courage, strength, and skills, but also the ideals they serve, the hope they inspire, the spirit they represent.

As some may recall, during the crisis in Haiti, Shali visited with refugees in the camps, observing and listening with quiet understanding, the quiet understanding of one who had also been in that position. And he ordered improvements to make those camps as comfortable as possible, to alleviate boredom and brighten hopes and bring toys to the children at Christmas. That story also revealed something about his character, a clear sense of what is right and wrong, a man whose conscience is always his guide.

I'll miss a lot of things about Shali, but perhaps most of all I'll miss the integrity he always displayed in being my closest military adviser. In every conversation we ever had, he never minced words; he never postured or pulled punches; he never shied away from tough issues or tough calls; and most important, he never shied away from doing what he believed was the right thing. On more than one occasion—many more than one occasion—he looked at me, and I could see the pain in his eyes that he couldn't tell me what I wanted to hear and what he wished he could say, but with a clear and firm voice and a direct, piercing gaze, he always told me exactly what he thought the truth was. No President could ever ask for more.

Shali has had the support of a proud and dedicated family: his son, Brant; his brother, himself a distinguished Green Beret veteran; his sister; and of course, there are his dogs. I understand they are the only living creatures who have never obeyed his orders. [*Laughter*]

And most importantly, there is Joan. Joan, you have been a terrific support for our men and women in uniform. They know you are always looking out for them and their families.

From around the corner to around the world, you were the Chairman's personal inspector general when it came to how families are cared for. No one had more commitment, a better eye, or a bigger heart. And we thank you.

General, very soon now you and Joan will be settling into your new home in Washington State. You can tuck your uniform into a drawer. You can carry an umbrella. [*Laughter*] You can even grow a beard. Maybe you'll actually even open that hardware store you have been talking about. I don't know if you know the first thing about power tools and mixing paint, but the brand you have to offer is the top of the line.

Our Nation is safer, our Armed Forces are stronger, and our world is a better place because of your service. Thank you for all you have done. God bless you, and Godspeed.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:06 p.m. at Fort Myer.

Citation on the Presidential Medal of Freedom for General John M. Shalikashvili

September 30, 1997

Throughout a remarkable 39-year military career, General Shalikashvili has worked tirelessly to improve our Nation's security and promote world peace. A steward of freedom, his landmark endeavors include Joint Vision 2010; initiation of NATO's Partnership for Peace; NATO enlargement—which includes his native Poland; ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention; and successful military operations in Bosnia, Haiti, and elsewhere in the world. A strong and thoughtful leader, his sound judgment and strategic vision have been instrumental in preparing our Armed Forces for the challenges of today and the 21st century. For a lifetime of dedicated service, our Nation gratefully honors General John Shalikashvili.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of this citation.

Statement on the Death of Roy Lichtenstein

September 30, 1997

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the death of Roy Lichtenstein. He will long be remembered as a defining force in the pop art movement.

We grew to love his trademark Benday dots and striking primary colors, which distinguished his unique art form and altered the landscape of American art. He had a talent for presenting everyday cultural symbols in ways that attracted our attention and gave these images a new meaning. Two years ago, I had the honor of presenting to Roy the National Medal of Arts Award in recognition of his contribution to American art. In addition, he was especially valued and treasured by us here in the White House because of his generous support for our Arts in Embassies program.

Hillary and I will miss him. Our thoughts and prayers are with his friends and family in this sad time.

Statement on the Report of the Commission on Immigration Reform
September 30, 1997

The Commission on Immigration Reform, chaired by the Honorable Shirley Hufstedler and the late Barbara Jordan, issued its final report today. This report, which reiterates many of the excellent recommendations contained in the Commission's interim reports, further contributes to our country's understanding of the role of immigration in the United States. I commend the Commission's work and its contribution to the national dialog on immigration policy.

America has always been a nation of immigrants, and I am proud of the significant progress my administration has made toward improving America's immigration system. My administration has curtailed illegal immigration through tougher border control, strengthened worksite enforcement, and the removal of record numbers of criminal and other illegal aliens. We have also worked to improve and tighten the naturalization process and have made needed reforms to our asylum system for refugees fleeing persecution.

One of the Commission's recommendations is to restructure the immigration system by reallocating the main functions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to other agencies. This proposal raises difficult and complex issues which need further consideration. I have asked the Domestic Policy Council to coordinate with the affected Federal agencies to evaluate carefully the Commission's proposal and other reform options designed to improve the executive branch's administration of the Nation's immigration laws.

With this report, the Commission completes its work. I want to thank all of its members and staff for their service and contribution on these important issues.

Message on the Observance of Rosh Hashana, 1997
September 30, 1997

Warmest greetings to everyone celebrating Rosh Hashana.

Throughout the centuries, the shofar has sounded on this day to herald the beginning of the High Holy Days and the start of a new year. It is a time for both joy and reflection—joy in the promise of another year in which to live and work, reflection on how to grow closer to God and family. It is also an opportunity to look back on our failures and shortcomings during the past year; not to dwell on them with bitterness and regret, but to learn from our mistakes so that the new year will be sweetened by the gifts of wisdom and hope.

As Jews across America and around the world gather to reaffirm their faith in God and their love of family and community, Hillary and I extend best wishes that the coming year will be blessed with great abundance, true peace, and lasting joy.

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 30.

Statement on Signing the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998
September 30, 1997

I have today signed into law H.R. 2016, the "Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998," which provides funding for military construction and family housing programs of the Department of Defense.

The Act funds the vast majority of my request for military construction projects, the military family housing program, other quality-of-life projects for our military personnel and their families, and the base closure and realignment program.

I am concerned, however, that the Congress has chosen to add funds for projects that the Department has not identified as priorities.

I urge the Congress to complete action on the remaining FY 1998 appropriations bills as quickly as possible, and to send them to me in an acceptable form.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

September 30, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2016, approved September 30, was assigned Public Law No. 105–45.

Statement on Signing Continuing Appropriations Legislation
September 30, 1997

I am pleased to have signed into law today House Joint Resolution 94, a short-term continuing resolution for fiscal 1998.

The Act provides 1998 appropriations for continuing projects and activities of the Federal Government through October 23, 1997, except those funded by the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998, which I signed into law earlier today.

On May 2, 1997, I reached agreement with the congressional leadership on an historic Bipartisan Budget Agreement that balances the budget while honoring our values. Over the next few months, my Administration worked closely with the leadership to translate the agreement into law. On August 5, I was proud to sign two key elements of the agreement—the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and the Taxpayers Relief Act of 1997. As the current fiscal year comes to a close, we must work together to enact the third element of the agreement, the appropriations bills for fiscal 1998.

But to date, in a number of important instances, the Congress has failed to address matters specifically called for under the agreement. In certain other instances, the Congress has addressed policy issues in ways that make the pending appropriations bills unacceptable. I urge the Congress to approve 1998 spending bills that include the items contained in the agreement and to provide funding for other priority programs.

To give the Congress time to adopt such bills, I have approved this continuing resolution.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 30, 1997.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 94, approved September 30, was assigned Public Law No. 105–46.

Message to the Congress on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Iran
September 30, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency declared in 1979 is to continue in effect beyond November 14,

1997, to the *Federal Register* for publication. Similar notices have been sent annually to the Congress and the *Federal Register* since November 12, 1980. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on October 31, 1996. This emergency is separate from that declared with respect to Iran on March 15, 1995, in Executive Order 12957.

The crisis between the United States and Iran that began in 1979 has not been fully resolved. The international tribunal established to adjudicate claims of the United States and U.S. nationals against Iran and of the Iranian government and Iranian nationals against the United States continues to function, and normalization of commercial and diplomatic relations between the United States and Iran has not been achieved. In these circumstances, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities that are in place by virtue of the November 14, 1979, declaration of emergency and that are needed in the process of implementing the January 1981 agreements with Iran.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
September 30, 1997.

NOTE: The notice is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks to Television Weather Forecasters
October 1, 1997

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. Welcome to the White House on a cool, overcast day, about 60 degrees. [*Laughter*] How am I doing? I'm auditioning. [*Laughter*] You know, I have to leave this job after 3 years, and I don't know what I am going to do. I am too young to retire, and I'm used to delivering bad news. [*Laughter*]

Let me say, we are delighted to have you here in the White House. I thank you for coming and for devoting this much of your time to the briefings and to giving us a chance to meet with you on what is a profoundly important issue and one, frankly, that you, just in the way you comment on the events that you cover, may have a real effect on the American people.

People look to you to figure out what they're going to wear in the morning and whether something really bad is going to happen. If so, they expect a timely warning and advice. So you not only get watched more than anyone else on the television news programs to find out about the weather, sometimes you are actually saving lives and always performing a public service. And we thank you for that.

I'd also like to thank your outstanding partners at NOAA and the National Weather Service. I'm very proud of them and what they have done. In the past decade alone, they have doubled the amount of warning time we have to prepare for tornadoes, quadrupled the time for flash floods. And those are just two of the ways that our people here, with NOAA and the National Weather Service and their research and technology, have improved our Nation's safety and planning.

You know, I spent most of my time over the last 4½ years telling the American people that we had to prepare for the 21st century, with all of its new opportunities and all of its new challenges, if we want to keep the American dream alive for everyone who will work for it and maintain our leadership for peace and freedom and keep our country coming together with all of its diversity and clash of interests, whether it's racial and ethnic or religious or whatever. And we have really focused on trying to just get the country to think about how we have to build these bridges to the future, how the future will be as we want it to be.

Clearly, to me, this climate change issue is one of the principal challenges that we face, a challenge that, if we meet it, will ensure the continued vitality of our small planet and the continued success of the United States throughout another 100 years; a challenge that should we fail to meet it could imperil the lives of

our children and, if not our children, our grandchildren on this planet, how they live, how they relate to others, and whether they are able to continue to pursue their dreams in the way that our generation has.

In trying to come to grips with this climate change issue and then talk to the American people about it, there are four principles that have guided me, and I'd like to go over them very briefly.

First, I am convinced that the science is solid, saying that the climate is warming at a more rapid rate, that this is due in large measure to a dramatic increase in the volume of greenhouse gases going into the atmosphere, and that nobody knows exactly what the consequences are going to be or when they're going to be manifest, but on balance, it won't be all that long, and they won't be good. That is sort of a summary of what the prevailing scientific opinion is. I know there are those in a distinct minority who have a different view, but I am persuaded, having carefully looked at all this, that the vast majority opinion is, in fact, in all probability accurate. And that, therefore, we would be irresponsible not to try to come to grips with the results of these findings.

Now, unlike a lot of weather forecasts, there is something we can do about this weather forecast because we've got enough lead time; at least we believe we do. So I think that's very important.

Now, the second thing I want to say is that if we know that the majority of our scientists have this view and they say we don't know precisely what the bad effects of global climate change are or exactly how fast the climate will change, that means we don't know how severe the droughts and the floods of the future will be in a particular region, but we know that it won't be long and the consequences won't be good. If we know that, then it seems to me it is incumbent on the United States, when the nations of the world meet in December in Kyoto, Japan, to discuss climate change, that we be prepared to commit ourselves to realistic and binding limits on our own emissions of greenhouse gases.

With 4 percent of the world's population, we enjoy over 20 percent of the world's wealth. That also explains why we produce over 20 percent of the world's greenhouse gases. Those two things are related. Now, I believe that we have a responsibility to cut back. First, because the world is looking to us for leadership, and secondly, because we won't have any influence in getting anybody else to cut back if we don't.

To give you an example of how significant that is, we've got all these other countries that are growing that have far larger populations than we do. We estimate that the developing countries of Asia and Latin America will grow at roughly 3 times the rate of the United States, Japan, Europe, and Canada in the next 20 years. If that is true, we'll have to work very hard to maintain our 20 percent share of wealth. But even if we do maintain our standard of living and grow our economy, we won't be for long the world's largest producer of greenhouse gases. So if we expect others to show restraint, we must do the same, and we must lead the way.

The third principle is that we must embrace solutions that allow us to continue to grow the economy while we honor our global responsibilities and our responsibilities to our own children. We have worked too hard here from the first day to revitalize the American economy to jeopardize our progress now. And furthermore, we cannot make changes that will leave whole chunks of that economy out in the cold without having a response to them.

So the question is, can we emphasize flexible, market-based approaches? Can we embrace technology to make energy production more efficient and put fewer greenhouse gases into the atmosphere? Is there, in short, a way out of astronomical taxes or heavy-handed governmental regulation that will permit us to gradually bring down our greenhouse gas production and still grow the economy and enjoy what we've been enjoying here for the last 4½ years? I believe the answer is yes.

Now, let me just give you one example. Typically, about two-thirds of the energy produced by powerplants is absolutely lost in the form of wasted heat, billowing out in clouds of steam, or pumped out into rivers. A company called Trigen has doubled the efficiency of powerplants in Philadelphia, Chicago, and Tulsa simply by capturing the waste heat and turning it into steam to warm office buildings and fuel factories, and in the process, by definition, dramatically cutting the volume of greenhouse gases going into the atmosphere to do the same amount of work in all those places. That is just one small example.

The Vice President and I have been working with the Big Three automakers, our energy labs, and the UAW for years now on a new generation of vehicles that we hope will get triple the gas mileage of a typical car. Perhaps the design will even include a blend of gasoline and electricity in a way that avoids the worst problems of electric cars—that is, they don't go very fast, and you have to charge them up too often—but gets the benefit of the energy conservation elements of the cars.

All these things are out there, and we found over time—how many times have you seen America rise to a challenge? We didn't know how we were going to get to the Moon when President Kennedy said we were going there, but we got there because we put our resources behind it and we started with what we knew and then, in the process of exploring the outer limits of what we knew, we found a lot of things we didn't know, and we were able to put them to work toward a common mission. This is a scientific mission even more important in its implications than our race to the Moon in the 1960's. And yet we know a very great deal about how to do it without crippling the American economy.

Finally, because of what I said earlier, because we represent only 4 percent of the world's population, and because the developing countries of Asia, Latin America, and Africa increasingly are going to grow at 3 times the rate of the developed countries, I believe we have to ask all nations, both industrialized and developing, to be a part of this process.

I'm happy that other countries are developing. It's actually good for our economy when countries move from the ranks of the very poor countries into middle income countries, because then they can do more business with us. So it helps us when other people lift their children out of poverty and have a brighter future. It also means that they, too, however, become bigger energy users, and it imposes on us even heavier responsibilities, all of us, to change our patterns of energy use so that all of us can grow our economies without contributing to this greenhouse gas problem.

But because of the growth rates in the future, both the population and economic growth and the associated energy use, we could have a great deal of effort by Europe, by the United States, by Canada, by Japan and still be in very difficult straits on this climate issue within 40 years, unless we get real solid support from the developing countries. Should we make allowances for their growth? Of course we should. But in some way, in a fair and appropriate way, they should also participate in this agreement. Now, if that doesn't happen, then their emissions, the emissions of the developing world, will exceed the emissions of the developed world by about 2035.

Now, those are the things I want to do. I want to try to get America to accept the fact that the majority scientific opinion, the overwhelming majority scientific opinion is accurate. I want us to make a commitment, therefore, to go to Kyoto with binding targets. I want us to implement our commitment in a way that continues to grow the economy in a different way but still maintains our robust entrepreneurial economy. And I want to find a fair way for the developing countries to participate. Those are my four objectives.

On Monday we're going to try to take another step toward putting these principles into effect. We've invited noted economists and industrial leaders, State and local governmental leaders, and leaders from the environmental and scientific communities here to the White House conference—for a White House Conference on Climate Change. Our goals are simple. We want the American people to understand the importance of the challenge and to allow outside experts to help inform the policy process so we'll make the best decisions.

Now, I'd like to ask you to think about this in terms of the work you do. When we had the terrible floods in the Dakotas and Minnesota not very long ago, a young Congressman from South Dakota was in my office—happened to be a member of the other party. I don't believe there's a partisan aspect to the weather—[*laughter*]—although some days it seems stormier than others around here. [*Laughter*] And this young man said—I was talking about climate change, and he said, "Mr. President, we've had three 100-year floods in the last 9 years." He said, "Does that mean I get to go 500 years without one?" [*Laughter*] And you'd be amazed how many people just sort of, from their anecdotal, personal experiences, have this sense that there is more instability in the climate than there used to be and understand that it has something to do with the changes in the relationship of where we live and whatever little patch of land we occupy and this larger globe and the atmosphere which envelops it.

So what I hope will happen at the climate change conference I also hope has happened a little here today. What I want to do is to deal with the central political problem here. And I don't mean political in terms of party politics; I mean political in terms of how the body politic, how our society responds to this. If we have a problem that is a clear and present danger that we can see and feel, we get right on it. How did we get to the Moon? Because the Russians beat us into space, so we knew how to keep score, we would beat them to the Moon. And if we didn't, since there was a cold war and nuclear weapons, goodness knows what the consequences would be.

Now, it is much harder when you have no manifestation of this problem unless you happen to live in a place which has experienced an unusual number of or intensity of weather aberrations. And, even so, they go away, and then you can start thinking about something else. It is difficult when you are not quite sure how to keep score and you don't know who the enemy is.

All of you live with the weather as a fact of life and a precondition for life on our planet in a way that nearly no one else in the world does. The men and women of America who tune in and listen to you talk about the weather and rely upon you are either enlightened or entertained or disappointed by whatever it is you say and however you say it. Most of them are sort of like Sergeant Joe Friday; they just want the facts.

This is a case where people need the facts and the context. Where if all you do is just try to get people to start thinking about this—you may not even know how you feel about it, or exactly what you think should be done—that's okay, but I would ask you to think about whether you should ask people to think about this, because our country always gets it right.

We always get it right once we focus on it. But right now, while the scientists see the train coming through the tunnel, most Americans haven't heard the whistle blowing. They don't sense that it's out there as a big issue. And I really believe, as President, one of my most important jobs is to tell the American people what the big issues are that we have to deal with. If we understand what the issues are, if we start with a certain set of principles, we nearly always come to the right place.

That's what we did—we passed the first balanced budget in a generation earlier this year, partly because we had already gotten the deficit down by over 85 percent, but partly because we got people in both parties to agree that there's a goal: We're going to balance the budget. And then the Republicans said, "Here are the things we want in the balanced budget plan," and the Democrats said, "Here are the things we want," and we found out a way to reconcile them and still do the most important thing, which was to balance the budget, and we did it.

That's how we have to deal with this climate change issue. We have to say, "There's a challenge out there. We have to respond to it. Here's the principles we want in our response." And then we have to get after it. But we can't do it until we build the awareness of the American people.

So I hope you will think about how your work has been affected by what we believe is going on in the climate. And again, I don't ask for you to advocate or do anything outside whatever your own convictions or parameters of permissible speech are, but I do think it's very important, since you have more influence than anybody does on how the American people think about this, that at least you know what you believe and how you think we should proceed.

Thank you for being here, and thank you for your leadership.

The first time I ever really thought about this issue in this way was when I was reading Al Gore's book—[*laughter*]—which preceded our partnership. Sometimes he thinks all the great things he did preceded our partnership. [*Laughter*] I think most of the greatest things he's done occurred after our partnership started. [*Laughter*] I remember so well—one of the first times—we have lunch once a week, and I remember one week we were having lunch very early in this term—this is over 4 years ago—and he said, "Just in case you missed it in my book, here's the chart"—[*laughter*]—"of how much we are increasing the emission of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, and here's 10,000 years, and here's the last 50," like that.

So I can now pass Al Gore's climate test—[*laughter*]—and I'm very proud of that. I think we should be proud that we have a Vice President who not only cares about this issue but knows enough about it to have an opinion worthy of the respect of any scientist in the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Vice President.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:10 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Statement on Senate Finance Committee Action on Fast-Track Trading Authority Legislation

October 1, 1997

I am pleased that the Senate Finance Committee, with overwhelming bipartisan support, has reported out legislation that renews the partnership between the President and the Congress in reaching trade agreements, a negotiating authority every President has had since 1974. To keep the American economy strong, we must continue to break down unfair foreign trade barriers to our goods and services. This legislation will allow us to tear down those barriers and help American businesses and workers compete and win in the global marketplace. I look forward to working with the congressional leadership to build on the bipartisan spirit we saw in the Senate Finance Committee today and to secure passage of this important legislation this year.

Remarks Announcing a Food Safety Initiative and an Exchange With Reporters

October 2, 1997

The President. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, Secretary Shalala, Deputy Secretary Rominger, Cathie Woteki, Dr. Friedman, all the representatives of the groups that have helped us come to this day.

Our Government made a fundamental promise to the American people of a bountiful and safe food supply way back at the beginning of this century. It is a promise that we have had to renew our commitment to periodically over the years and a promise that needed a lot of work when I became President. From the day I took office, I worked very hard to honor that commitment, to make our food supply the world's safest, even safer.

In 1993 the Vice President's National Performance Review recommended an overhaul of our food safety procedures so that we could use the best scientific technology available in inspection methods to make sure that we had put in the best preventive controls to keep our food supply the world's safest.

Since then, we have taken major steps. We first put in place rigorous new safety standards for seafood, meat, and poultry products, throwing out archaic and ineffective methods of inspection that had not been updated for nearly a century. We've required slaughterhouses to test for deadly *E. coli* and salmonella bacteria. We've begun developing new safety standards for fruit and vegetable juices. We've strengthened our system of guaranteeing that our drinking water will remain safe and improved public health protections for pesticide uses on food. And we brought a host of Federal agencies together to boost food safety research, education, and surveillance efforts around our Nation. In so doing, we're using the world's best science to help prevent food contamination tragedies before they happen, to make sure our supply of food is as safe as it can be.

Today, our food supply remains the world's safest, but we can't rest on those accomplishments. We have to do more. At the time when Americans are eating more and more food from around the globe, we must spare no effort to ensure the safety of our food supply from whatever source. Today I want to tell you the new steps we're taking to ensure that our fruits and vegetables, including those imported from other countries, meet the highest health and safety standards.

First, I'm asking Congress to give the Food and Drug Administration the power and the obligation to ban the importation of fruits, vegetables, and other foods from countries whose safety precautions do not meet American standards. This new law would be similar to a law that already requires the United States Department of Agriculture to keep meat and poultry from countries with inferior food safety systems out of our stores.

In my next budget, I will provide enough funds to ensure that the FDA can fully implement this new legislation by dramatically expanding its international food inspection force. With these efforts, we can make sure that no fruits and vegetables cross our borders, enter our ports, or reach our dinner tables without meeting the same strict standards as those grown here in America. Our food safety system is the strongest in the world, and that's how it's going to stay.

I'm also directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Agriculture to work together in close cooperation with the agricultural community to develop the first-ever specific safety standards for the growing, processing, shipping, and selling of fruits and vegetables. These standards will address potential food safety problems throughout the production and distribution system, and they'll improve the sanitation and safety practices of all those seeking to sell produce in the United States market.

I'm asking Secretaries Shalala and Glickman to report back to me within 90 days with a complete schedule for developing these standards within a year. I'll also ask them to submit a comprehensive plan to improve the monitoring of food safety programs abroad, to help foreign countries upgrade their safety precautions and toughen food inspections at the border.

Being a parent is perhaps the toughest job in the world. Our parents deserve the peace of mind that comes from knowing the food they set before their children is safe. With today's new actions, we can help make their jobs much easier.

And, again, let me thank all of those who were involved in this effort as I sign this order. Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the President signed the memorandum on the food safety initiative.*]

The President. Thanks.

Line Item Veto

Q. Mr. President, will you be using the line item veto——

The President. Excuse me?

Q. Will you be using the line item veto on any of the appropriations bills that you've just passed—that you've just signed?

The President. Well, let me say, I have received only—I've received one memorandum from my staff on one bill. And that came in late last night, so I haven't read it. But I will consider it—as the bills come in, I will ask for a review of the potential uses by specific bill and make judgments as we go along. I have nothing to report at this time, because I have received only one memorandum, and I haven't read it.

2000 Decennial Census

Q. What about the census, sir? Do you have any concerns concerning the Commerce bill and the particular ways that the money will be used for the census?

The President. Well, my feeling is that we ought to do the census as well as we can. I don't think this is a complicated issue. The National Science Foundation has recommended this statistical sampling method. The man who did President Bush's census says that it's the only way to get the most accurate count. I just want to do whatever the Census Bureau believes, the full-time professionals believe is the most accurate thing to do.

I think that's a heavy constitutional responsibility we have, to conduct a census that is as accurate as possible based on what the professionals say. This ought to be a professional, not a political judgment. And that's the position I will take throughout.

Q. Mr. President, did the Democratic Party send money to the States because of Federal election law restrictions?

Q. Mr. President, there are fresh fruit and vegetable producers that are saying——

The President. Well, wait a minute. I'll take both of them. Go ahead first.

Food Safety

Q. There are fresh fruit and vegetable producers that are saying that you're acting with this action as the world food police and that your actions here today are unwarranted and that's going to complicate the trade environment.

The President. Well, I hope it doesn't complicate the trade environment. But you know, it seems to me that we have no higher responsibility than to protect the health and safety of our citizens, and everyone who has been following all of your reporting over the last 4 or 5 years knows that we have had continuing challenges in food safety. We have millions of people who get sick every year. And we're not trying to unfairly target foreign producers of food into our market. We don't ask them to meet any standards we don't meet. And indeed, if you look at the actions of this administration over the last 4 years, when we started, I think you can make a compelling case that we started working on things that were problems coming out of the American market first. So I just don't think that's right.

I don't want it to complicate the trade environment, but I'm not interested in trade in things that will make the American people sick.

1996 Campaign Financing

Q. Mr. President, did the Democratic National Committee send money to the States in order to get around the Federal spending limits that went along with accepting Federal money for the national campaign, sir?

The President. It's my understanding that everything the Democratic National Committee did had the prior approval of the lawyers. If they cleared it all in advance, then it was perfectly legal. And when this issue was raised about a year ago, the exact issue, I believe that that was clarified at that time. I'm sure that they had legal advice that they followed, and I believe the Republicans said that they did some of the same things and also had prior legal clearance.

Q. Mr. Clinton, do you feel that Mrs. Reno—she's been advised to go forward with the 90-day investigation into the fundraising calls of the Vice President—and perhaps Mr. Gore would like to comment, too——

The President. I think that——

Q. ——do you feel that the 90-day investigation would be helpful?

The President. Well, if you read the statute, she can consider certain things in the 90-day period that are not permitted in the 30-day period. But I think this is a legal question, and it should be done based on an independent legal review with no pressure from the outside, from me, or from anyone else. And that's the way I intend to keep it, at least on my part.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:59 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Catherine Woteki, Acting Under Secretary of Agriculture for Research, Education, and Economics; and Michael A. Friedman, Lead Deputy Commissioner for Operations, Food and Drug Administration.

Memorandum on the Food Safety Initiative
October 2, 1997

Memorandum for the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture

Subject: Initiative to Ensure the Safety of Imported and Domestic Fruits and Vegetables

American consumers today enjoy the safest food supply in the world, and I am proud of my Administration's record in this area. We have taken significant steps to ensure that we maintain the safest food possible. We have put in place improved safety standards for meat, poultry, and seafood products, and we have begun the process of developing enhanced safety standards for fruit and vegetable juices. We have also expanded research, education, and surveillance activities through coordinated efforts of all agencies involved in food safety issues. Together, these measures will greatly improve the safety of the Nation's food supply.

We need to build on these efforts, and today I ask you to do so by focusing on the safety of fruits and vegetables. Although the produce Americans eat is very safe, we can and must do even better, especially at a time when Americans are eating more fruits and vegetables from all over the world. Last year, 38 percent of the fruit and 12 percent of the vegetables consumed by Americans came from overseas. We

must ensure that fruits and vegetables coming from abroad are as safe as those produced in the United States, especially as we upgrade our own domestic standards.

To help accomplish this task, I plan to send to the Congress proposed legislation that will require the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to halt imports of fruits, vegetables, or other food from any foreign country whose food safety systems and standards are not on par with those of the United States. This legislation, which will be similar to existing law requiring the USDA to halt the importation of meat and poultry from such countries, will enable the FDA to prevent the importation of potentially unsafe foreign produce. My Fiscal Year 1999 budget will provide the necessary funds to enable the FDA to expand dramatically its international food inspection force. With this greatly increased ability to inspect food safety conditions abroad and at points of entry, the FDA will be able to determine when to halt the importation of fruits and vegetables from foreign countries.

Today, I hereby direct two administrative actions that will better ensure the safety of fruits and vegetables coming from abroad, while continuing to improve the safety of domestic produce.

First, I direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in partnership with the Secretary of Agriculture and in close cooperation with the agricultural community, to issue within 1 year from the date of this memorandum, guidance on good agricultural practices and good manufacturing practices for fruits and vegetables. This guidance should address ways to prevent potential sources of contamination, should take into account differences in both crops and regions, and should address food safety issues throughout the food production and distribution system. By providing the first-ever specific safety standards for fruits and vegetables, the guidance will improve the agricultural and manufacturing practices of all those seeking to sell produce in the U.S. market. To ensure that this guidance has the widest possible effect, I also direct the development of coordinated outreach and educational activities.

Second, I direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Agriculture, to report back to me within 90 days from the date of this memorandum with a status report and complete schedule for the good agricultural and manufacturing practices, and a plan on how to improve the monitoring of agricultural and manufacturing practices abroad, to assist foreign countries to improve those practices where necessary, and to prevent the importation of unsafe produce, including by detecting unsafe food at the dock or border. I especially urge you to consider the best ways to target inspection and testing toward those areas where problems are most likely to occur.

In addition to taking these actions, you should accelerate whatever food safety research is necessary to support them. You should also call upon the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Labor, and other agencies as necessary, to provide you with assistance in achieving this goal. These steps, taken together and in coordination with the proposed legislation I will send to the Congress, will improve the safety of fruits and vegetables for all Americans.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Statement on the National Economy
October 3, 1997

Today the Labor Department announced more good news for America's workers and their families. Real wages are rising, the American economy has created 13.2 million new jobs since the beginning of my administration, and for the first time in 24 years, the unemployment rate has remained at or below 5 percent for 6 consecutive months. We have the most solid American economy in a generation, with strong investment, low unemployment, and low inflation.

While the economy is strong, we still have more to do to keep the American jobs machine on the move and ensure that all Americans have the opportunity to benefit from our growing economy. We must continue our three-part economic strategy that is helping move America

forward. We must ensure fiscal responsibility for future generations. We must continue to invest and expect the most of our people through initiatives such as national education test standards. And Congress must provide traditional trade negotiating authority so we can reach fair trade agreements with other countries, breaking down trade barriers to American goods, and creating high-paying jobs for American workers.

Statement on Crime Statistics
October 3, 1997

Today the Federal Bureau of Investigation released its final crime statistics for 1996, and the results are good news for all Americans. We are finally—and decisively—tipping the scales of justice in favor of law-abiding Americans. Overall crime is down for the fifth year in a row, with the biggest reductions coming in violent crime (6 percent)—and especially murders (9 percent). Reported rapes, robberies, assaults, and all types of property crimes are down from the previous year. Even the arrest rate for violent juveniles, which had skyrocketed for 7 years, has now gone down for 2 years in a row.

For 5 years, my administration has worked with police, prosecutors, school principals, and community leaders on a tough, smart crime strategy to attack violent crime. Together, we have fought for more police in our communities, fewer guns on our streets, tougher punishment for violent offenders, and better opportunities for our kids. Today's crime statistics show that, armed with these tools, we are moving in the right direction.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 3 but was embargoed for release until 9 a.m. on October 4.

The President's Radio Address
October 4, 1997

Good morning. Today I want to talk about our responsibility for raising our children and strengthening our families. Six years ago yesterday, when I announced that I would seek the Presidency, I said that our greatness depends upon our ability to create opportunity for all, get responsibility from all, and build a community of all Americans; and that the role of Government was to give our people the tools and establish the environment that would enable them to build that kind of America. I also said that nothing would ever replace the fundamental role of citizens' responsibility.

That is nowhere more important than when it comes to the family. The family is the cornerstone of our society. It unites us across all our faiths. This week, for example, Jewish parents at Rosh Hashana say a blessing for the family and over their children. The United States Catholic Conference has noted, "The most important work to help our children is done quietly—in our homes and neighborhoods, in our parishes and community organizations. No government can love a child and no policy can substitute for a family's care, but clearly," the Catholic Conference has noted, "families can be helped or hurt" by the actions of government.

Here we have tried to help families. From improving our schools to helping parents reconcile the demands of work and childrearing, to expanding access to college and health care, to punishing domestic violence, families have always been at the heart of our concerns. We have worked hard to help parents take responsibility for their children and even to require that as much as we can.

We passed the family leave law to allow parents to take some time off to care for sick children or welcome new babies. We've raised the minimum wage and increased the earned-income tax credit so that Americans who work full time will be able to raise their children out of poverty. We cracked down on deadbeat dads, increasing child support collection by 50 percent. We're building a new system of welfare that promotes work and responsible parenting. And we're doing everything we can to punish domestic violence and to reduce it. And of course, the strong economy we have helped to build has created millions of high-paying jobs, bringing dignity, stability, and opportunity for millions of families.

This has been an important concern of all the members of our administration for a long time. Even before we took office, the Vice President and Tipper Gore had begun holding their annual family conferences in Nashville, exploring all the various challenges facing our families in their efforts to stay together and raise their children. And the First Lady has been working on these issues for 25 years. Soon she'll be holding a national conference here on child care to help people get affordable, accessible quality child care. And she's raised some brave questions, like whether we ought to toughen our divorce laws to make it more difficult for parents to walk away from their children.

But the most important work always is done in the hearts and homes of individuals. And it's clear to everyone that in recent decades too many parents, especially men, have not taken their responsibilities seriously enough to their families, their children, and themselves. And there are serious consequences. We know, for example, that the simple failure to pay child support is one of the chief reasons women and children are on welfare. And this week, the Vice President and Secretary Riley released a report showing that when fathers do take an active role, their children do better—much better—in school.

The need for men to take responsibility for themselves and their families is something that unites Americans of all faiths and backgrounds and beliefs. A couple of years ago we had a Million Man March in the District of Columbia which highlighted the importance of African-American men building families and raising their children and taking responsibility. There were many people who had a lot of political differences with some of the speakers, but no one questioned the need or the sincerity of the hundreds of thousands of men who came from all across America to reaffirm their personal responsibility for their children.

Today, thousands of members of a Christian men's organization, Promise Keepers, are meeting on The Mall in Washington. Again, there are those who have political differences with some of the statements which have been made by some leaders of the organization. But again, no one can question the sincerity of the hundreds of thousands of men who have filled football stadiums across our country and who are willing to reassume their responsibilities to their families and to their children and, therefore, to our future. Their presence here is yet another example of the Nation's understanding and attention to the need to strengthen our families. There is nothing more important.

When all of us, men and women, take responsibility for raising our children and passing on our values, our families are strengthened. And when our families are stronger, America is stronger.

When I think of how many parents there are out there like my mother who sacrifice to raise their children, when Hillary and I look with bittersweet pride at our own daughter going off to college now, I'm more acutely aware than ever of the special responsibilities and the wonderful rewards of parenthood. For me, there has been no job, even the Presidency, that is more important. And that should be true for all mothers and fathers. The future of our children is truly in our hands.

Thank for listening.

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

Remarks on Campaign Finance Reform Legislation
October 4, 1997

For 5 years now we have watched the bipartisan effort to reform our campaign finance laws die at the hands of a filibuster in the United States Senate. I hope this year will be different. Republican Senator John McCain and Democratic Senator Russ Feingold have a strong bill that would curb the power of special interests and increase the confidence of the American people in our campaign finance system.

But this Tuesday, their opponents will try once again to kill this bipartisan bill, which has the support of every Democratic Senator and a number of Republicans. They'll try it by using a "poison pill" amendment that will guarantee that reform dies one more time.

Make no mistake, a vote for this killer amendment is a vote to block meaningful reform.

NOTE: These remarks were recorded at 11:10 a.m. on October 4 in the Oval Office at the White House for later broadcast.

Remarks at a Dinner for Democratic Gubernatorial Candidate Don Beyer in Arlington, Virginia
October 4, 1997

Thank you. Well, Don, I can say yes to almost everything you asked for. [*Laughter*] I don't know about the car deal. We'll have to negotiate that. [*Laughter*] Everything else, put me down for a "yes." [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the warm welcome, and thank you for being here for Don and Megan. Thank you for inviting me. I want to begin by expressing my enormous admiration and gratitude for the friendships of two people in this audience with whom I served as Governor, Chuck Robb and Gerry Baliles, two of the greatest Governors Virginia ever saw.

In addition to everything Don said, I also would be remiss if I did not thank Gerry for his leadership of the special commission I established on the future of the airline industry. When we started, every airline company in America but one was losing money. We were in terrible shape. But it is a very different situation today, thanks in no small measure to the recommendations that Gerry Baliles made several years ago that we have implemented. And the country is in your debt, and we thank you, sir.

And I also want you to know from my point of view, I'm not sure there is a person in the United States Senate, given his background, his constituency, the battles he's been through, that when he was really needed, showed more consistent personal courage as a public figure than Chuck Robb has these last 5 years. And I am very grateful to him for that.

I think the most battle-hardened veterans of war would tell you that there are many different ways of displaying courage and very few people can display them in every way you should in life. Everyone knew what a great battlefield record Chuck Robb had, but I have seen him stand up under withering personal attacks. I have seen him take votes that people in much safer constituencies than his would not take. I have seen him honorably and in a friendly manner disagree with his President when he thought I was wrong, and every time I knew he was doing exactly what he thought was right. And you should be very, very proud of that.

I want to compliment your whole Democratic team. I was glad to see Bill Dolan out there, and I miss L.F. Payne in Congress, but it will be nice seeing him in State office in Virginia. And thank you both for running, and thank you for being a part of this.

Let me say that I have been especially enthusiastic about Don Beyer's campaign for Governor, for what I think are good reasons. But I think the stakes are also very high. Everybody knows that in general Virginia has been a Republican State that able Democrats have been able to beat the odds in on occasion in the

last 20 years. I have enjoyed a lot of friends and a lot of support from this State for which I am very grateful.

But I want you to understand why I think this governorship is important to the future of the country. And if you'll give me a few minutes, this is not exactly a political speech, but you have just a—not very long before the election, and I want you to understand what I believe the significance of this election is to the children of this State, to the future of this State, and perhaps for the message it might send to our whole country as we move into next year when there will be 36 Governors' races like this throughout the country.

It was—just 2 days ago marked the 6th anniversary of my formal entry into the race for President on October 3, 1991. I can't believe it was so long ago. [*Laughter*] At that time, I had been Governor for quite a long while, and I was Democrat by heritage, instinct, and conviction. I was extremely frustrated by the state of play in our national debate because I thought there was too much hot air, too much rhetoric, too much sort of tired old fights replaying themselves over and over again in Washington that had very little to do with the future that I was struggling to build for our people in our State.

And I said, "Look, I have a vision of what our country should be like in the 21st century, and I don't think we're moving there. I believe that we ought to be a nation in which everyone who takes the responsibility for doing so should have an opportunity to make the most of his or her own life. I believe we ought to be a country in which we are coming together across the lines that divide us into one America, not being divided for short-term political gain. And I believe we ought to be a country that continues to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity. And if we are going to be that kind of country, that means we have to take a new direction. We have to favor policies that are pushing the future, not the past. We have to lead, not follow. We have to work for unity, not division. We have to work for people, not power politics. And we have to work in a way that supports progressive change, not the status quo."

And that means that we have to do things very differently. It also means that we need a different kind of Government, a Government that doesn't try to do everything but doesn't pretend it can do nothing. That's the new Republican message, basically: Government is the enemy and people don't need any help.

My view is that the role of Government is to give people the tools to make the most of their own lives and to try to create the conditions in which they can succeed in doing that. That's what I believe.

For almost 5 years now we've been implementing that approach. And uncomfortably for our opponents, there is now a record on which people can make a judgment. And I'm really proud that America is better off today than it was 5 years ago, much better off. We believed that we could have an economic policy that reduced the deficit and balanced the budget and still have money left over to invest in our future, in our children, in education. We believed that we could expand trade in ways that both were free and fair. And the results have given us the strongest economy in generations.

We believed we could fight crime in ways that were tough but also smart, to try to keep kids out of trouble as well as punishing those who got into trouble. And we believed we ought to put 100,000 police on the street and we ought to take the assault weapons off the street. And I saw a lot of good people—and we didn't think it would kill anybody if they had to wait a while to buy a handgun until we checked out whether they had a criminal record.

Now, the results are in, and crime is dropping. And I believe that new approach is one of the reasons every single law enforcement group in this State endorsed Don Beyer for Governor, because they know—[*applause*].

We believe we had to end the culture of poverty and welfare dependency in a way that was not just tough but was also pro-family. But it was one thing to require people to go to work, but you had to do it in a way that also supported our fundamental and most important job, which is the raising of our children. So we could be tough on work, but we had to be good to children. And that's why we said no when the people in the other party tried to take away the guarantee of health care and nutrition to our children, and why we said, "If you want to require people to go to work, make sure they have job training and make sure they've got child care when they go to work so their kids will be all right, and then we'll be successful."

That approach has given us the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history and the lowest percentage of Americans on welfare since 1970. After 20 years of immigration and a lot of people from all over the world who were on low income, we still have the lowest percentage of our people on welfare we've had since 1970. So it worked.

We also reduced the size of the Government by 300,000 people, got rid of 16,000 pages of regulation, and gave more authority back to State and local government, forged more partnerships with the private sector. All that worked.

And now we are looking to facing the future. And that's where the Governors come in. The job of Governor is now more important than it was 5 years ago. Why? Because Governors have more responsibility. And what is their responsibility? Well, if we know what the right path is on crime, if we know what the right path is on welfare, if we are practicing fiscal responsibility, what does it take to create that vision in the lives of the American people, to create opportunity for all responsible people? What does it take to bring us together across the lines that divide us? What does it take to keep America strong, leading the world?

Well, among other things, it takes an unlimited commitment, in my judgment, to the proposition that we have to preserve our environment while we grow our economy. That means Don Beyer should be Governor of Virginia.

Our administration has passed the Safe Drinking Water Act. We've cleaned up millions of tons of chemicals from the air. We're tightening air pollution regulations. We are working very hard across a whole broad span of things. We have cleaned up more toxic waste dumps in 4 years than the previous administrations did in the last 12, and we're going to clean up 500 more.

But there are still some things that the States have to do, and that we have to work in partnership with the States on. The *pfiesteria* thing is one issue. The Chesapeake is another. It matters who the Governor is. I'm telling you, if you care about the environment, it is not enough to vote for Members of Congress and for the Presidency on environmental issues. It really matters what the environmental philosophy of the Governor of Virginia is, and it will have a lot to do with your future. That's the first thing.

The second big issue: One of the major contributions of the Democrats in Congress to this balanced budget agreement was the biggest expansion in health care for children since Medicaid was enacted in 1965: $24 billion to provide enough money to insure 5 million more children in America, and almost all of them in working families who don't have health insurance. About half the kids in the country don't have health insurance.

How are we going to do that? In a partnership with the States. You need a Governor who believes that these kids ought to have health insurance and who will be devoted to implementing that program in the proper way. Virginia has a lot of people who are working hard to raise their children. They show up for work every day; they pay their taxes; they ought to see that their kids have health insurance. It will not happen unless this legislation which we passed is actually made real in the lives of the children of Virginia. And it will matter a very great deal who the Governor is. That's another reason to be for Don Beyer for Governor of Virginia.

The third reason—and in my judgment, even though it's not the last point I want to make, it is still the overriding point—is the question of education. Virginia has been devoted to the cause of education for a long time—perhaps the best system of higher education in the United States, certainly one of the four or five best systems in the country, in Virginia. You know that.

We also know that our system of K through 12 education is not as good as it ought to be. And there's a lot of ferment and debate in America about that. Don asked me to veto any attempt to divert public school money to the private schools. That's my speech. I agree with that. I'm all for more choices for people within the public schools, and I understand why people make other choices, and I like privately funded scholarship programs for private schools. But the truth is that most of our public schools today are underfunded, not overfunded. You will not make education better for the vast majority of people by further weakening the funding level. They should be held accountable. Standards should be raised. We should improve them.

But what are we going to do? There are a lot of things that I could talk about. We could stay here until dawn talking about education. But I'll just mention two that Don has made

important. One is technology. We now know that, properly implemented, technology in our schools can, for example, do things—we know that it will help the brilliant kids who already know more than their parents do about computers. [*Laughter*] We know that. But what we now know is, that properly implemented in the early grades, technology can help children who have learning problems, can lift reading levels, can lift comprehension levels. We know that.

And in our budget we have funds that would put us on the way toward making sure we hook up every library and school classroom to the Internet by the year 2000. He wants to have one computer for every five students. That is the future of America. That's another good reason to be for Don Beyer for Governor of Virginia.

You already heard Don express his opinion about the standards issue, whether we should have national standards and a national exam. And you know that his opponent is against it. Let me tell you, if there was ever an example of the conflict between ideology and reality, this is it. There is not a single major country in the world, except the United States, that does not have national standards for what constitutes adequate knowledge in the dominant language of the country, in mathematics, in science, and a number of other things—only the United States.

Now, we have said, "Well, we don't want to do that because we've always had local control of the schools. We don't want the Federal Government to engage in some power grab." And that's the sort of ideological hit we're taking for doing this. Let me remind you that the first call for national standards and national exams to measure them came at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville in 1989, endorsed by President George Bush—I stayed up all night long writing that national education goals statement—endorsed by Republican and Democratic Governors alike. The Republican Governors were insisting on it.

I got elected. We said, "Let's do it." All of a sudden they said, "The Federal Government is trying to take over the schools." [*Laughter*] Mathematics is the same in Virginia and Vermont. [*Laughter*] Language is the same in Michigan and Maine. This is crazy.

Furthermore, our plan simply says that the States can voluntarily participate or not. The local school districts can voluntarily participate or not. The Federal Government's sole role in the bill that Chuck Robb voted for that passed 87 to 12 in the Senate is to pay for the development of the test to be supervised by the bipartisan or nonpartisan national board established by Congress, with Republican and Democrats and educators on it—already supervising tests given in 40 States but to only selected students—so that every fourth grader could take a reading test. If the kids have not been here long enough, obviously they shouldn't be held to a knowledge in English that they couldn't possibly make. So that's not a problem; we're not going to unfairly discriminate against the children of immigrants.

Nothing in this test can be used to hold back kids. This test is designed to say: If you don't know what you need to know, here is a roadmap; here's what you should know; here's what you don't know; here's what your teacher, here's what your schools can do to make sure you get up to snuff. I think the kids that are the most disadvantaged kids in the country have the biggest stake in the success of this national standards program. How will we ever get all our public schools up unless there are high standards by which we can measure them?

Now, if there was ever an issue which ought to determine—with no other issues taken into account—the outcome of a Governor's race in any State in America, it should be the education standards issue. And in Virginia, which is proud of itself, from the time of Thomas Jefferson, in leading the country in education, surely you ought to send a message to the country that Virginia will vote for national standards of excellence for all our children in the next election, and not against it—surely.

And there's one last issue I want you to think about, because I think it sends a big message to the country. We are in the process of becoming a truly multiracial, multiethnic democracy in a way that no other nation is. Now, India is bigger than we are and, believe it or not, they have even more languages spoken within their border. Russia has many, many different languages spoken, many different ethnic groups. But the difference is, almost all the people who are in different groups live only with their own group on their own piece of land, and they're not nearly as blended as we are. With all of our problems of segregation, we are clearly becoming the most integrated, multiracial, multiethnic, multireligious democracy in the world.

And as I'm sure virtually everyone is this room knows, based on the best evidence we have, the most diverse school district in the United States is Fairfax County, Virginia—in the entire country. Look around this room. We've got all different kinds of people, all different backgrounds. In a global economy, in a global society, where the real threats to our future are threats that can cross national borders—terrorist groups, drug traffickers, international criminal gangs, people robbing accounts through clever uses of computers—whether we can work together and live together and solve our problems together will determine our success as a nation.

I think the person who is elected Governor of Virginia sends a clear signal about what this State, which was at the base of our founding and wants to be in the vanguard of our future, believes about whether we can build one America. And that's another big reason to be for Don Beyer for Governor of Virginia.

I worked with Chuck Robb. I worked with Gerry Baliles. I worked with Doug Wilder. I want to work in a new way with Don Beyer. But I want you to do it not for me and not because we really want to say our new Democratic Party is accepted in Virginia but because we're building a new America for the 21st century, because we have within our hands the capacity to build a future better than any past the United States has ever had, able to put all of you in this room and all the people you represent together in an incredible kaleidoscope of opportunity, achievement, and common endeavor.

But it really will matter who your Governor is; what the priorities are; whether we are for the future, not the past; change, not the status quo; unity, not division; people, not politics. That's what Don Beyer represents. You've got a few weeks to go out and make sure that he wins on election night, and I want you to do it.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:35 p.m. in Chesapeake Hall at the National Airport Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Mr. Beyer's wife, Megan; William D. Dolan III, Democratic candidate for attorney general of Virginia; L.F. Payne, Jr., Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor of Virginia; and L. Douglas Wilder, former Virginia Governor.

Opening Remarks at the White House Conference on Climate Change
October 6, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for your remarks and your remarkable leadership to help us keep our Earth in the balance. Thank you, Father O'Donovan, for letting me come home to Georgetown one more time to discuss a matter of immense importance to America and its future. I thank the Members of Congress and the members of the Cabinet and the administration who are here, all those who have agreed to serve on the panels, and all you who have come to be part of this important day.

Six years ago last Friday—I can hardly believe it, but it was 6 years ago last Friday that I announced my intention to run for President, challenging America to embrace and to vigorously pursue a vision of our country for the 21st century: to make the American dream alive for every person responsible to work for it, to keep our country the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity, to bring our people together across all the lines that divide us into one America.

Shortly afterward I came here to Georgetown to this great hall to outline specific strategies and new policies to achieve that vision, rooted in our values of opportunity and responsibility, faith and family and community, designed to help Americans seize the opportunities and solve the problems of this new age. It was clear to me that our new direction had to be rooted in some basic guideposts, that we had to be oriented toward the future, not the past; toward change, not the status quo; toward partnership, not division; toward giving all a chance, not just the few; and finally toward making sure America leads, not follows.

We tried to develop a new approach to Government, where we didn't claim to do everything and we wouldn't tolerate doing nothing but instead we focused on giving people the tools to make the most of their own lives and creating the conditions that would allow them to succeed.

And we had new policies, the economic policies and trade policies, education policy, crime and welfare, policies toward the working poor, policies to bolster families and help them balance work and childrearing, policies in health care and foreign policy, and yes, policies in the environment.

In the last 4 years and 8 months, I think it's fair to say that, together, we have made real progress toward that vision for the 21st century. We stand at the threshold of that century stronger than most people thought was possible back in 1991, with our economy thriving, our social fabric mending, our leadership in the world strong. We have a solid foundation of achievement on which to stand as we take on the remaining challenges to build that bridge to the 21st century.

We are back here at Georgetown today because global climate change clearly is one of the most important of those challenges and also one of the most complex, crossing the disciplines of environmental science, economics, technology, business, politics, international development, and global diplomacy, affecting how we and all others on this planet will live, support our families, grow our food, produce our energy, and realize our dreams in the new century.

That's why we've put together this White House Conference on Climate Change, bringing together experts and leaders with a wide range of knowledge and a wide range of views. People of good will bring to this conference many honest disagreements about the nature of the threat we face and how we should respond. That is healthy in a democracy like ours. My hope is that we will take advantage of this forum to actually talk with each other rather than past each other. For it is our responsibility to work together to achieve two vital and compatible goals, ensuring the continued vitality of our planet and expanding economic growth and opportunity for our people.

Despite the complexities of these challenges, we have good reason to be optimistic, beginning with our 220-year record of making all manner of difficult problems solvable and, importantly, a very good record in the last generation of environmental progress. For in the last generation alone, we came together to heed Rachel Carson's warnings and banned DDT and other poisons. We cleaned up rivers so filthy they were catching on fire, phased out lead in gasoline and chemicals that were eating a hole in the ozone layer. We worked with citizens to conserve the headwaters forest of Northern California, restore the Florida Everglades, protect Yellowstone National Park from the assaults of mining, in each case proving that environmental stewardship does not have to hamstring economic growth.

Indeed, in tackling the difficult task of cutting sulfur dioxide emissions with an innovative system of permit trading, the United States is well ahead of the schedule we set for ourselves and well below the projected cost in cleaning the environment. I believe we find that same common ground as we address the challenge of climate change.

Before we begin our discussion today, I think it's important for me to explain the four principles that will guide my approach to this issue. First, I'm convinced that the science of climate change is real. We'll hear more about this today from our first panel. But for me the bottom line is that, although we do not know everything, what we do know is more than enough to warrant responsible action.

The great majority of the world's climate scientists have concluded, if we don't cut our emission of greenhouse gases, temperatures will rise and will disrupt the global climate. In fact, most scientists say this process has already begun. I might add that I had nothing to do with scheduling this conference on the day which is predicted to be the hottest October 6th that we have ever had in Washington, DC. [*Laughter*]

I know not everyone agrees on how to interpret the scientific conclusions. I know not everyone shares my assessment of the risks. But I think we all have to agree that the potential for serious climate disruption is real. It would clearly be a grave mistake to bury our heads in the sand and pretend the issue will go away.

The second principle is that when the nations of the world meet in December in Kyoto, Japan, we must be prepared to commit to realistic and binding goals on our emissions of greenhouse gases. With 4 percent of the world's population, we enjoy more than 20 percent of the world's wealth, which helps to explain why we also produce more than 20 percent of the world's

greenhouse gases. If we expect other nations to act on the problem, we must show leadership.

The third principle is that we must embrace solutions that will allow us to continue to grow our economy as we honor our global responsibilities and our responsibilities to our children. We've worked far too hard to revitalize the American dream to jeopardize our progress now. Therefore, we must emphasize flexible market-based approaches. We must work with business and industry to find the right ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We must promote technologies that make energy production and consumption more efficient.

There are many people here today from companies that are addressing the climate change in innovative ways, taking steps that will save money for American families even as we reduce the threat of global warming. For example, a number of leading electric utilities, including AEP, Southern Company, Niagara Mohawk, and Northern States Power, are working with homeowners to promote a new technology called geoexchange, using geothermal pumps to heat and cool homes far more cheaply than traditional systems while reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 40 percent or more. Ballard Power and United Technologies are leading pioneers in developing fuel cells that are so clean, their only exhaust is distilled water. Right now, Ballard is working with Chrysler, Mercedes Benz, and Toyota to introduce fuel cells into new cars. Both of these technologies represent the kind of creative solutions that will make our job easier.

The fourth principle is that we must expect all nations, both industrialized and developing, to participate in this process in a way that is fair to all. It is encouraging that so many nations in so many parts of the world are developing so rapidly. That is good news for their people, and it is good for America's economic future. But as we've seen right here at home, rising energy demands that accompany economic development traditionally have meant large increases in greenhouses gas emissions. In fact, if current trends continue, emissions from the developing world will likely eclipse those from the developed world in the next few decades.

But they have an opportunity to pursue a different future without sacrificing economic growth. The industrialized world alone cannot assume responsibility for reducing emissions. Otherwise, we'll wind up with no reduction in emissions within a matter of a few decades. In Kyoto, therefore, we will ask for meaningful but equitable commitments from all nations. Second, we must explore new ways for American businesses to help these rapidly growing countries to meet their developmental needs with cleaner and more efficient energy technologies.

Today I hope we can take a step forward in putting all four of these principles into effect. We have studied this issue long enough to know that there are sensible options for action. It is our job now to pull them together into a coherent plan.

Nearly three decades ago when the Apollo astronauts first went to the Moon, we gained an entirely new perspective on the global challenge we face today. For looking down on Earth from the vantage point that revealed no political boundaries or divisions, the astronauts had the same chilling sensation. They were simply awestruck by how tiny and fragile our planet is, protected from the harsh void of space by an atmosphere that looked as thin and delicate as the skin of an onion. Every astronaut since has experienced the same insight, and they've even given it a name, the Overview Effect. It has instilled in each new astronaut a passion to convince people we must work together on Earth's behalf. Rusty Schweickart has said, "You realize that on that little blue-and-white thing, there is everything that means anything to you, all history and music and poetry and art and death and birth and love, all of it on that little spot out there you can cover with your thumb."

To the best of my knowledge, only one person here has actually experienced the Overview Effect firsthand, Dr. Mae Jemison, a former shuttle astronaut and current international development expert who will participate in our third panel discussion this afternoon. Nonetheless, I challenge everyone in this room to rise to a vantage point high enough to experience the Overview Effect. It will enable us to reach common ground.

Let me say when the Vice President was talking and Father O'Donovan was talking, I was looking around this old hall that I have loved for so long, and I found it utterly amazing that I first came here 33 years ago. I was reading this morning up at Camp David the list of people who were going to be here today, and I found it utterly amazing that a few of you I first talked to as long as 20 years ago about the need to build an alternative energy future

for America. And I find it completely amazing that five-eighths of my Presidency is behind me.

I make these points for this reason: If you think about the benchmarks in your own life, it doesn't take long to live your life. And what seems at the beginning of your life a very long time, seems to have passed in the flash of an eye once you have experienced it. These great developments, such as the one we're here to talk about today, occur over many life spans. And popular democracies are far more well-organized to take advantage of opportunities or deal with immediate crises than they are to do the responsible thing, which is to take a moderate but disciplined approach far enough in advance of a train coming down the track to avoid leaving our children and our grandchildren with a catastrophe.

So I ask you to think about that. We do not want the young people who sat on these steps today, for whom 33 years will also pass in the flash of an eye, to have to be burdened or to burden their children with our failure to act.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 a.m. in Gaston Hall at Georgetown University. In his remarks, he referred to Father Leo J. O'Donovan, president, Georgetown University; and Apollo astronaut Russell L. Schweickart.

Remarks During the White House Conference on Climate Change
October 6, 1997

[*The first panel discussion on the science of global warming and climate change is joined in progress.*]

The President. Isn't there some evidence already that malaria in nations and areas where it presently exists is becoming more prevalent and moving to higher climates?

[*At this point, Diana Liverman, chair, National Academy of Sciences Committee on Human Dimensions of Climate Change, confirmed increases in malaria in developing countries and in the United States due to climate change and population mobility.*]

The President. Let me ask you one other question, because—let me go back to what I said in the beginning. This is one of the most difficult problems of democracy because we get 100 percent of the people to agree that it exists, and only 10 percent of the people have experienced it and another 10 percent of the people can imagine it and, therefore, are willing to deal with it. You still have to have 51 percent in order to develop any kind of political consensus for doing anything, I think, commensurate with the need.

So would you say—I have—and I know this happens to a lot of people—but I had a number of people—I had a young Congressman in to see me the other day who was a member of the Republican Party, and he said, "You know, in my State we've had three 100-year floods in 10 years." I met a man over my vacation who said that he was moving away from the place he had lived for a decade because it was a completely different place than it had been just 10 years ago. It was hotter; there were more mosquitoes; it was a very different and difficult place. Do you believe that these anecdotal experiences are likely related to climate change, or are they just basically people's imagination?

[*Dr. Liverman cited surveys on perceptions of climate change which correlated with observed temperature changes.*]

The President. Dr. Karl, do you want to say anything?

[*Thomas Karl, senior scientist, National Climatic Data Center, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, mentioned statistics showing record precipitation in six States in 1996. The Vice President commented on budget increases related to flooding and other disasters, and then asked about the predicted heat index for Washington, DC, in the next century.*]

Dr. Karl. I think it's up to 105 or 110. I don't know the exact numbers, but——

Dr. Liverman. It's under 100 now, and it's going to go to about 105 on average, they think, during the summer months.

The Vice President. Well, we'll get some more on that. [*Laughter*]

The President. We certainly will. [*Laughter*] One reason I believe this is occurring is that James Lee Witt is the only member of my Cabinet who is actually disappointed when his budget goes up. [*Laughter*] And he's had a lot of disappointments these last 5 years.

I'd like to now call on Donald Wilhite to talk about the relationship—we've heard about increased precipitation, and I'd like to ask him to talk about drought and the apparent paradox in drought patterns and increased precipitation patterns and what implications this might have for American agriculture, which is a terribly important part of our economy. And we have all been counting on it being a very important part of our export economy for the indefinite future.

[*Donald Wilhite, director, National Drought Mitigation Center, University of Nebraska, discussed the impact of drought on U.S. agricultural production.*]

The President. I want to ask a question and try to make sure that we are all as clear as we can be based on what is known about two apparently contradictory things, that is that the total volume of precipitation has increased virtually everywhere and the number and severity of droughts has increased across the country.

Now, Dr. Karl said earlier that part of the explanation is that the precipitation we're getting is coming in bigger bursts. But what I would like to do is have somebody offer basically a line of explanation that everyone in the audience, and hopefully those who will be following these proceedings, can understand. Why did it happen at the same time that we had more drought and more floods? How could we have more droughts when the aggregate amount of precipitation on an annual basis was increased? And I think it's important that people kind of get why that happens.

[*Dr. Wilhite explained that increased intense precipitation resulted in very high runoff, and increased temperatures resulted in increased evaporation and soil drying.*]

The President. So I think that's important. When the temperatures warm, they dry the soil and create the conditions for the floods simultaneously.

Dr. Wilhite. That's correct.

The President. And because these floods don't—wash away the soil, rather than sink down into the soil, you get very little benefit out of them, and farmers lose a lot of topsoil.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. Let me ask you a follow-up question, and perhaps someone else would like to answer. But I think it's important again, and forgive—for those of you in the audience who know a lot more about this than I do, you will have to forgive me, but I'm also trying to imagine how this is going to be absorbed by our Nation and by people who will be following this.

It appears that we are headed into a powerful El Niño, and I wonder if one of you would just simply very briefly explain what that is and whether you believe there is a link between the power of the El Niño and climate change.

[*Robert Watson, Director for Environment, World Bank, and Chair, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, explained the effects of the El Niño phenomena on temperature and precipitation patterns throughout the world. The Vice President then noted the similarity between attitudes toward global warming and past skepticism concerning the detrimental effects of tobacco.*]

The President. We've got to wrap up the first panel and get on to the next one, but I'd like to ask—I think I'd like to ask, John, you to respond to this. If anyone else wishes to, you're welcome to. I think there is a more sophisticated question to be asked—although the Vice President is right, there still are some people who claim that this scientific case that I have been completely persuaded by has not been made. I think the more difficult argument, John, goes something like this: Look, you put all this stuff in the atmosphere and it stays there for 100 years at least, and maybe longer, and so what's the hurry? And in a democracy, it's very hard to artificially impose things on people they can't tangibly feel, and so why shouldn't we just keep on rocking along with the kind of technological progress we're making now until there really is both better scientific information and completely painless technological fixes that are apparent to all? Why shouldn't we just wait until

all doubt has been resolved and hopefully we have even better technology—and because, after all, the full impact of whatever we do if we start tomorrow won't be felt for decades and maybe even for a century?

Number one, if that's true, how quickly could we lower the temperature of the planet below what it otherwise would be, and, number two, what about the argument on the merits?

[*John Holdren, member, President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, and professor, Harvard University, used graphs to demonstrate the need to reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere as soon as possible in order to avoid unmanageable degrees of climate change in the future.*]

The President. But I do want to make the following points: Number one, we can't get to the green line unless there is a global agreement that involves both the developing and the developed countries. Number two, however, that's not an excuse for us to do nothing because if we do something, it will be better than it would have been otherwise, because we're still the biggest contributor and will be until sometime well into the next century. And number three, based on everything we know, it will be easier in some ways, particularly if they get the financial help they need, for developing countries to choose a different energy future in the first place than it will be for the developed countries to make the adjustments, which is not to say we don't have to make the adjustments but to say that—I have read a lot of the press coverage and people saying, oh, well, we're just using this for an excuse or we're not being fair to them or we don't want them to have a chance to grow. That is not true.

The United States cannot maintain and enhance its own standard of living unless the developing nations grow and grow rapidly. We support that. But they can choose a different energy future, and that has to be a part of this. But it's not an excuse for us to do nothing, because whatever we do, we're going to make it better for ourselves and for the rest of the world than it otherwise would have been. But I think it's important to point out what John showed us there on the green line. The green line—it requires—to reach the green line, we have to have a worldwide action plan.

[*Following conclusion of the first panel discussion, the second panel discussion on the role of technology in reducing greenhouse gas emissions is joined in progress.*]

The President. Let me just say before we go on to the transportation sector, these presentations have been quite important. I remember 20 years ago, more or less—maybe a little less now, I can't remember exactly when—the Congress voted, or the Federal Government at least required—it might have been a regulatory action—that the new powerplants not use natural gas anymore and that we phase out of them because we grossly underestimated how much natural gas we had. And we thought we could go to clean coal because we didn't want to build nuclear plants, for all the reasons that were clear.

And one of the biggest problems we face now in trying to make a reasoned judgment about how quickly we can reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and by how much, is the need not to be unfair to electric utilities that have billions of dollars invested in Government-approved powerplants that they have not yet fully amortized. Therefore, insofar—and this applies both to buildings and to the utilities themselves, about which these two speakers have spoken. You can either conserve more in the production of electricity, or you can have the people who consume it conserve more, or you can change the basis on which the plants work, which is the most expensive way to do it. Therefore, insofar as we can do more in terms of how much electricity people use or how much waste heat you recover, either one of those things is a far preferable—far preferable—alternative than to change the basis on which plants that have already been built are being amortized and will generate huge amounts of saving at lower costs if we can do it.

At the end of this session, we'll get around to sort of the skeptical economist's take on the technological fix. We'll get around to that later. But I just think it's important that we focus on this specific issue, because if our goal is to minimize economic dislocation, then having conservation by the end-users, the people who have the buildings, for example, whether they're manufacturers or residential buildings or otherwise business buildings, and having recovery of waste heat are clearly, I think, the preferable

alternatives and clearly the less expensive alternatives.

I'd like to call on Mary Good now, who was the Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology in our administration for 4 years and now is the managing member of Venture Capital Investors. I want her to talk a little bit about the potential for technological advances to reduce emissions in the transportation sector and to focus particularly on the partnership for new generation vehicles that we've been working on with the auto companies and the UAW since this administration took office. And Mary had a lot to do with it.

There is also a huge debate here about how much we can do how quickly. And we have to make the best judgment about this in determining what to say about where we are in Kyoto, because transportation, as Secretary Peña said, occupies such a large part of this whole equation. So, Mary, have at it. Tell me what I should say in Japan on my visit.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. I just wanted to make two brief points. The leaders of the Big Three auto companies and the UAW came in to see us last week, and they said they're going to meet their partnership for the next generation vehicle goal. The real problem is, once they develop a prototype, how quickly can it be mass-produced, and how will people buy it, and will they buy it at present fuel prices? We'll come back to that at the end. But one related question to that is, given Americans' buying habits and consumer preferences, don't we have to include these light trucks and even heavy trucks in this partnership for the next generation vehicle? Don't we have to achieve significant fuel efficiencies there as well, if we have any hope of succeeding here?

The only other point I want to make, Mary, is, you know I'm big on all kinds of fast-rail research, but I hope tomorrow's headline isn't "Clinton Advocates More Research on Levitation." [*Laughter*] I don't need that.

Ms. Good. We'll have to explain it to them better.

The President. I'd like to call on Michael Bonsignore now to talk about the energy savings available through the use of more high-efficiency products and systems, and also the potential for environmental technology exports. What he has to say and how applicable and expandable you believe it is has a lot to do with whether this transition we're going through will be an economic plus, a drag, or a wash. I personally have always believed it would be a plus if we did it right. But I'd like to ask Michael to talk about that.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. We need to wrap up; we're running a little bit late. But I wanted to just give everyone an opportunity to comment on this. Mason was the only person, I think, who explicitly said that in order to make this transition we need to raise the price of carbon-based products. One of the difficulties we're having within the administration in reaching a proper judgment about what position to stake out in Kyoto relates to how various people are responding, frankly, to the recommendations and the findings of the people coming out of the energy labs, because they say, hey, look, what we know already shows you that we have readily available technologies and courses of action which would take a huge hunk out of—right now, with no great increased cost—a huge hunk out of any attempt to, let's say, flatten our greenhouse gas emissions at 1990 levels. We just heard about it today. Look what you could do with powerplants. You can recapture the waste heat, two-thirds of that. You can make buildings and manufacturing facilities and residences much more energy efficient. You can make transportation much more energy efficient. Besides that, we've got all these alternative sources of fuel for electricity and transportation. I mean, it's all out there; this is what we know now. And then sooner or later, we're going to have the partnership for the next generation vehicle.

So the question is always, though, who will buy this stuff? Right now, you can buy light bulbs—every one of us could have every light bulb in our home, right now, every single one of them—we'd have to pay 60 percent more for the light bulb, but it would have 3 times the useful life. Therefore, you just work it out; we'd pay more up front, we'd save more money in the long run, and we'd use a whole lot less carbon. And why don't we do it? Why do we have any other kind of light bulbs in our homes?

And that is the simplest example of the nature of the debate we are now having. That is, in order to get from here to where we want to go, do we have to either raise the price of

the product—there are only three or four things you can do: You can raise the price of the product to the consumers; you can lower the price of the alternative thing you wish to be bought by the consumers; you can create some new business opportunity through some market permit trading, other market option, or otherwise change the business environment the way we do electric deregulation, for example; or you can somehow increase the awareness of consumers of what their options are and the consequences of that and hope that they will behave in a different way. I think those are the four categories of possibilities.

And if you choose an ambitious target, then, if the requirement is more—to reach the target is almost exclusively on the front end—that is, you have to raise the price to the consumer or to the business involved—the businesses may be a consumer—if it happens too quickly, you're going to do economic damage on the one hand. And on the other hand, there is no way in the world this Senate will ratify our participation in Kyoto, so we'll be out there—it will be a grand gesture, but it won't happen.

Therefore, we have got to know how much we can do through a combination of price—you might be able to get some price changes, particularly going back—Mike said this, too, on the real price of energy—particularly if it was not a net tax increase, you wouldn't have to have a net—there are a lot of other ways to do this. But we have to be able to get something out of either lowering the cost of the alternative, creating new business markets, or increasing consumer awareness of what is right there for them now and what the consequences are. We can't do it all on the front end and expect realistically—if all we do on the Consumer Price Index, raising the price of coal, raising price of oil to the real consumer, and that's all we do, we are not going to get what we want to do in the time allotted to get it because it either won't pass the Senate or it won't pass muster with the American people.

So we have to be able to access what the Energy Department tells us is there for all to see in other ways. And I don't know if any of you want to comment on that, but this is not a question of whether you're brave or not or all that, it's really a question of what we can get done and what realistically is going to happen in America.

But I'm plagued by the example of the light bulb I have in my living room at the White House that I read under at night, and I ask myself, why isn't every light bulb in the White House like this? I use this when—I get so tickled—I go in and turn it on and I measure how much longer it takes to really light up, but I know it's going to be there long, you know? [*Laughter*] And I say, why am I so irresponsible that I have not put this in every light bulb? Why are we not all doing this?

So when you get right down to it, now, this is where the rubber meets the road. We have to make a decision, a commitment; it has to be meaningful. I'm convinced that the Energy Department lab people are absolutely right, but the skeptics on my economic team said, there will not be perfect substitution, they're not going to do it.

So if you want to say anything about that, you can. But when you get right down to it, that's where—all the decisions are going to be made based on our best judgment about what kind of markets we can create for the private sector, what kind of substitution there is, and whether we can—how quickly we can move to alternative energy sources that people will actually access.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. I strongly agree with that, pushing that. And again, I say that does not let us off the hook to do things here at home, it just makes good sense. It's easier for—we should give these other countries a chance to choose an alternative path.

I never will forget a couple of years ago—I know we've got to wrap up—but I had a fascinating conversation with the President of China a couple of years ago, and we were discussing what our future would be and whether we wished to contain China. And I said, "I don't wish to contain China." I said, "The biggest security threat China presents the United States is that you will insist on getting rich the same way we did." And he looked at me, and I could tell he had never thought of that. And I said, "You have to choose a different future, and we have to help. We have to support you. And that does not in any way let us off the hook. But it just means that we have to do this together."

Well, this has been fascinating. You guys have been great, and I thank you a lot.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 11 a.m. in Gaston Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Michael Bonsignore, chairman and chief executive officer, Honeywell, Inc.; Mason Willrich, chairman of the board, EnergyWorks, L.L.C.; and President Jiang Zemin of China.

Remarks on Signing Line Item Vetoes of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998, and an Exchange With Reporters

October 6, 1997

The President. Good afternoon. Today we take another step on the long journey to bring fiscal discipline to Washington. Over the past 4½ years, we've worked hard to cut the deficit and to ensure that our tax dollars are used wisely, carefully and effectively. We have reduced the deficit by 85 percent even before the balanced budget legislation passed. The balanced budget I signed into law this summer will extend our fiscal discipline well into the next century, keeping our economy strong.

But to follow through on the balanced budget, Government must continue to live within its means, within the framework established in the agreement. The line item veto, which all Presidents of both parties had sought for more than a century, gives the President a vital new tool to ensure that our tax dollars are well spent, to stand up for the national interests over narrow interests.

Six days ago, I signed into law the Military Construction Appropriations Act, a $9.2 billion measure that is vital to our national defense. Today I'm using the line item veto to cancel 38 projects inserted into that bill by the Congress that were not requested by the military, cannot make a contribution to our national defense in the coming year, and will not immediately benefit the quality of life and well-being of our men and women in uniform. The use of the line item veto saves the taxpayers nearly $290 million and makes clear that the old rules have, in fact, changed.

I want to stress that I have retained most of the projects that were added by Congress to my own spending request. Congress plays a vital role in this process, and its judgment is entitled to respect and deference. Many of the projects I have chosen to cancel have merit, but should be considered in the future. This is simply the wrong time.

The projects I have canceled are all over the country, in the districts of lawmakers of both parties. These are tough calls involving real money and hard choices. I canceled the projects that met three neutral and objective criteria:

First, the Department of Defense concluded that these projects were not a priority at this time, after conducting its own rigorous, massive planning process. Judgments about our defense needs made by military professionals must continue to be the basis of our national defense budgeting.

Second, the projects I am canceling do not make an immediate contribution to the housing, education, recreation, child care, health, or religious life of our men and women in uniform. Our fighting forces and their families make extraordinary sacrifices for us, and I have a longstanding commitment to improve their living conditions. I have, therefore, left untouched a number of extra projects not requested this year because they fulfill that commitment in enhancing the quality of life of our men and women in the service.

Third, I am canceling projects that would not have been built in fiscal year 1998 in any event, projects where the Department of Defense has not yet even done design work. In short, whether they're meritorious or not, they will not be built in the coming year in any event.

In canceling these projects, I was determined to do nothing that would undercut our national security. Every penny of our defense dollars should be used to maintain and improve the world's strongest system of national defense.

Also, under the balanced budget, however, we have the added obligation, again I say, to ensure that taxpayer funds are expended wisely. The use of the line item veto here will ensure that we focus on those projects that will best secure our strength in the years to come.

Let me say finally that the work of protecting taxpayers in reforming the Government must continue. I will scrutinize the other appropriation bills, using appropriate criteria in each instance, and will exercise the line item veto when warranted. And I will continue to fight for bipartisan campaign finance reform.

Tomorrow the Members of the Senate must decide: Will they move forward with a bipartisan campaign finance reform bill, or be derailed by a partisan poison pill? The American people will be watching. If they make the right choice, this can, indeed, be a banner week for reform in our Government.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President——

The President. John, [John Donvan, ABC News] let me just sign this, and then I'll come back to answer questions.

[*At this point, the President signed the message transmitting the line item vetoes.*]

Videotapes of White House Coffees

Q. My question is about the videotapes that were released and your staff telling us that they really did not know about the existence of these tapes until this week. How could your staff not know about the existence of these tapes?

The President. Oh, I think that probably they never discussed it with anybody in the White House Communications Agency. You'd have to ask them. But I can tell you, as soon as I became aware of it, I instructed them to be turned over to the appropriate committees as soon as possible.

We have fully cooperated with these committees. We've given over 100,000 pages of documents to the Senate committee alone, I believe. And we'll continue to do so. But I think you could just ask the people involved what happened, but my guess is that the White House Communications Agency just took some footage and that the rest of the staff was unaware of it or didn't think of it, and they didn't think about it either.

So now you have it, and people can view it and draw their own conclusions.

Q. Mr. President, are you disturbed by this belated discovery? Are you concerned? Have you asked what——

The President. No, because I don't think there's any—I don't believe for a moment that any of the career military people in WHCA in any way deliberately didn't say anything about this. I think it was just an accident. And so I think that that would be my guess. And all I can tell you is, as soon as I found out about it late last week, I said, "Get this out and let's go on." And you can view the tapes and draw your own conclusions.

Q. The question isn't really whether the WHCA people tried to withhold them, but whether people like your Counsel and other officials involved who realized these videotapes existed didn't turn them over.

The President. Oh, I'm sure that Mr. Ruff didn't do that. I talked to him—he called me as soon as he knew about it—or one of the assistant counsels came down——

Q. When was that?

The President. I think it was Thursday afternoon—came down and told me, and that's the first I knew about it. And I don't think they had known about it for very long. And I'm sure they took a little time to figure out exactly what was covered, how much they needed to do, and reviewed the materials, and then turned them over, which is what should have been done.

Stand-Clark-Squillacote Espionage Case

Q. Sir, are you concerned about the Soviet espionage arrests that happened in Virginia today, that date back to the cold war? And just how widespread is this problem, sir?

The President. Well, let me say I have been briefed about it, and it appears to me that the law enforcement authorities have done their job in trying to uncover a problem. We'll have to wait and see. We can't presume people's guilt. But I think that the only responsible thing is for me to refer you to the Justice Department because they made those judgments.

Assassination Attempt on Khaled Meshal

Q. Mr. President, one other matter. On this apparently failed assassination attempt by Israeli agents in Jordan, what was your reaction to that? And are these not precisely the kinds of actions that serve to undermine confidence in the peace process?

The President. Well, since the Government of Israel and the Government of Jordan have made no comment about this, I think it is inappropriate for me to make any comment. I will say this—you know the policy of the United States for our own conduct is, and has been

I believe for more than 20 years under Presidents of both parties, that we do not engage in assassinations. But I can make no comment on what others did or did not do when it has not been confirmed by either of the governments in question.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:25 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Kurt Alan Stand, James Michael Clark, and Theresa Marie Squillacote, who were accused of spying for East Germany in the 1970's and 1980's; and Hamas leader Khaled Meshal, who was attacked in Amman, Jordan, on September 25. The Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998, H.R. 2016, approved September 30, was assigned Public Law No. 105–45.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Line Item Vetoes of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998

October 6, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel the dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the "Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998" (Public Law 105–45; H.R. 2016). I have determined that the cancellation of these amounts will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
October 6, 1997.

NOTE: The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on October 7.

Statement on Signing Legislation Designating the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington Field Office Memorial Building

October 6, 1997

Today I am pleased to have signed into law H.R. 2443, a bill that would designate the new Washington, D.C., field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as the "Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington Field Office Memorial Building." The new building is so named in honor of the five FBI agents who have been killed in the line of duty while assigned to the FBI's Washington field office: William H. Christian, Jr., Martha Dixon Martinez, Michael J. Miller, Anthony Palmisano, and Edwin R. Woodriffe.

Naming the FBI's new field office in honor of these brave and courageous FBI employees is a reminder to us all of the difficult and dangerous job that FBI agents do—day in and day out.

In establishing this permanent memorial, we do well to remember—and be grateful for—the lives of all Federal, State, and local law enforcement personnel who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the performance of their duties.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

October 6, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2443, approved October 6, was assigned Public Law No. 105–52.

Remarks on Campaign Finance Reform Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

October 7, 1997

The President. Thank you very much, Ann, for your work. And I want to thank all the other groups here represented for your labors. I thank Congressman Shays and Congressman Meehan for their work in the House. And I hope we'll have something important for them to do here in just a few days.

I also want to say a lot of the issues that need to be raised have obviously been clearly articulated in the Vice President's statement and by Ann, and all of us know them. But I think it's important to try to put this into some context. This problem has been building up for years. For years the cost of political campaigns have been escalating, as the cost of communicating with people through mass media has gone up and other costs have increased. And that has led to a fundraising arms race that has overwhelmed and consumed both parties and candidates all over our country.

For years there have been efforts to do something about this, bipartisan efforts. And every year of my first term, bipartisan efforts for reform were met by obstruction, opposition, and delay, and specifically died of filibuster in the United States Senate. For years there were interests and there are interests who actually benefit from the present system; we have to acknowledge that. And they like it the way it is, and they would like to keep it. They have been able, until today, to smother campaign finance reform in the shadows, away from the clear light of public evaluation.

That is what has changed this year. This year there is a highly public and increasingly clearly understood moment of truth in Washington. Today, the Members of our Senate have it within their power to strike a blow against politics as usual and a blow for a better future for America. They can pass the first significant campaign finance reform in a generation and give voters the loudest vote in the country, clearly and unambiguously.

The lines are sharply drawn, I will say that; this is much clearer than it has been in years past. Those who are fighting to preserve the status quo have made their position crystal clear. They have said they will use every procedural device they can muster in both Houses to keep this from happening. They seek to use "poison pill" amendments, proposals that would worsen the current system in the name of reform. And if all else fails, the filibuster is always there to block the majority will.

But this is also clear: The tide of reform is coming in. The one million signatures Ann mentioned is one example of that. It's not just the President who supports McCain-Feingold legislation. It's not just groups that labor here in the vineyards year-in and year-out. The public supports it. And I believe when the voting comes, a majority of the Senate will support it if they are simply allowed to vote on it. All we need now is a fair vote—yes or no, up or down, reform or the status quo. The American people are entitled to that. They are entitled to see that this legislation does not die by procedural maneuvering or "poison pill" amendments.

The choice is plain. A vote for the filibuster is a vote to keep the soft money system. A vote for the filibuster is a vote for less disclosure, for weaker enforcement, for back door campaign spending by so-called independent groups. A vote for the filibuster is a vote to kill bipartisan campaign finance reform. And I hope and believe that will be a vote that will be difficult to explain to the American people.

I know some Senators favor provisions that aren't in this bill. This legislation is a principled compromise. Those of us who support spending limits and free television time had to agree to drop those to get a bill. And I think they're very important, and it killed me to have to drop those. I hated it. But this bill is better than having no reform. So everybody has had to give up something to get this bill in a position where people of both parties in good conscience could vote on it and where we had a chance to pass it. So for those who complain about that, they're not alone. Those of us who favor even stronger and more sweeping legislation had to give up something, as well.

There are many other worthy ideas being advanced, and that's all to the good. But the irreducible fact is, only McCain-Feingold, and its counterpart legislation in the House sponsored

by Congressmen Shays and Meehan, is a vehicle which can move us forward. That is the bottom line, and the one that I hope we can convince the United States Senate to embrace. We need to put aside partisanship, reject pressure, and join in an effort to find common ground here. And the Senate has got to take the lead.

I will say again: This is our best chance in a generation. The debate is now clear, unambiguous, out in the open. I will fight as hard as I can for as long as it takes to keep it right there. And if all of you help, then I think we can fulfill our obligation to renew and strengthen our democracy for a new century.

Thank you very much.

1996 Campaign Financing

Q. Mr. President, given the fact that your former senior aide, Mr. Ickes, is on the Hill today and may lay out the tactics of your last campaign that he admits were some potential errors in judgment, and given the revelations of the past few days about the belated disclosure of the coffee tapes, do you think it's hard for people to follow you as a standard bearer for campaign finance reform?

The President. No. It may be hard for you, but I don't think it's hard for people. I'm not ashamed of the fact that I did the best I could within the present system. I knew we would be outspent badly in 1996, but we weren't outspent as badly as we would have been if I had laid around and done nothing.

I'd like to ask you to go back and review what the reports were that you gave the American people in '95 and '96 about what the Republican majority in Congress was telling people when they raised money from them, things that I was never accused of saying. I never told anyone they had to contribute to me in order to do business with the White House. I never asked anybody not to do anything with the other side.

And we didn't raise nearly as much as they did, from any category, but we were able to continue to fight against what I thought was bad for the country and to fight for what was good for the country. That's why, in this balanced budget amendment, we've got provisions that will insure 5 million children who don't have health insurance, and open the doors of college to all. That wouldn't have happened if the election had turned out the other way. And I'm not sorry that I did what was available under the existing system.

But I have always been for changing the system. I'm just not for unilateral disarmament. And I expect that Mr. Ickes will go forward and answer the questions and do a good job today. That's what I expect him to do.

Campaign Finance Reform

Q. Mr. President, you say that you're not in favor of unilateral disarmament, but wouldn't this be a time to stake out a leadership position, sir, and swear off soft money and challenge the Republicans to do the same?

The President. No. No, because if I did that, they would do what they're doing now. They would laugh. They would be happy. They would go into the next election, they would outspend our people even more. In the last 10 days of the last election cycle, in the 20 closest races, almost all of which were lost by Democrats, they were outspent 4-, 5-, 6-to-1—in the last 10 days, even under the present system. And you know, I thought about that a lot. It would be easy for me to do, too, because I don't have to run again. And then I could get some of you to say nice things about what I did. It's not up to me. I don't have to run again. I could easily do that.

But I'd like to remind you that there are other issues at stake here. There are other issues at stake here. In 1995, I fought a battle to keep the guarantee of medical care and nutrition—basic nutrition—to children who are poor from being taken away from them. And I could not have won in that battle if I didn't have enough allies in the Congress to sustain my veto. In 1993, because of the composition of the Congress, we passed a budget bill that reduced the deficit by 85 percent before the balanced budget bill had passed. I could not have done that if there hadn't been those people in the Congress to do that.

So, I am committed to this campaign finance reform. But there are other issues, and we have to have allies. People give money in these elections based on what they honestly believe should be done. I don't question the sincerity of those who financed Mr. Gingrich and the Republican revolution. But I disagreed with it. And we had an argument. And we have to have enough capacity to stake out our position, and if we don't have—we have to fight for the things we believe

are important, just as they fight for the things they believe are important.

It's a simple thing. The cost of communications have overwhelmed the capacity of the system as it was intended to operate. The FEC created this soft money loophole. It has become the way of getting access to virtually unlimited communications. We have to close the loophole. And we have to close it for all on a fair basis. For me, I could give it up easily, but I don't think it would be right for me to put the people that agree with me about what's best for America at an even greater disadvantage than they're going to be. And it doesn't affect me personally, but that's been my position.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Ann McBride, president, Common Cause; and Harold Ickes, former Deputy Chief of Staff to the President.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Ezer Weizman of Israel and an Exchange With Reporters

October 7, 1997

President Clinton. Good morning, everyone. I'm delighted to have President Weizman here, and we had a nice dinner last evening, and we're going to have further talks today about what we can do in the United States to further the peace process. And certainly we are grateful for all that he has done as President and throughout his entire career. It's a great honor to have you here.

President Weizman. Thank you very much.

President Clinton. Thank you.

Jonathan Pollard Espionage Case

Q. Mr. President, thank you. In light of the recent swap between Israel and Jordan, there has also been talk raised again about Jonathan Pollard. I was wondering if you believe justice was served when he received his life sentence, and do you believe he will spend his life sentence in prison?

And to President Weizman, will you be raising this issue today with the President?

President Weizman. You were talking too fast. What did you say?

Q. The question of Jonathan Pollard—will you be raising it with President Clinton today?

President Weizman. It's always in our minds.

Q. Mr. President?

President Clinton. Well, I receive—when Mr. Pollard applies for clemency, I receive recommendations from both my Justice and National Security Advisers, and I take into account what they recommend, and then I take action. And that's what I'll do if it comes up again.

Assassination Attempt on Khaled Meshal

Q. Good morning. Thank you, Mr. President. What is your reaction to the attempted assassination attempt in Jordan and Mr. Netanyahu's apparent contention that it was a legitimate tool of government?

President Clinton. The United States law is different on that, and our policy is different on this. I believe that, certainly for us, we have the right law. We don't—it's illegal for the United States Government to engage in assassination attempts. But I think that it's very important for countries to fight terrorism. I think that Israel's struggle against terrorism is important, but it's also important to consider the consequences on people who are your allies of whatever actions you take.

I think the important thing now for me is to try to get this peace process back on track. That's really the only way to ultimately get rid of terrorist problems in the Middle East. We've got to keep doing that. And then we can all—have all governments working together against terrorists.

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

President Weizman's Visit

Q. President Clinton, can I ask you a question?

President Clinton. Let me first say that we are profoundly honored to have President Weizman here. We are grateful for his visit and for his work for peace as President and for, indeed, his entire career. I've looked forward to this for a long time. We had a grand dinner last night, and I'm looking forward to our visit.

Please ask your question.

Assassination Attempt on Khaled Meshal

Q. What do you think about this Israeli failed assassination attempt in Jordan?

President Clinton. I believe that it's important to fight terrorism, but I think it's important to consider in the fight the consequences on all your allies in that fight and what the ultimate conclusions will be. The people that are involved have dealt with it as best they could, and so I think the important thing for me now is to get the peace process back on track and to go forward.

American law is very different, you know. We don't—it's against the law in America for the Government to promote any kind of assassination, and I agree with that for us. But I think the most important thing for me is to get this peace process back on track.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, I understand that you were considering last night the possibility of inviting both Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat to a 2-month summit at the North Pole? [*Laughter*] Is it on the agenda?

President Clinton. You got a good leak. Let me say what I said last night. I said that I would go anywhere or do anything that I thought would be most effective in promoting the peace process, and if I thought it would help I would get parkas for all of us and we could all go to the North Pole and stay there until we had a peace agreement. And I will reiterate that in public.

But what we are going to discuss today, and what I am continually assessing, is what is the best way for the United States to promote the peace process, without pretending that we're a party that can make the peace, and what is the most effective thing for us to do.

But what I said was that I would do anything, including go to the North Pole, if I thought it would help make peace, and I will reiterate that in public. I would do that. At least it would cool things down. [*Laughter*]

Q. Are you optimistic about the peace process? Because people in the Middle East are not.

President Clinton. In a funny way, sometimes when things get really bad, they have a way of getting everyone's attention about the bigger issues. And it may be that some of the difficulties of the last 6 months will create an environment where everyone is more aware of the ultimate consequences. And perhaps we can therefore actually have a chance to get it back on track that is greater than the chance we've had for the last several months. I just hope so.

Thank you. We need to visit.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:48 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Hamas leader Khaled Meshal, who was attacked in Amman, Jordan, on September 25; Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel; and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Senate Action on Campaign Finance Reform Legislation
October 7, 1997

Today was not the end of this fight for campaign finance reform but the beginning. The Republican leadership and a minority of the Senate used procedural maneuvers to block the obvious will of a majority of United States Senators to support bipartisan campaign finance reform legislation. I will fight for this measure as hard as necessary, for as long as necessary. And I call on all Senators to realize that the bipartisan McCain-Feingold measure is our best chance to move forward with reform.

Remarks on Welfare Reform and an Exchange With Reporters
October 8, 1997

The President. Good morning. I ran for President with a challenge to our country to replace the broken welfare system with one that expands opportunity, demands responsibility, and reflects our values of faith, work, and families.

Since I took office, we've worked hard to make this vision a reality, first by working with 43 States to launch innovative experiments in welfare reform, and then by enacting a welfare reform law that challenged all our States and all people involved in the system to do far more to move from welfare to work.

Today we received yet another piece of evidence that welfare reform is working far better than anyone had predicted it would. We learned that welfare rolls have continued their unprecedented decline, dropping by another 250,000 people in the most recent month alone, one of the largest monthly drops ever. Altogether, we have seen our welfare rolls shrink by more than 1.7 million people since I signed the welfare reform law and by more than 3.6 million people, or 26 percent, since I took office.

This is a truly historic achievement for America. It shows that we can accomplish great things when our policies promote work and reflect our values. We're building an America where all families have the chance to center their lives around work, family, and responsibility.

But we have more to do to ensure that all those who can work are able to work. The private sector here must do more to take the lead. The balanced budget law I signed last August not only repealed unfair cuts that targeted legal immigrants but also created a $3 billion welfare-to-work program and increased incentives for businesses to hire former welfare recipients.

For our part, we've set a goal of hiring 10,000 people off the welfare rolls to fill existing jobs in the Federal Government. Later today the Vice President, who has led this initiative, will report on our progress in doing our part.

We are working hard here to change lives to empower all Americans to seize the new opportunity of a new century. I am very encouraged by these welfare numbers. We now have the smallest percentage of our people on welfare in about three decades after the biggest drop in the welfare rolls in history. This proves that this system can work. But to get to the rest of the people, we have to have more help in creating these jobs, the businesses have to take advantage of the tax credits, and the municipal governments and others have to take advantage of the $3 billion fund. But this is great news for America today, and I must say I am very, very pleased.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

1996 Campaign Finance Inquiry

Q. Mr. President, Senator Thompson says that it's time for you to take personal responsibility for the campaign finance irregularities and relieve Janet Reno of her responsibility and simply ask for an independent counsel on your own. How do you respond to Senator Thompson on that?

The President. Well, I think that, first of all, I have assumed responsibility. We set up a system that has given Senator Thompson 100,000 pages of documents. And I was surprised that these films had been subpoenaed and not turned over. I think there is a logical reason for it. I'm frustrated whenever there has not been absolutely full compliance, but I think it's in everyone's interest that the films be turned over, and I would urge you to watch them if you haven't. I think they will reinforce the fact that no one has done anything wrong here. So I would just urge—there's been a lot of talk about these films; everybody ought to watch them and see what they show. That's what they're for.

The other thing I would say is, again, I'd say that question is a legal question, notwithstanding the best efforts of some to turn it into a political question. And I don't think there is any lack of evidence that the Attorney General, when she thought it was warranted, has asked for special counsels.

Q. Mr. President, what about Senator Thompson's charge that you and your administration are just trying to run out the clock since his hearing mandate expires at the end of the year and that you've delayed, stonewalled, and otherwise put barriers in the way of the investigation?

The President. He knows better than that. I think he may be disappointed in the results of the hearings. He now has more evidence. If he wants to have more hearings, he's got

them. But let Senator Thompson comment on what's in those films. He has 100,000 pages of documents. They have the evidence. If there is any more, we'll do our best to get it to them. They have the films. Let them discuss what's on the films.

Q. Mr. President, do you worry about the credibility of your administration in view of these mistakes, and do you think that you have hurt the Vice President in all of this campaign fundraising frenzy that's resulted in this?

The President. No. I don't worry about our credibility. You know, it's interesting that we have come to this point after all these hearings, and they're not talking about any wrongdoing by the President or the Vice President as uncovered in the hearings, they're talking about why they didn't have access to films which reinforce the fact that we didn't do anything wrong. What I hope—the only thing I ever hope in this is that we get through the smoke to the facts.

Now, I have said—and it's interesting that we're discussing this—I have said all along and now for nearly 5 years that the campaigns have become too costly and require too much time to raise money and require too much money to be raised and that, inevitably, will raise some questions. And the only answer is to reform the campaign finance system.

Yesterday there was yet one more attempt to kill any campaign finance reform. That is the real story there lurking in the weeds. I actually think it's probably pretty good strategy for those who are trying to kill campaign finance reform to try to talk about these films of events in the White House which were legal and which I want everybody to watch.

I think it's in everybody's interest to get whatever evidence is relevant out here. But once we get all the relevant evidence out, we need to really look at what's going on here. And what's going on here is that under the smokescreen about all these films, which everybody can now freely watch, there was yet one more attempt yesterday, which I hope won't be successful, to deal the death blow to campaign finance reform. And they've done it every year in the Senate; they've done it every year with a filibuster. This year, they're prepared to use a filibuster and two or three other tactics because they raised more money, more big money, and more money from other sources than the Democrats. But both parties are going to have problems and questions raised, and raise too much money and spend too much time raising it, until we reform the campaign finance laws.

The big story yesterday was, one more time, they're doing their very best to kill it, and they're hoping that they can stir up all this business, I think, about these films. Now, I'm not defending the fact the films should have been turned over. But I think you've been given, I think, a pretty good background on what happened. I think there is a logical explanation. I don't like it; I'm frustrated when there's not complete compliance. But when we gave 100,000 pages of documents to Senator Thompson's committee, I think that's pretty good evidence of our good faith. We have tried to do no inappropriate things to resist his need to discover evidence. We want him to know the facts.

Yes, go ahead.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, yesterday there was the first meeting in 8 months between Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat. No statements were made. What have you heard about that meeting, and how do you see it in light of the latest events in the Middle East?

The President. The most important thing is that it occurred, and it occurred not a moment too soon. We've had some difficult developments in the Middle East. I am pleased that Ambassador Ross was able to put it together. As I said with President Weizman yesterday, it may be that the developments of the last few days have been so troubling and so difficult that it has gotten the attention of both sides and clarified the necessity for them to get back to talking with each other and to get this peace process back on track. I hope—I hope that is what happened. That is certainly what I have tried to do, certainly what Ambassador Ross is trying to do there. So the fact that they met is encouraging. I think it would be better for me at this moment to let them characterize the nature and results of the discussions they had.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:10 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to his departure for Newark, NJ. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador Dennis B. Ross, Special

Middle East Coordinator; President Ezer Weizman and Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel; and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority.

Remarks at the Metropolitan Baptist Church in Newark, New Jersey
October 8, 1997

Thank you all for that warm welcome. Thank you, Reverend and Mrs. Jefferson, for making us feel at home in the Metropolitan Baptist Church. Thank you, Senator McGreevey, for your introduction and your passionate commitment to the families and the children and the future of this State.

Thank you, Mayor James. Thank you, my great friend Congressman Donald Payne. Thank you, Audrey West, for your work here in the Head Start program. And thank you, Linda Lopez, for having the courage to get up here and give a speech today. You did very well. I thought you did very well.

Mr. Mayor and Congressman, I'm delighted to be back in Newark, a city that is earning its reputation as a Renaissance City every day. I hear story after story of Newark's coming back—a new performing arts center, a new sports complex in the historic Ironbound district, most importantly a new spirit that I sense in this room and that I saw in this church and its facilities for caring for children when I walked in the door.

You know, I have been in a lot of buildings in my life. Sometimes I think the job of a President or a Governor is going into buildings of all kinds. [*Laughter*] And after you have a little experience with walking into buildings, you get the feel of what's going on there before anybody tells you. When I walked in this building and I saw the posters of the children on the walls, I saw the pride people take in maintaining it, I saw the care that had gone into designing it, I knew that the spirit of the Lord had moved you to do the right thing for our children. And I thank you for that.

I'm feeling a little nostalgic now, not only because my daughter just went off to college, because this is the 20th anniversary of my first public office, when I was attorney general of my State, but also because last week it was 6 years ago that I first announced for President.

Now, sometimes young people come up to me all the time and they say, "I want a career in public life. Should I do it?" And I always encourage them. I tell them that no matter what they may read or hear from time to time, the overwhelming majority of people in public life, from both parties and all philosophies, are honorable, good people who work hard to do what they believe is right, and it is a noble endeavor. And we spend sometimes so much time finding fault with ourselves we forget that we wouldn't be around here after 220 years if we didn't have a pretty good political system supported by a wise and caring citizenry. But I always tell them, the most important thing before you run for office is not to decide what office you want, but what you would do if you got it.

You remember there was a—about 20 years ago, Robert Redford was in that great movie "The Candidate"—you remember that? And he won and said, "Now what?" If that's going to happen to you, don't run. I was encouraged. I was listening to Senator McGreevey talk, and I thought—it's the first time I've heard him speak since he's been officially the nominee of our party—I thought, that man knows what he wants to do, and that's the beginning of wisdom and the prospect of success. If you just want the job for the honor of the thing, it's not worth the pain of getting there. It's only worth it if you have an idea about what you're going to do.

And all of us are living on the vision of those who went before us. I'm sure that Reverend Jefferson is grateful for the vision of all of his predecessors, Reverend Johnson and others, who conceived of what this might be. The Scripture says, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." And what I want you to think about today is, as you celebrate what goes on in this building for our children and you imagine what could go on in this entire State and Nation, what is your vision for what America should look like when your children or your grandchildren are

your age? That's a question I ask myself and try to answer every single day. It keeps me centered, keeps me focused, keeps me going in the tough days.

When I started this odyssey 6 years ago, I had a vision that I was afraid might not be realized unless we changed what we were doing. I knew we were about to start a new century and a new millennium, and I had a very clear idea of what I wanted. I wanted to see three things out of which I thought all else would flow: I wanted our country to be a place where the American dream was really alive for every person, without regard to race or color or creed or where they live if they were willing to work for it. I wanted our country to continue to lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity and security even though the cold war is over and we no longer totally dominate the economy of the world the way we did at the end of World War II. And I wanted our country to embrace and celebrate our increasing diversity but not be divided by it, instead to come together as one America.

The American dream for everybody willing to work for it; America leading the world for peace and freedom and security and prosperity; America coming together as one America—that's what I want. And everything I do in the limited time available to me as your President I try to make sure is advancing that vision.

Now, we have, therefore, tried to follow certain policies: policies that favor the future, not the past; policies that favor change, not the status quo; policies that favor unity, not division; policies that help everybody, not just a few people; and policies that enable us to lead, not follow. You know that old joke they used to tell me that unless you're lead dog on the sled, the view is always the same. [*Laughter*] We've got to be leading. We've got to be leading.

Now, we have come a long way in the last 4 years and 8 months as a people: over 13 million more jobs; lower crime; the biggest drop in welfare rolls in our history; a cleaner environment; advances in the safety of our food and the public health generally; breakthroughs in science and technology and especially in medical research; advancing the cause of peace and freedom and prosperity and security all around the world and with more energy than ever before in Africa, thanks largely to the leadership of your Congressman, Donald Payne. We thank him.

In 1996 I tried to characterize all this as building a bridge to a new century. And we have a strong foundation of success on which to build that bridge, but we all know that there's more to do. There are still people in Newark who don't have a job, even though we've created more jobs in less time than our country ever did before. There are still people in Newark who get up and work hard every day, but they and their children are still living at or below the poverty line. There are still children who are losing their childhoods to crime and gangs and drugs and guns, even though we've tried to reduce those problems and they are not as bad as they were. But if you're one of the victims or one of the people caught up in it, it's just as bad as it ever was.

So we still have things to do. But we know this—we know that if everybody has got a good job and everybody has got a good education and everybody can raise their children properly, most of our problems will go away. Don't you believe that? Don't you believe that? [*Applause*]

And the reason I wanted to come here today and celebrate what you have done and then look to the future is that it seems to me that, with more and more and more people in the work force, with more two-parent families having to have both incomes to make ends meet and more and more single-parent families, we can't ever forget that the most important job any of us ever have on this Earth if we bring children into the world is raising those children right.

I used to tell my daughter after I got elected President—the first time she said, "You're too busy for this, that, or the other thing"—I said, "Let me tell you something: Until you leave here, you are still my most important job, and don't you ever forget it." And I believe everybody—everybody—should feel that way. If we fail with our children, since we'll be gone and they'll be left, what will we leave?

Not very long ago, Senator Paul Tsongas tragically died, too early in life, after a long battle with cancer. I remember when he left the United States Senate, the first time he had to deal with his cancer. He wrote a book called "Going Home." I was Governor when it came out. I took it home one day and laid down on the couch and read it straight through, one afternoon—played hooky from school—from

work. That's one nice thing about being Governor, you can give yourself an excused absence. [*Laughter*]

And I was laying there reading Paul Tsongas' book, and here was this man I had admired from before. I thought he was such a creative United States Senator; I was sick that he was leaving. I knew he had a reasonable chance to live quite a few more years, and I couldn't figure out why this guy would leave, because he was not a quitter in any way. And there was a section in this book where he was talking about his children and where he was saying, "I'm determined to fight this. I hope I'll live a long time." And he did, he lived more than 15 more years. He said, "I hope I'll live a long time, but," he said, "one of the wisest things I ever heard—it never meant anything to me until I was diagnosed—is that no person on his deathbed ever says, 'I wish I'd spent more time at the office.' "

These kids, they're our most important job. They are the only manifestation of the immortality of the human spirit on this Earth. And I think it's great that everybody—I hope—will want to have a good education and have the ability to work. And I will never rest until the work we've done to bring the economy back embraces everyone. But we should never forget that there are conflicts between work and childrearing which we all have to help people resolve.

There is no more important responsibility than helping people balance the demands of work and family, because, think about it: If Americans fail at work, then the economy craters and our country has all these problems and all the social problems get worse. If America fails at home, the economy might be strong and our social problems will still get worse, and more importantly, our legacy will be a destructive one.

We must find a way for people to succeed in the workplace and succeed in raising their children and do both. And there is a role for all of us in that. That is a community responsibility. For us to pretend that that is everybody's problem and they've got to work it out ignores the fact, number one, that people can't do it and, number two, that I'm stronger and my child will have a better future if your children have a better future, that we are in this together whether we acknowledge it or not, so we better acknowledge it and reach out and make ourselves one community.

Hillary has said many times that governments don't raise children, parents do, but that every one of us has a special responsibility to help parents succeed, to create the conditions to give parents the tools to make their lives successful. Or in my wife's words, it really does take a village to have the kind of childrearing we want for all of our children. That's what this church and this Head Start program mean. It's the living embodiment of our shared responsibility for our children.

And for nearly 5 years, we have worked very hard to help parents raise their children. We fought for the V-chip and the rating system on television programs, because I think there is too much inappropriate material on television for young children at times when they're watching it. And I think you ought to have more opportunity to—[*inaudible*]—it. We've worked very hard to put tobacco out of the reach of children because it's still the largest killer of our young children.

We're fighting every day to make our streets and our schools safer and more drug-free and to hold up those examples of fighting juvenile crime that not only punishes people who should be punished but saves kids from getting in trouble in the first place.

It's been nearly 2 years now since a single child under the age of 18 has been killed by a gun in the city of Boston, where the police and the probation officers make house calls and the parents walk the streets. And the compliance with the probation officers' orders is 70 percent; I feel quite sure it's higher than most places in the world and in America. Why? Because they said it takes a village to keep kids out of jail. Better send the kids to college than to jail.

We have made it easier for millions of parents to take some time off if their children are sick without losing their jobs and to keep their health insurance when they move from job to job.

We raised the minimum wage and we lowered taxes on families with children with incomes of under $30,000. It's worth about $1,000 a year now to families of four with incomes less than that. And this summer, when I signed the new balanced budget law, it's the biggest increase in aid to children's health and in aid to education since 1965 in that law—5 million more

children, almost all of them in low-income working families, will be able to get health insurance under that bill.

And the bill really does go a very long way toward creating that system of lifetime learning that Senator McGreevey talked about: a $500-per-child tax credit for working families; a big increase in Head Start; the America Reads program, to mobilize a million volunteers to teach all the 8-year-olds in this country to read, so that every third grader can read independently; the great effort to wire all of our classrooms and libraries to the Internet by the year 2000, have computers within the reach of all children.

And I must say, thanks to AT&T, which was complimented earlier, and others, New Jersey has had the gift of private sector support there that I want to see in every State in this country. We're going to do our part. We need others to do their part. Technology can be a great liberation for children, particularly in poorer neighborhoods, and if properly used, for children that are having learning problems, and if properly used, children who need to become fully fluent in English as well as whatever their native tongue is. We have to do this.

And we have done more to open the doors of college to all Americans than ever before. I think we can really say when these programs are fully implemented, anybody who's willing to work for it can get a college education because we had the biggest increase in Pell grants in 20 years; we're up to a million work-study positions now in our schools; more and more young people going through the national service program, AmeriCorps, and serving in their communities, earning the right to go to college; an IRA you can save in and withdraw from tax-free if you're paying for college for your children; and the HOPE scholarship and other tax credits so that you can get a $1,500 tax credit to pay for the first 2 years of college and other tax reductions for the junior and senior year, for graduate school, or if you're an adult and you have to go back and get training.

We are trying to set up a system where people of any age can be educated at any time, whenever they need it. And we will help them. But we still have to make sure that our parents have access to quality, affordable child care. That's the great big hurdle left to be crossed. If we can get all the children insured for health care, then the great hurdle for families will be making sure that we can solve this last great obstacle.

As Head Start parents and personnel, those of you involved in this program know how important it is, and your director has already spoken eloquently about it. That's why I worked hard to create Early Head Start, so we could bring in kids even earlier, and why I fought to make sure that in this budget we'll have a million children in Head Start every year by the end of the budget period.

But as hard as we've worked on that, we've got to do more. We've got to keep going until we literally can say, every parent and child in this country can have access to quality, affordable child care, which includes, for the reasons Senator McGreevey said, an educational component, an appropriate, stimulating educational component for the youngest of our children.

Our brains, we know now, are like computers that we're building ourselves, and they get wired in a certain way by the time we're about 4 years old. And it's hard to rewire them after that. We know, for example—and I don't want to get into numbers, but let me just give you an example of the significance of what goes on in this building. The newest scientific research shows that a child who has loving, involved parents—and a big part of this, by the way, is helping parents who—almost 100 percent of parents want to do a good job; one of the things we've got to do is make sure they all know how to do a good job. But a child with loving, involved parents and an appropriate pre-school or other child care program that has an appropriate educational component—and I mean basic things for infants, singing to people, showing colors and sights and sounds, all that—will have about 700,000 positive interactions with that developing computer up here by the time they're 4 years old—700,000. A child who is left essentially isolated, with a parent who has never been trained to do that work, may have as few as 150,000 positive interactions, or less than one-fourth.

Now, you tell me which child has got a better chance to make it at 17, at 21, at 30, at 40, at 50. You can literally reduce it, therefore, almost to a matter of science. Fundamentally, it's an affair of the heart, but you have to understand there is a fact basis behind this, now. And this new scientific research is just stunning; it's breathtaking. And we cannot knowingly permit huge numbers of our children to be at that

kind of input disadvantage while their own little computers are being built. It isn't right. And it isn't smart. And we pay every day—today—for the mistakes that were made 10, 15, 20 years ago. And so that's why I say that we have to do this.

One of the things we were worried about when we started moving all these folks from welfare to work is what would they do for child care. So we put $4 billion more into the child care program, because the worst thing in the world we could do is to have someone who had been gripped by welfare feel good about being at work and then be racked with worry about what was happening to the child at home.

We've now—this morning we learned that last month another 250,000 people went to work from welfare. That's a stunning number. Now, in 4 years and 8 months, 3.6 million people who were living in families on welfare now live in families at work, drawing a paycheck. That's good. That's good.

But we've got to make sure their kids are okay. Because most of those jobs, when you move from welfare to work if you don't have a lot of education, most of those jobs don't pay very much. And we know that child care can cost as much as 25 percent of a person's paycheck, if they live on a modest income. So one of the things that I'm encouraging all the States to do, as your welfare rolls drop, is to take the money that you've got left—because the Federal Government gives you the same amount of money now, whatever your welfare rolls are—is take that money, put it into child care, and make sure the kids are going to be okay. If you help the parents when they go to work, you should help the kids when they go to child care.

Listen to this. Over half of the children under the age of one are already in some kind of day care. But 12 million children under the age of 6—17 million children between the ages of 6 and 13—have one or both parents in the work force. So, in spite of the numbers and the great efforts and the stunning success of facilities like this one, the hard truth is, there are still too few child care facilities to meet our growing demands.

And again, I say that remember the findings that Senator McGreevey referred to that we had people testify when Hillary and I sponsored that White House conference on early childhood and the development of the brain. We can't let this happen. There are also too many facilities in operation that are doing the best they can on the money they've got, but they're just not adequate for what the children need. What every child needs is what you provide here, education. If they need to be here all day, let them stay all day. We've got to find a way to do this.

If you take any survey of parents and experts in the country, they'll say that child care is in short supply, especially in our hardest pressed communities. Studies tell us that more than half of the child care centers that are in operation don't provide adequate child care, including the educational component for their children. One out of three children in child care programs that are running out of private homes receive care that may actually retard their development, according to the studies. But what can the parents do if it takes 25 percent of their income, which is not enough, at any rate, to pay the expenses to be in a proper child care facility?

So I say to you, our vision cannot be realized until we face this. And every American should be concerned about it because every American—or our children—will be affected by it. And we pay now or pay later. We either act like a community now to lift these children up, or we will be punished as a community later for our collective neglect. This is a big challenge for our future.

I'm delighted that so many people at the State and local level, and now increasingly in Congress, are taking up this issue and giving it the attention it deserves. On the 23d of this month the First Lady and I will host the first ever White House Conference on Child Care, with parents and child care providers and experts and business leaders and economists to talk about what we can do to learn from promising efforts like yours.

But I ask you to think about this today as you walk out of this building and you think about what everyone has said—what the pastor said, what Senator McGreevey said, what the satisfied parent said and the dedicated Head Start provider said—think about what we can do together to make sure that what was said here about the children in this place can become real for all the children of our country. It is the next great frontier in bringing our community together so that we can realize that grand vision for the new century.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. in the gymnasium. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. David Jefferson, Sr., pastor, Metropolitan Baptist Church, and his wife, Linda; State Senator Jim McGreevey; Mayor Sharpe James of Newark; Audrey West, director, Newark Head Start program; Linda Lopez, a parent who introduced the President; and Rev. B.F. Johnson, former pastor of the church. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks at a Reception for Democratic Gubernatorial Candidate Jim McGreevey in West Orange, New Jersey

October 8, 1997

Well, he looks like a Governor. [*Laughter*] He sounds like a Governor. He's got a good plan about what he would do if he were Governor. And he's got something else, just magical. We were a couple of hours ago in a wonderful Head Start program at a church near here, and when McGreevey walked in the room, the fire alarm went off. [*Laughter*] If you've got that kind of heat and electricity, you ought to be Governor.

I am delighted to be here with all of you. I thank the legislative leaders who are here: Senator Lynch, Assemblyman Doria, State Democratic Party Chair Tom Giblin—if I forget somebody, complain—[*laughter*]—Assemblywoman Buono, State Senator Bryant, Hudson County Executive Bob Janiszewski, Cherry Hill Mayor Susan Bass Levin, Sheriff Fontoura, Mayor-about-to-be Bob Bowser, Mayor Spina, and all other officials who are here.

I'd like to say a special word of thanks to a former colleague of mine, Brendan Byrne, who is in the audience. Governor Byrne, thank you. I'm glad to see you here. After he left the Governor's office, it was never the same at the national Governors meeting. [*Laughter*] He's been gone a long time, and we haven't produced a single Governor who had the one-liner gift that Brendan Byrne had. [*Laughter*] We only laugh about half as much. I'm glad to see you all.

This is perhaps the first opportunity I've had, in this sort of setting anyway, to say something I would like to say really to all the people of New Jersey, which is, I want to thank you for the enormous vote of confidence that was given to me and to Al Gore and to our team in the election of 1996. I was overwhelmed by it, and I thank you for it. [*Applause*] Thank you very much.

I'd like to talk for a few minutes in maybe an almost conversational way to try to explain to you what I know, both as President and as someone who was a Governor for 12 years before I became President and served with 150 other Governors, about the importance of this election at this moment in time.

I'd like to thank the Lieutenant Governor of New York, who's also here. Betsy, stand up. Thank you for becoming a Democrat and coming across the river to be with us. Thank you.

I think it's important that you understand because you have to go out of here and talk to people about this election, and you want it to be fundamentally a positive election of choices about the future. I promise you, that's the way the voters will look at it. They'll be trying to figure out, "If I make this choice, what difference will it make to my life, my child's life, the future of our State?" And there are some things you need to really focus on about this particular moment in our country's history and what the role of a Governor, any Governor, would be at this moment in history and therefore what kind of things you should be looking for.

When I ran for President and I announced 6 years ago last week, I did it against all the odds, when no one but my mother really thought I could win. [*Laughter*] He said he knows the feeling. [*Laughter*] I'll tell you, there are a lot more who think you can win today, Senator, than when you started—a lot more today than when you started.

I had a very clear reason. I did not think my country was moving in the direction that would take it where I thought we ought to go in the century that was upon us. And I have

said all over America repeatedly, like a broken record, and the poor folks that have to follow me around get sick of me saying—I apologize to them—but I actually think about it every day: What is it that you want? And I said, what I want is an America where everybody who is responsible enough to work for it has a shot at the American dream. What I want is an America that—[*applause*]—thank you. What I want is an America that is no longer staving off the nuclear threat and the cold war and no longer controls 40 percent of the world's wealth like we did at the end of World War II but still, because of our values and our successes and our willingness to serve, still can lead the world toward peace and freedom and security and prosperity and is interested in all kinds of people all over the world and what they can do to help us build a better future for our children.

And finally, what I want is an America that embraces all the diversities you see if you look around this room and celebrates it and says, "We love all this diversity. It's our meal ticket to the future. But the most important thing is we are still bound together as one America across all the lines that divide us."

Every day I still say to myself, what do you want for America when you're gone, and what have you done to advance it today—every single day? And then it seemed to me obvious that we had to change course. So I made a few notes and I said, "Well, what kind of policies would you change?" I said, "I want policies that basically look to the future, not to the past; that embrace change, not the status quo; that promote unity, not division"—we've got enough of that, goodness knows, in our country—"that give everybody a chance, not just a few people; and that promote us as leaders, not followers."

And I advocated a whole lot of things, and we've done virtually everything that I said I wanted to do in '92 and the vast majority of things now that I advocated in the '96 election. And what are the consequences? The strongest economy in a generation, over 13 million new jobs, even a lot of our poorest areas finally beginning to revitalize, a declining crime rate, an improving environment. We learned that last month another 250,000 people moved from the welfare rolls to families that are living off of payrolls. And now we've had a drop of 3.6 million people moving from homes living on public assistance to homes living on payrolls since I took office. I'm very proud of that. It's the biggest drop in the history of the country. I want that.

But in addition to all the policies, it also was clear to me we needed a different kind of Government, not a Government that would do everything or a Government that would do nothing but a Government that would focus on getting our country in good shape, creating good conditions, and then giving people the tools to make the most of their own lives.

So, for example, in the beginning of our term we adopted a budget in 1993 that helped us to cut thousands of governmental programs out that we've eliminated over the last nearly 5 years, 16,000 pages of Federal regulation. The Federal Government is 300,000 people smaller than it was the day I took office. But we're not doing everything we were doing before.

Neither are we doing nothing. That was my big fight with the Republican contract on America. I didn't want to see us walk away from our guarantee of health care to the poorest children, of our guarantee of a clean environment, of our commitment to giving everybody a chance at educational opportunity, and of our obligation to take on new challenges as a people through our Government when it was necessary.

So I think we made the right decision. You can't do everything; you can't do nothing. You've got to balance the budget, but you also have to invest in our future and our people. That's the path we took. The results have been quite good. But there is still an awful lot of work to do. We have a lot of work to do at the national level.

We were talking about the lack of affordable child care just before I came over here, and what a terrible problem it is since we know that the vast majority of children's mental wiring occurs in their first 4 years of life. We were talking a couple of days ago in Washington about the need to come to grips with the challenge of the climate changing in the globe, and how it could change our lives, but how we have to do it in a way that doesn't throw large numbers of people out of work or disrupt our economic progress. We are working this week on peace in the Middle East again, hoping that we're making some progress. And yesterday I had a meeting to try to further the peace process in Northern Ireland.

So there are a lot of things to do, but what I want to tell you is, this new approach to Government and this new way of doing business has made the Governor's office even more important today and looking to the 21st century than it has ever been before. And it's very important that everybody understands that.

We have given huge new responsibilities to the State. For example, all the States now have to move a lot more people from welfare to work. But I promise you, the easiest work has already been done. It's not that the people are still on welfare don't want to go to work, but the ones that are still there may have more difficulty going to work, may need more training, may need more work.

In this budget, we gave the private sector incentives—tax incentives to hire people. We've provided $3 billion more to flow into States and local communities to help create jobs for people for whom the market did not produce jobs. But this is something you have to have a Governor to tend to. And you want people to succeed at home and at work, which means you don't want to take a poor person and say, "I'm going to feel better about you when you're drawing a payroll," and then said, "but I feel worse about your child because you can't afford child care," which means that, if New Jersey has reduced its welfare rolls and you've got a surplus in the welfare account, you ought to, first of all, make sure that those people that are going to work can take care of their children with affordable child care, they can get a good Head Start program or some other program.

That's a big deal. We said in Washington, we can't micromanage this; you've got to figure it out. But it makes the Governor more important. There are a lot of big environmental issues we're trying to face. Our budget now should allow us to clean up another 500 toxic waste dumps in the next 4 years. Remember, I came to New Jersey in 1996 and pledged to support just that. And we got it into the budget, and we're going to do it. But there are all kinds of other issues that have to be dealt with by you here.

The whole issue of fiscal responsibility is very important. When I became President the deficit was $290 billion, projected to go higher. Now it's going to be under $30 billion this year, and 85 percent of it was cut even before we passed the last balanced budget bill. We haven't balanced the budget since 1969, and don't—let me just say, everybody who works for a living, who pays a home mortgage or a car payment or makes any kind of payment on credit, is better off because we've reduced this deficit because the interest rates are lower because of it. Every single person who makes any kind of payment any month on interest is better off. And the whole country is better off because the private sector has had more money to invest. And that's why we've got over 13 million more jobs.

Now, I've got people in Washington now, including our friends in the Republican Party who said they were fiscal conservatives, they're all talking about how they're going to spend the surplus. [*Laughter*] We still have a deficit—most people think $30 billion is real money, or $28 billion—[*laughter*]—where I come from that's still a nickel or two.

I'm just saying, Jim McGreevey has a record here. He's got a record of proving that he cares about people, he's concerned about people. But in every job he's ever held he's shown discipline and fiscal responsibility and the willingness to resist the sort of siren song of the easy moment, to look down the road to make sure that, first of all, the ship of state is being run in a responsible manner. Every person—liberal or conservative, black, white, brown or whatever, Republican or Democrat—every person has a vested interest in that in New Jersey. It's part of what enables us to be a community, knowing that our fundamental institutions are properly run with real discipline. It's a big issue. And sometimes when you're the guy making the decision, you have to make decisions that make people mad if you do it. But it's important.

There are lots of other examples I could give, but let me just give you one that to me dwarfs all the others. The insurance plan, by the way, I think is important because one of the problems that people—that we have with the legitimacy of public officials is that most people think that they don't count. They think in the end the big guys always win. And I've done everything I could to try to change that perception.

In 1993, we cut income taxes on the poorest working people, and now it's worth about $30,000 a year to a family of four with an income of $26,000–$28,000 or less. And we raised the minimum wage, and we passed the family leave law, and we passed the TV rating system.

We've done these things, trying to make ordinary people think that they were being given more authority.

But this insurance thing, this auto insurance thing is a big issue because it relates not only to how much money is going out of people's pockets, it's their feeling that, something has gone wrong, and they don't have any power to do anything about it. And if you're going to bring people together, people have to believe that you're on their side and that when the chips are down something can be done to put things right and make things better. So this is about more than money.

The last thing I want to say to you that I think is terribly important is, I cannot tell you how important I believe it is that every single Governor have a passionate, uncompromising commitment to excellence in education for every single person in the State. Now, part of this is a money problem, but a lot of it is not.

We've worked hard to promote all kinds of reforms to sort of shake things up in stodgy bureaucracies and put more power down to parents and teachers and principals at the school level and at the same time to raise standards. We're supporting programs to put computers and to hook up computers to the Internet, every classroom and library in the entire United States by the year 2000.

We are—I think perhaps most importantly, this budget, I believe, that we just passed, this balanced budget, 30 years from now people will look back on it and say there were two things that were interesting about it and profoundly important. One is they balanced the budget for the first time in a generation. The second is America finally opened the doors of college to every person who will work for a college education. That is in this budget.

Through the tax credits, the Pell grants, the work-study provisions—all of these things are going to literally make it possible so that no one can say, "I can't go to college because of the money" anymore—no one of any age. Even when older people have to go back and get retraining, there are tax benefits available.

But in the end, we all know something that we ought to face. The United States has the best system of higher education in the world. No one believes we have the best system of kindergarten through 12th grade education in the world. We have been challenged—I want to just state some facts—we've been challenged. We have far more diversity by income, by race, by culture than any other country trying to do what we're doing, number one. Number two, you need to know that on the whole American education is better than it was a decade ago. Our educators have made it better. Our parents have made it better. It's getting better, but it's nowhere near where it needs to be.

We are the only major country in the world that does not have national education standards and some way of measuring whether our children are meeting them, not to punish the children but so the parents and the taxpayers in every school district can know how the schools, how the district, and how the children are doing.

And I can't do this alone. This is not something I'm trying to impose on people. My proposal, which many Governors in the other party now oppose—although when I wrote it back in 1989 all the Governors but one were for it—my proposal is very simple: that the Federal Government should pay for but not develop—should pay for the development of national exams that reflect the standards that every child should meet in language in the fourth grade and math in the eighth grade. Start there. And then make it voluntarily available to every State and school district. And they then can give it to the children. But the tests cannot be used to punish the children, to hold them back, to put them down, to do anything. It is a measurement so we can finally know the truth.

Now, I believe all our kids can learn. I could take you into schools in every State in this country that, against all the odds, are proving that all children can learn. Therefore, it is unacceptable for us to continue to tolerate a system under the guise of local control or State responsibility or anything else that hides from the clear light of day to do better. We're not trying to punish anybody; we're trying to get better.

Every weekend, tens of millions of Americans are glued to the television set watching football games. Now, we're all glued to the TV set watching the pennant race. Suppose someone came on television and said, "I'm sorry, but due to the sensitivities of the players we're not going to keep score tonight." [*Laughter*] "We're going to play for 3 hours, and every now and then we'll change sides and let somebody else bat, and I hope you all enjoy it." [*Laughter*]

The only difference is, the game I'm trying to play in education, there doesn't have to be any losers. No one has to lose. The difference

is, in the exam we're trying to—we're trying to say, "This is the threshold. This is what everybody should know. But this is a fence over which everyone can jump." We're not trying to rank people first to last. We're trying to say 100 percent of the people need to be over this threshold so they can have the kind of future for themselves, their own families, and this country that we need.

That is a huge issue, and the Governors will determine whether it's done. And this man is for the proposition that all our children can learn and that every child is entitled to high national standards and an adequate measurement of them. And on that issue alone he has the right to claim your support for Governor of New Jersey.

The point is, when I became President I said, "We ought to give more power to State government, more power to local government. We ought to do more things with the private sector." We even privatized some Government operations I think had been in the Federal sector too long. But when we do these things, and if you like having a smaller, leaner, more focused National Government and you like the results we've achieved, you have to understand it makes everybody else more important. It makes all the mayors here more important. And it means when you elect a county official or a local official, and especially when you elect a Governor, you are voting—whether people know it or not, they are voting to give them a wider range of decisionmaking and a bigger impact over their lives than was the case 4 or 8 or 12 years ago. And it's very important.

And I want you to go out there and talk to the people in New Jersey about this. You don't have to be intensely partisan. You can just take these issues, one after the other, and ask people what they want for the future of their families and their State. And conduct your own little mini-townhall meeting. And tell people, first of all, they've got to vote, and here's why you are for Senator McGreevey and what you think the issues are. I believe you can have a huge impact.

But I'm just telling you, it is a big deal. Don't be under any illusion. This is not just about who gets this appointment or that appointment or who gets along with whom in the legislature. This is huge now, and we have been given very much more responsibility. And your future is on the line.

This is a magnificent State with unbelievable assets and challenges that are well within the ability of the people of New Jersey to confront them. But it matters who the leader is and what the direction is.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:15 p.m. in the Mayfair Room at Mayfair Farms. In his remarks, he referred to State Senator John A. Lynch; Assemblyman Joseph V. Doria, Jr.; Assemblywoman Barbara Buono; State Senator Wayne R. Bryant; Sheriff Armando B. Fontoura of Essex County; Robert Bowser, member, Newark Board of Education; Mayor Samuel A. Spina of West Orange; Brendan Byrne, former New Jersey Governor; and Lt. Gov. Betsy McCaughey Ross of New York.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Reception in Florham Park, New Jersey

October 8, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Jim, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for being here for him and for our party and for what we're fighting for.

I want to thank my longtime friend Alan Solomont for being here and for being the finance chair of our Democratic Party—[*applause*]—yes, you can clap for him, that's nice—why don't you do that? He has a thankless job. [*Laughter*] When he calls people, you know—even when he calls me, I think he's going to call and hit me up for a contribution any day. [*Laughter*]

But most of all I'd like to thank the Kushners, Charles and Seryl, and thank you, Rae Kushner, and thank you, Mrs. Felsen. And I thank the children who gave me the shofar, Joshua and Nicole; Dara and Miryam, thank you.

And I'm glad we've got a long-distance connection to Israel. In a way, I always have a long-distance connection to Israel. [*Laughter*]

President Weizman was just here; we had a great visit. And of course Mr. Arafat and Prime Minister Netanyahu had a visit of their own, and we're hopeful that the peace process is back on track and so is the—that the security process is back on track, and I know all of you hope that, as well. But we're working hard on it.

Let me just briefly say that I came to New Jersey today for Jim McGreevey for what I think is a very good reason—it is entirely positive, there's nothing negative about it—and that is that in the next several years, for the foreseeable future in the 21st century, who happens to be Governor of any State and what decisions they make will have a bigger impact on how people live than in the previous 20 years, as an inevitable outgrowth of the way the world is changing, the way we change how we govern ourselves, how we make decisions, and how we go forward. And I think it's very important.

Let me say that a lot of you have helped me a lot over the last several years, and for that I am very grateful. I think we are much closer than we were 5 years ago to realizing the vision that I started out with when I announced for Governor—for President, when I was a Governor. I'm going to talk about that in a moment. That is, I think we're closer to the time when every American has a chance to live out the American dream if he or she will work for it. I think we're closer to the time when our country has articulated a vision that will maintain our world leadership for peace and freedom and prosperity and security. And I think we're closer to a time, although we still have a lot challenges, in which we can reach across all the racial, the ethnic, the cultural, the religious lines that divide us, and stand in stark contrast to what is going on in so much of the world today and to the terrible story that Charles told us that had such a wonderful ending—of his family—by being a country that really can embrace all this diversity, celebrate it, respect it, honor it, and say, "We're still bound together as one America." And I feel very good about that.

There is still a lot to do. There is a lot going on in Washington. I'm still trying, for the 5th year in a row, to pass campaign finance reform. And the opponents thought they had killed it yesterday, but we've got a little life left in us up there. If you can influence anybody, I hope you will, although I want to say that Senator Torricelli and Senator Lautenberg are part of the unanimous vote in our caucus for the McCain-Feingold bill and for campaign finance reform, which I very much appreciate.

We're dealing with the trade issue and the question of the extension of the President's authority to conduct trade negotiations with other countries and then have the Congress vote up or down on the bill, which is essential for me to make those agreements and to continue to expand trade. Otherwise—no one wants to negotiate with 535 people; they want to negotiate with one person.

And there's a lot of debate, and it's a healthy thing, because what we really want in the global economy is more involvement in the world economy in a way that benefits America but also having our communities make the appropriate response for people who have or will suffer as a result of dislocations in that economy. We owe that to them. That's what we're trying to achieve.

We had a fascinating conference this week on climate change. I'm convinced the climate is warming at an alarming rate and that we have to do the responsible thing, to lower our emissions of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. But it's a difficult problem for a democracy to address because it's not on anybody's back right now. It's something that's out there ahead of us. But if we do a little bit now we can avoid disastrous consequences and much more burdensome actions later.

Hillary and I are going to have the first White House Conference on Child Care at the end of the month. And that's a huge problem. We have more people in the work force than ever before, a higher percentage of people in the work force than ever before. But the most important job any of us has is our job to raise our children well. I know you believe that. I had more people—we just all took our picture—I had a higher percentage of people in the line that I just stood in ask me about my family and my daughter than any photograph line I have ever stood in in my whole life. And that's a great tribute to you and your values. And I thank you for that.

But this child care issue is really about whether all these people who have to work, who also have children, can succeed at work and at home. And we shouldn't have our country making a

choice there. We don't want to crater the economy, but our most important job is to raise our children well.

So we're full of all these challenges, and it's exciting. But we have to—when I took office, we had this huge deficit and basically a yesterday's Government. And I made a commitment, as I've said many times, to the policies that favor the future over the past, change over the status quo, unity over division, and things that benefit everybody instead of just a few people. And that required changes, so we downsized the Government; we shared more responsibility with State and local government and the private sector. And State governments, anyway, have primary responsibility for things like auto insurance rates and, constitutionally, education.

So I can go out here and talk until I'm blue in the face about the importance of embracing national education standards. The United States is the only great country in the world that has no national standards of academic achievement that guarantee international capacity—in terms of operating in the economy—that everybody has to follow. We're not talking about Federal Government standards. We're not talking about imposing anything on anybody. It's totally voluntary. But that means that every Governor will decide whether to participate in the standards movement.

So the decisions made by the Governor of New Jersey in the next 20 years almost certainly will range over a wider scope and have a deeper impact on the lives of the people of New Jersey than in the previous 20 years. And if my vision is going to be fulfilled, we have to have a partnership that really works to grow the economy, to fight crime, to preserve the environment, to deal with social problems, and most importantly, to make sure that every child in this country has a chance to live out his or her dreams with a decent education.

That's why I showed up here today, because this young man actually has an idea of what he will do if he gets elected. He's not running for Governor because he wants to live in that magnificent old house—New Jersey I think has the oldest and perhaps the most beautiful old Governor's mansion in the country—he actually has an idea of what he wants to do, and I think it's the right idea. And I hope you'll help him achieve it.

Thank you. Bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 4 p.m. in the chief executive's office at the Kushner Companies. In his remarks, he referred to State Senator Jim McGreevey, Democratic gubernatorial candidate; Charles Kushner, chief executive officer, Kushner Companies; Mr. Kushner's wife, Seryl, and children Joshua and Nicole, and his mother, Rae; Annette Felsen, Seryl Kushner's grandmother; Dara Freiriech, student council representative, Joseph Kushner Hebrew Academy; Miryam Lichtman, student council president, Kushner Yeshiva High School; President Ezer Weizman and Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel; and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority.

Statement on House Ways and Means Committee Action on Fast-Track Trading Authority Legislation

October 8, 1997

I am pleased that the House Ways and Means Committee has reported out legislation with bipartisan support that restores the traditional trading authority every President has had since 1974.

To keep our economy strong, we must continue to break down unfair foreign trade barriers to American products and services. This legislation, now passed by the committees of jurisdiction in both the Senate and the House, will allow us to tear down those barriers and help American businesses and workers compete and win in the global marketplace. I look forward to working with Members on both sides of the aisle to secure passage of this important legislation this year.

Statement on Action Against Terrorist Organizations
October 8, 1997

Last year I signed into law the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act. It authorizes the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, to designate an organization that engages in terrorist activity a foreign terrorist organization if it threatens the national security of the United States. The law prevents any fundraising or other financial transactions by these groups in the U.S. Heavy criminal penalties will also be levied against individuals in the United States who provide material support or resources to these terrorist organizations. Together, these provisions will help deprive terrorist groups of the resources they need to finance their acts of destruction.

Today Secretary Albright has designated 30 foreign organizations as terrorist groups. Now we will work to uncover those who raise money for them in America and encourage our friends and allies to do the same within their own borders.

The Secretary's designations are part of our ongoing fight against those who would undermine freedom and prosperity by violent acts. Just as we must reward and encourage the builders of peace and democracy, we must give no quarter to the enemies of these aspirations. Today's action sends a clear message: The path to change is through dialog and open deliberation, not violence and hatred. The United States is committed to fight against those who speak the language of terror.

NOTE: The designation of foreign terrorist organizations was published in the *Federal Register* on October 8 (62 FR 52650).

Statement on Signing the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998
October 8, 1997

I have today signed into law H.R. 2266, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998.

This bill provides for a strong national defense, maintains high military readiness, funds investment programs necessary to modernize the equipment that our combat forces use, and supports our commitments to a better quality of life for our service personnel and their families. By providing the necessary support for our armed forces, this bill ensures continuing American global leadership.

As President, I have a solemn obligation to provide for the defense of our country. My Administration has designed a coherent strategy to provide the necessary military forces to deter and prevail over the threats we may face.

I remain deeply concerned, however, that the funding provided in this bill is excessive. The bill provides $4.2 billion more than I requested in my 1998 budget, and $1.2 billion more than the levels that my Administration believes was agreed to in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement.

Further, section 8080 of the Act contains certain reporting requirements that could materially interfere with or impede this country's ability to provide necessary support to another nation or international organization in connection with peacekeeping or humanitarian assistance activities otherwise authorized by law. I will interpret this provision consistent with my constitutional authority to conduct the foreign relations of the United States and my responsibilities as Commander in Chief.

My Administration is continuing discussions with the Congress on the remaining 1998 spending bills in order to protect important priorities in education and training, the environment, science and technology, law enforcement, and international affairs. Over the past several days, we have made progress in good-faith discussions with the leadership of the House and the Senate

Appropriations Committees to close the gap between us. It is critical that these discussions continue with the goal of reaching a satisfactory conclusion as rapidly as possible.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
October 8, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2266, approved October 8, was assigned Public Law No. 105–56.

Remarks at a Young Democrats Council and Saxophone Club Reception in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

October 8, 1997

First let me thank my good friend Steve Grossman for the hard work he's done as chair of our party. And I want to ask him and our national finance chair, Alan Solomont, who is here, who is also from Boston—I appreciate what they said about Philadelphia in Philadelphia. Please don't ever say it in Boston. [*Laughter*] We're trying to hold both beachheads in a tough time.

Let me say to the mayor—Philadelphia has a wonderful mayor, flack, promoter, arm twister, and leader in Ed Rendell. He always thinks—[*applause*]—he's never ashamed to ask for the business, and I like that. And I feel pretty good at this podium. Somewhat to my regret, I will not be the nominee of our party in 2000. [*Laughter*] And so, ultimately, it will not be my decision to make, but I will say this: The last time we had a convention in Philadelphia, in 1948, it worked out pretty well for us. And I like that.

I'd like to thank the Saxophone Club and the Young Democrats from Philadelphia, tonight's cochairs, Lou Magazzu, Don Schroeder, Jill Ross-Stein, Jerry McCabe, and David Maser, and all of you who worked hard to make this a success. I'd like to thank you for coming here and for your good spirits, and for helping us to take this country in a new direction.

Through you, I would like to thank the people of Philadelphia, who gave me nearly 80 percent of the vote here in the last election—I am very grateful for that—and the people of Pennsylvania for twice supporting Al Gore and me and our administration and what we were trying to do.

Last week was the sixth anniversary of my declaration for the Presidency, back in October of 1991. It's hard for me to believe that 6 years have passed and that almost five-eighths of my Presidency is behind me. But I am very proud of what we've been able to do together. And I did it mostly for the young people of this country—and for the future of this country—because I wanted you—[*applause*]—I believed that if we changed the direction of America we could create a nation in the 21st century where the American dream really was alive for every person, without regard to race or gender or background, everybody who was willing to work for it.

I believe that we can create an America still leading the world toward peace and freedom and democracy and prosperity. And I believe we can create an America out of all of our diversity where we celebrate our differences and respect our differences and we're still bound together as one America, a stunning challenge to all those countries where people are killing each other because of their differences. And that's what I want for you and your future and our children's future.

It seems hard for me to believe it was 6 years ago. I said, "Okay, let's all get together and work at this, and we'll change this country. We will pursue a course based on the future, not the past; based on change, not the status quo; based on unity, not division; based on helping everybody, not just a few; based on leading, not following. And we'll have a Government that doesn't try to do everything but doesn't walk away from our challenges either. And we'll change this country."

And 6 years later, look at what's happened. In 4 years and 8 months in office, we've got over 13 million new jobs and the strongest economy in a generation; a lot of our most distressed neighborhoods are beginning to come back; we just learned today that last month alone—in one month—there were 250,000 people who moved

from welfare to work, that there has been a 26 percent reduction in the number of people who were living on welfare, moving instead into families living on paychecks—the biggest drop in the history of the country; 5 years of declining crime, thanks to the efforts of people like Mayor Rendell who took those police officers and put them on the streets in community policing programs.

This country has a stronger and cleaner environment than it had 5 years ago. This country has a smaller Government and stronger partnerships with cities and States and the private sector. But we also stood against the contract on America and the attempt to take away the things that bind us together as a country, our common commitments to education, to the environment, to the health of our children, and to the future of our country. That's what this was about.

And as we look ahead, we've still got a lot of challenges ahead of us and a lot of things I hope we can do to build that bridge to the 21st century before we begin to celebrate the millennium in 2000 and I have to depart in January of 2001. And I just want to mention three or four of them now.

First of all, all of you are here at this Saxophone Club-Young Democrats event at ticket prices of $25 to $100. It's my favorite group. We started this when I was running for President, the Saxophone Club. A young American with a great idea started it, and we tried to promote it all over the country. If we can get the other party to stop trying to kill campaign finance reform in the Senate, we could all raise all of our money this way and be on an equal footing, and we'd see who had more bodies, more citizens, more people, more voices, and better ideas. And I hope you'll help us do it.

Secondly, we have a great challenge before us—long-term—that will affect the youngest people in this audience, I'm convinced, in your lifetime if we don't do something about it, and that is confronting the challenge to the change in our climate by the warming that is going on all across the Earth as we put more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. Now, what the challenge is, is for us to figure out a way to do less of it without throwing people out of work, without diminishing incomes, without cutting off future growth. Can we do it? You bet we can.

Don't let anybody tell you that we can't improve our environment and still grow the economy. Two-thirds—let me just give you one example—two-thirds of all the heat generated by electric powerplants is wasted—two-thirds. Of all the inputs of coal and oil, only one-third of it goes to actually giving you electricity you can use for heating or cooling or lighting or for manufacturing purposes. What happened to the other two-thirds? If we go get it back, we'll be putting less into the atmosphere that warms the atmosphere and compromises the future of our children and grandchildren.

So I ask you to help me in that. The young people of America have been the strongest environmentalists, and yet we owe it to you to give you a strong economy. We have to find a way to do both. I know we can, and I need your help to do it and to send a message loud and clear: We do not want to have to make a choice in the 21st century, and we refuse to do so. We can clean our environment and grow our economy, and we're determined to do it.

The third thing that I would ask you to do in thinking about the future is to support our efforts to continue to lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity. I know most Americans believe on a daily basis that what happens halfway around the world doesn't affect them, but it does, not just in the climate changes, which affect us all no matter where the problems occur, but in other ways as well.

If we had not stepped in to stop the slaughter in Bosnia, eventually the United States would have been pulled into a wider, deeper conflict in Europe, and more American lives would have been put at risk. If we had not stepped in to try to restore democracy in Haiti, eventually we would have had much more disruption on our own shores and much more human destruction on the island of Haiti that we would have been forced to come to grips with.

If we don't continue to try to reach out and trade on honorable and fair terms to sell more American products in Latin America and Asia and Africa and the other growing countries of the world, not only will we see other countries with weaker economies and weaker democracies, we won't grow as wealthy as we would grow. Because we only have 4 percent of the people in the world, we have to sell to the other 96 percent. These things matter.

It matters that we're banning chemical weapons. It matters that we're trying to do something about landmines. It matters that we're trying to stop nuclear testing for all time. It matters

that we're trying to make this a safer, freer, more prosperous world. And someone has to take the initiative.

So all of you who are young—you look around here at the students who are here who come from all these different heritages and backgrounds—you should want your country out there working for peace in the Middle East, peace in Northern Ireland, to continue to make the peace in Bosnia hold. You should want your country out there working to reduce the nuclear threat, to fight terrorism, and to take the lead in global efforts to grow the economy and preserve the environment. And you have to develop this attitude. Just like you see people from all over the world in Philadelphia—that is our meal ticket to the future, if we relate to the rest of the world in a constructive and friendly and strong way. So I ask you—say we want America to lead the world, not to follow, and we will support that. That's part of the new Democratic Party we're trying to build.

Finally, and most importantly, let me come back to where I began. The biggest challenge we face is to embrace our diversity, celebrate our diversity, respect our differences—our racial, our ethnic, our religious, all our other differences—and say that still the most important thing is we can find common ground as one America.

When you look at the time I spend as your President trying to stop people from Bosnia to Burundi and Rwanda, from the Middle East to Northern Ireland, people who look as different as daylight and dark, united only by one thing: They are caught in the grips of ethnic or religious or racial hatred, and it dominates their lives and destroys their countries. We can stand as a shining alternative to that.

One of our school districts, the one just across the Potomac River from Washington—Fairfax County—now has students in the public school district from 182 different countries, speaking over 100 different languages—one school district. Many—I'll bet you the number is not much smaller in Philadelphia. I know it's not in New York or Chicago or Los Angeles. The point is, we are really becoming the world's first truly multiracial, multiethnic democracy in the sense that here we all more or less live and work together. And yet we know that there continue to be problems that divide us.

That's why I had this national advisory board on race, and I asked the American people to join me in trying to deal with our racial differences. And we know that not everybody has an equal economic and educational opportunity. We know there are still some neighborhoods where all this economic recovery has not reached. We know there are still some schools that are not doing the job they should be doing for their children. We know, in other words, that our ideal of liberty, which was forged in Philadelphia around the Liberty Bell so long ago, is still not real for everyone.

This country will always be a work in progress. But as we move into a global information age, where not only the changes in the economy and technology but the changes in how we live and patterns of immigration have brought us closer to others and to each other than ever before, the great test of our time and your future will be whether we can learn to live together, both respecting our differences and saying what unites us in the end is more important—the shared values, the shared devotion to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, the belief that everybody has a place in this country if they work hard, obey the law, and show up every day as good citizens.

That's what I want you to really fight for, because if you do it, believe me, the best days of this country are still ahead, and the Democratic Party that came into power in the United States by a vote of the American people in 1993 and changed the course of this country, to bring us together and move us forward, will have a proud claim to its contribution to that for the 21st century, thanks to you.

Thank you. God bless you, and good night. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:52 p.m. in the CoreStates Arena.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Philadelphia
October 8, 1997

Thank you. If I had any sense at all, I would simply quit while I'm ahead. [*Laughter*] That was a wonderful statement, Mr. Mayor, given by a person who's in a position to know.

I've said many times in the last 6 years or so that, as I've had a chance to travel this country, the most gifted and innovative public servants in America today are the mayors of the cities that are beginning to work again for all the people. And Philadelphia certainly is, and in no small measure because of you.

I know most of you heard what I had to say downstairs, and I won't make you sit through it again. So I would just like to try to build on what the mayor said. I've been feeling rather nostalgic lately; last week was the 6th anniversary of my declaring for President, and the end of this week is my 22d wedding anniversary. And Hillary and I are dealing with the empty nest syndrome, so we have time to think—[*laughter*]—we have time to think high thoughts at night now, instead of wondering when Chelsea is going to bed—"Stop studying, turn out the light, you can't learn after one o'clock," or something. [*Laughter*]

Let me just say that I am, first of all, very grateful for the last almost 5 years. I've tried to do what I said I would do when I ran for President. A leading political scientist said before I was reelected that I had already kept a higher percentage of my promises than the last five Presidents and that I made more than they did, which really was something. And I was very grateful to hear that.

This last balanced budget meant a great deal to me because I thought it would be a good thing for the country psychologically, as well as economically, to have a balanced budget for the first time in a generation. And I thought it was important to prove that you could balance the budget and still have the biggest increase in investment, in health care for working families and poor children, and in education since 1965.

And I do agree with Mayor Rendell, I think the biggest legacy of that budget over the long term will be that we literally have opened the doors of college to everybody who will work for it now—because we had the biggest increase in Pell grants in 20 years; we go up to a million people in work-study; we have IRA's that people can save in and withdraw from without penalty if you use it to pay for education. You get a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college, the HOPE scholarship, and then other tax credits for the junior, the senior year, graduate school, or when people go back. It's a great, great thing. But I'd like to just sort of ask you to take a few minutes and sort of look at what underlies that.

Six years ago when I decided to run for President, I had been a Governor for quite a long while. And one of the things that bothered me was that the rhetoric that came out of Washington and the fights that the political parties had seemed increasingly disconnected from the life that I knew my friends to be living and my people to be living. And it was all sort of left-right, liberal-conservative, this box-that box, this conflict-that conflict, and it didn't seem to me to really work. I mean, I didn't know anybody that talked like that except in Washington. I never met anybody on the street that talked like that. And it really bothered me, because I admired a lot of the people in Washington, frankly, in both parties, with whom I had worked. I didn't understand it. But I just thought that we were locked into a dialog with each other in Washington that was actually preventing anything from getting done and moving the country forward.

And essentially what I thought was that the Republicans understood the importance of the market but were blind to the needs to give everybody the tools and conditions to take advantage of the market; that the Democrats understood the importance of compassion and of trying to take care of everybody in the social contract but too often were unwilling to make the tough decisions to get the economy going, which is still the best social program for everybody who has got a good job; and that somehow we had to reconcile that and develop a dynamic approach to politics so that we could have this debate between the two parties, and one would be more liberal and the other would be more conservative and the debate would go on, but

at least it would be about the real choices facing the country and the real lives of people.

And I decided that if I didn't do anything else in the campaign—and when I started only my mother thought I could win—[*laughter*]—that I was going to try to change the terms of the debate, so we would be talking about real things in a real way that could have a real impact on the way people live. And in a way, I tried to be President the way I served as Governor or the way Ed Rendell serves as mayor.

So let me just sort of take stock about where we are. I said, "We're going to have to take a new direction. If we're going to have opportunity for everybody responsible enough to work for it, if you're going to rebuild the American community with all this diversity, and if we're going to maintain America's leadership, then we have to focus on it." Instead of the old left-right, liberal-conservative, we said, "We have to be for the future, not the past; for change, not the status quo; for unity, not division; for policies that help everybody, not just a few people; and we have to do things that will help us lead, not follow."

I love that old one-liner, you know, that unless you're the lead dog on the sled, the view's always the same. [*Laughter*] And I think it's something that we have to remember. Because as I told the young people down there tonight, it's very frustrating to me that I have not been able to persuade my fellow Americans of the benefits of our involvement in the world on a general, philosophical level. And I regret that. I've got to keep working on that. I've got to find a way to do a better job of that.

But if you look at where we are now compared to where we were, with an economic policy that says basically we're going to charge head on into the global marketplace, but we're going to try to preserve the social contract at home and give everybody a chance to play—what that has meant in practical terms is expand trade; be fiscally responsible and balance the budget, but invest more in education, invest more in environmental technology, invest more in the health care of our people, and support things like family and medical leave and the minimum wage and the adoption tax credit and things that enable people to build strong families while they go to work; support the empowerment zone, like the one Philadelphia has, and community financial institutions that loan money to new entrepreneurs that couldn't get money at the local bank otherwise, do things that bring the benefits of free enterprise into the inner cities. The other big trade opportunity we've got in America is all these neighborhoods where people are unemployed or underemployed. If they were all working, that would be a big market for America's future.

So that's what we've tried to do. And I think it's incontestable that it has worked. We've never generated so many jobs in such a short time, over 13 million now in less than 5 years. And it has worked. There is more to do, but it has worked.

With the crime program—the mayor talked about that—what we wanted to do was to be tough and smart. We had people in Washington that wanted to pass tougher and tougher sentences when the police were screaming, "Give me more police officers, and I'll not only catch more criminals, I'll prevent crime. Give me people who can walk the streets and know the kids and know the parents and know the neighbors, and we'll drive the crime rate down." And that's what we did. And it had to be done. It cost us a few Members of Congress in 1994, but sooner or later the Federal Government had to take on the people who said that it was wrong to have any restriction on guns. And what we did with the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban has made this a safer country. It was the right thing to do. It's something we take for granted now—we wonder what else we ought to do—but it was a huge thing at the time it occurred. And our party sacrificed so many House Members that it may—that alone may have cost us the House in '94, including some here in Pennsylvania, because all these people were told we were coming after their guns.

But in 1996, I had the pleasure of going back to New Hampshire and looking at all those people with their hunting license and saying, "You remember 2 years ago when they told you we were coming after your guns, and you beat one of our Congressmen?" I said, "Every one of you that lost your gun, you ought to vote against me, too. But if you didn't, you need to know they lied to you, and you need to let them know you don't appreciate it." And we carried New Hampshire again and turned it around, because people now say, "We can have safe streets, we can have responsible gun laws. There's no reason somebody who's got a felony record or a serious mental instability should be

able to walk in and buy a handgun without even being checked out."

So we changed the debate now. The debate is not this sort of abstract argument about the second amendment. The debate is, how can we preserve the culture, the way of life, the legitimate desire of people to go out and hunt and fish and do what they ought to be able to do, and make our streets safe and stop these kids from getting killed in Philadelphia. The mayor told the truth: There are kids all over this country that don't believe they'll ever live to be 50. Why should they ever forgo anything that's bad for them since they're not going to be around very long? But at least we've changed the debate now; we're moving forward.

I think we changed the nature of the welfare debate. Today we found out another 250,000 people moved off the welfare rolls last week. There are now 3.6 million Americans living off paychecks, instead of welfare checks, that weren't when I became President. That's how much we've reduced the rolls by, 3.6 million. Why? Because the answer was not to throw people in the street. And it's fine to require people to go to work, but you also have to realize they had young children—that's why they're on welfare in the first place—so they've got to be able to take care of their kids. So don't take their health care away. Don't take their food stamps away. And give them medical care, and give them child care.

Because the biggest problem most families face—even a lot of well-to-do families with young children face terrible problems of reconciling their responsibilities as parents and their responsibilities to the work force. There are people in this room who have good incomes who have had lots of days where you were tearing your hair out, trying to figure out how you could do what you thought you ought to be doing at work and still do the right thing by your children. It is the single most significant social challenge facing all classes of Americans. Why? Because our biggest job is still raising our kids right. That's more important than everything else. If we do that right, most everything else will be all right.

On the other hand, if we have to, in order to do that, basically crater our family's income, wreck a business, or weaken the American economy, that's a price we shouldn't have to pay. That's why all these family leave policies and all that is so important.

So we tried to say, "Okay, we'll step into the gap here." That's why we passed family and medical leave and raised the minimum wage and passed that Kennedy-Kassebaum bill that said you can keep your health insurance when you change jobs or if somebody in your family gets sick, or stopped the sort of drive-by deliveries where women could be thrown out of the hospital after they had a baby within 24 hours, or provided the extra tax credit so we get people to adopt kids that are homeless and desperately need homes. Why? Because we're trying to figure out a way to grow the economy and support families. Not the same debate—it's not an either-or. We have to find a way to do both things, to have balance and harmony in America.

The same thing with the environment. I consider myself a passionate environmentalist, and yet you know that I have devoted most of my energies in my first term to getting the economy going again. I think if we have to choose, we're in terrible trouble.

But most of the choices are false choices. I remember when the United States decided—this was before my time—to limit sulfur dioxide emissions into the atmosphere. And everybody said, "This is going to cost a ton of money, and it's going to bankrupt the country, and we'll never get it done on the timetable." And we let the market take over. They set up a permit trading system for sulfur dioxide emissions permitting. And a few years later, we're way ahead of schedule at far less than half the predicted cost, and the economy is booming because we found a way to get the private sector and its creativity involved in protecting and cleaning up our environment.

That's what we have to do with this greenhouse gas problem that's warming the climate. If we do this right, we will create jobs, we will not shut down jobs, and we'll preserve the environment for our children.

So we got out of the environment—so the Republicans are for jobs, and the Democrats are for the environment; the liberals are for the environment, the conservatives for jobs—what a crazy way to live. I want to be able to breathe when I go to and from work. [*Laughter*] This is not a debate that should be structured this way. So I think we've changed it.

And the last thing I'd like to say in that regard is this whole business about how we should handle our diversity. I could see it coming even in '92. The whole thing was, are you for or

against affirmative action. What I'm for is everybody having a chance to participate in this country's life. And if people don't have a chance, then I am poorer. It is a selfish thing to want every American, without regard to their race, their neighborhood, their background, or where they start out in life, to have a good chance to make it. That is a selfish thing for you to feel, because if they don't, then they're a drag on your future. And if they do, then they're contributing to your future.

So we tried to reform the affirmative action programs without getting rid of them. Why? Because it was manifestly clear that there is still an absence of completely equal educational and economic opportunity in America. But that's not the main thing. The main thing we've got to do is get everybody a job, everybody an education, and open opportunity to people.

The other thing I tried to get the American people to think about is, we are well on our way to becoming a country in which there is no majority race. Before midway through the next century, people of European heritage will not have a majority of the population, before 2050. We don't know exactly when, but sometime before then. Within about 5 years, that will be the case in California.

Now, we have always said we were a country bound together by ideas and ideals, not by any particular piece of land and not by any race and not by any standard. When we started out, you had to be a white male property owner to vote. We've slowly shed all that stuff. We've moved toward more and more and more equality. But we are now going to have to face the fact that in a global society our greatest asset is our diversity. But if you look at the problems other countries are having, and the problems that are still lurking under the surface here from place to place, it could also be our greatest problem.

Now, it seems to me to be foolish to have yesterday's debate about this. The facts are, here we are. I said to the group downstairs and I'm going to say again: The most diverse school district in the country apparently is the one that's across the river from Washington, DC, in Fairfax County, Virginia, where there are children from 182 countries in one school district, speaking over 100 languages. But there are 5 school districts already in America where there are kids whose native tongues number more than 100. And there will be 12 within a couple years. And every school district—there are school districts that had no diversity at all 4 or 5 years ago that now have large Hispanic populations where people had to be brought in because there was a negative unemployment rate. So this is happening across America.

Now, what's our attitude about this? Are we going to think about this in future terms or in yesterday's terms? Are we going to look at people who are different from us as a great opportunity to make our lives more interesting or as some problem we have to deal with? This is a huge issue.

The one thing I'm convinced of is, if we think about the future instead of the past, and change and not the status quo, and unity instead of division, and what helps everybody instead of what helps a few people, we are highly likely to make the right decision. And it is very important.

So if—in addition to what the mayor said about hope for young people, I want you all to think about this. I want you to do what I try to do. When you get up tomorrow, think about: What would I like America to look like 20 years from now? What would I like America to look like when my children are my age? What would I like my legacy to my children to be in terms of my country? And I think that if we do that, we're going to be just fine.

I have seen, in the last 5 years—if I had told you 5 years ago when I was inaugurated President, in 5 years we'll have over 13 million new jobs and the biggest drop in welfare in history and 5 years of dropping violent crime, and the environment will be cleaner, and the public health will be more secure, and America will be clearly leading the world toward a more peaceful situation—you would have been pretty happy, wouldn't you? But you probably wouldn't have believed it. At that point, we didn't have much self-confidence. And this was not rocket science; we just sort of showed up for work every day. This was not rocket science.

I thought about how would I—how should I be President in the way I would behave if I were mayor—it's the way I would behave if I were Governor, it's the way I would behave if I were running any other big enterprise—remembering that my bosses are the American people as a whole. And I think we've changed the direction of the Democratic Party. I hope we've changed the direction of the political debate in the country. I hope eventually we'll also

change the direction of the Republican Party so we'll have a principled debate about where the dynamic center of America ought to be on education questions and environmental questions and other questions for the future.

But when you come here and contribute to this, I just want you to understand that. I'd also just like to say this last thing. I think that we have changed the way Government works. State and local governments, the private sector are in more partnerships with us now. We have 300,000 fewer people than we used to, 16,000 fewer pages of regulation. We've reformed a lot of our laws and our processes. The only thing we haven't reformed is campaign finance, and that's because—if we had a majority in Congress today, at least enough to break a filibuster, we could do that. But we may get that if we keep working at it. And that will be nice, because I'll still have dinner with you and it will be less expensive for you—[*laughter*]—and we'll have a good time. That would be important, too. That's important, too.

And let me just say one last thing to all of you. I'm glad you're here. I appreciate your support. We ought to pass this McCain-Feingold bill, but the work won't be done until we lower the cost of campaigns. And to do that, you have to lower the cost of communicating with the voters. That's what really has driven this whole thing. So people who observe strict campaign limits ought to be rewarded with free or reduced air time and other means of communication with people, so they can afford it. Sometimes we put the cart before the horse here, and we forget what has been driving all this. And I hope we can do that.

I just want you to feel good about your country. We're in better shape than we were 5 years ago. We're having a debate that makes sense again, by and large. We're arguing over things that are important, that will make a difference to your future. And you should feel very good about your country. You should be very strongly confident in the role you've played in it.

But I want to make it clear that for all the things that have been done, we've got a lot to do between now and the 21st century. And I intend to work to the last minute of the last hour of the last day, until the Constitution puts me out to pasture, to do my part. But even then, there will be more to do. And I just hope you can remember and believe in these basic ideas and make sure that our party keeps pushing this basic line, to throw this country into the future, because this is a great place and it has been given to us to sort of take it through this transition.

And here in Philadelphia, where it all began—I was talking to the mayor tonight about what John Marshall wrote when he heard George Washington had died, and he heard it here, and he couldn't go home to Virginia and get there in time for his funeral. So all the Founding Fathers had to organize a service for President Washington here. And we were thinking about it—just think about it, over 200 years ago. We're still around because people like us, in the past, at every moment of change, did the right thing. And that's what we really have to be doing now.

I think we're going in the right direction. But I need you—you should not flag in your commitment. You shouldn't be discouraged. You should be encouraged, and you should know that if we face the challenges that are still out there and complete this transition, that clearly—clearly—the best days of our country are still ahead.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 p.m. in the Victors Restaurant at the CoreStates Arena. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Edward Rendell of Philadelphia.

Remarks Honoring the National Association of Police Organizations "Top Cops"

October 9, 1997

Thank you very much. Good morning. Madam Attorney General; Tom Scotto, Bob Scully, the executive director of NAPO, and the other officers; Ray Kelly; and Mr. Feldman and the other

members of your organization who are here. I want to thank the previous speakers for their comments and, more importantly, for the work they have done to bring us to this day.

I'm delighted to welcome you to the White House to once again honor our Nation's courageous "Top Cops" and to emphasize the importance of the breakthrough we are announcing today in our efforts to protect children from gun violence.

Four and a half years ago, we committed ourselves, as an administration, to take back our streets from crime and violence. We put in place a comprehensive plan based on what law enforcement officers were already trying to do in communities all across America—to put 100,000 new community police officers on our streets, to put tough new penalties on our books, to steer our young people away from crime and gangs and guns, and to keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

We've made real progress. Just last week, as the Attorney General said, we learned our Nation's murder rate has fallen to the lowest point in more than a generation. And for the 5th year in a row, violent crime and property crime have dropped nationwide. These are encouraging trends, and it is clear what is working. One big reason we're turning back the tide of crime is because we're blessed with the kind of outstanding police officers who are standing with me today.

Every year, I look forward to meeting with the winners of the Nation's "Top Cop" awards. NAPO does a great job in picking these people for what they have done. It's an honor to shake hands and look into the eyes of true American heroes. Nominated by their fellow officers, selected from among hundreds of worthy nominees, the "Top Cops" assembled here today represent America's finest.

To say that their courage and devotion has gone beyond the call of duty is indeed an understatement. From rescuing wounded detention officers during a brutal prison riot, to saving hundreds of plant workers under threat from a deranged sniper, you have risked your lives to protect ours. On behalf of a grateful and admiring Nation, I say thank you and congratulations to our "Top Cops" and to their families.

During my time in office, one of the things we've tried to do to work with law enforcement is to help to protect our children from the horror of accidental deaths from unlocked guns. Communities all across our Nation have suffered devastating losses when a child playing with a parent's gun accidentally takes the life of a brother, a sister, or a playmate. According to a recent study released by the Justice Department, 22 million privately owned handguns are kept both loaded and unlocked, which helps to explain why every year about 1,500 children are treated in hospital emergency rooms for unintentional gun injuries. In 1994 alone nearly 200 children died from accidental gunshot wounds.

In March I directed that guns issued to all Federal law enforcement officials, including the FBI, the ATF, the DEA, and Customs agents, be equipped with child safety locks. And by next week, every agency will have fully complied. When I announced this policy, I said if it's good enough for law enforcement, it should be good enough for all our citizens. Today, because of the voluntary action of the firearms industry, millions of our citizens will receive this protection. I'm pleased to announce that eight of the largest handgun manufacturers will now provide child safety devices with every new handgun they sell. This will affect 8 of 10 handguns made in America, and it will save many young lives.

We have today with us leaders of these eight companies: Smith and Wesson, Glock, Beretta, Taurus Firearms, Heckler & Koch, H & R 1871, SigArms, and O.F. Mossberg & Sons. I'd like to ask them to stand so that we can thank them for their commitment. Please stand up. [*Applause*] Thank you very much for your example and your leadership. I hope soon our other handgun makers will follow your lead.

As is well known, this administration and the gun industry from time to time have stood on different sides of various issues—the Brady law, the assault weapons ban—and there may be other disagreements in the future. But today, as has already been said by your representative, today we stand together and stand with the law enforcement community to do what we all know is right for our children.

I should add, as the Attorney General has already said, there are many Members of Congress who have worked with us to advance this issue of child safety locks, and I want to thank them as well.

Now we must work together to do more to protect our children from the scourge of violent crime and especially from crimes committed by other young people. This is now my highest

law enforcement priority. We must provide for more prosecutors and probation officers, tougher penalties, and also better gang prevention efforts, including after-school programs, so that these young people have something to say yes to and some way of staying out of trouble. And we should prohibit violent teenagers from buying guns once they become adults. The same proscriptions of the Brady law should apply to them.

We also, of course, will never be able to supplant the work that must be done by parents in working hard to teach their children that no matter how hard it is, they must do the right thing and reject the wrong course.

For too many years, our people feared that crime would always grow and grow, that nothing could be done to stem lawlessness and violence. But working together—police and parents, public officials and responsible industry leaders—we are making a difference in the lives of our families.

I especially want to thank, again, the "Top Cops" for their truly heroic contributions. And through them, I thank all the others who might well have been here today but who still do their jobs every day and also deserve our thanks, in every community in this country. Because of that kind of bravery every day, America is moving forward into a new century with safer streets and much, much greater peace of mind.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Thomas J. Scotto, president, and Robert T. Scully, executive director, National Association of Police Organizations; Raymond W. Kelly, Under Secretary (Enforcement), Department of the Treasury; and Richard Feldman, executive director, American Shooting Sports Council.

Statement on Signing the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997

October 9, 1997

I am pleased to sign today H.R. 1420, the "National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997." This Act will strengthen and improve our National Wildlife Refuge System as we enter the 21st century. It embodies the principle that whether they cast a line, pitch a decoy, or click a shutter, the 30 million Americans who annually visit and enjoy our refuges have one common and enduring interest—the conservation of fish, wildlife, and their habitat. That is what the National Wildlife Refuge System is about and that is what this Act will promote and ensure.

The National Wildlife Refuge System is the world's greatest system of lands dedicated to the conservation of fish and wildlife. It is a system founded in faith; a belief that in a country as bountiful and diverse as ours, there ought to be special places that are set aside exclusively for the conservation of fish and wildlife resources. These special places are National Wildlife Refuges where the conservation needs of wildlife are paramount.

Key provisions of H.R. 1420 mirror those of Executive Order 12996, Management and General Public Use of the National Wildlife Refuge System, which I signed in March 1996. These provisions include the mission statement for the Refuge System, the designation of priority public uses, and a requirement that the environmental health of the Refuge System be maintained.

The bill maintains the crucial distinction clearly set forth in my Executive order between wildlife conservation as the dominant refuge goal and compatible wildlife-dependent recreation as a priority public use. Wildlife conservation is the purpose of the refuges. The opportunity for compatible recreational uses are the important benefits that flow from this purpose. This bill recognizes that the use of refuge lands and waters, to the extent that such use can be allowed, shall be reserved first to those recreational activities that depend and thrive on abundant populations of fish and wildlife.

The bill also maintains the strict policy, first established by the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, that all refuge

uses must be compatible with the primary purpose or purposes for which the refuge was established. It sets up a sensible, consistent, and public process for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's managers to follow in making compatibility determinations, and it adopts the Fish and Wildlife Service's longstanding regulatory standard for compatibility.

The bill reiterates the specific categories of wildlife-dependent recreation found in Executive Order 12996 that are to be considered as the "priority public uses" for the refuge system: hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation. Where compatible, refuge managers are to provide increased opportunities for these uses and enhance the attention they receive in refuge management and planning.

Finally, H.R. 1420 maintains the historic Refuge System policy that refuges are "closed until open." That is, in order to ensure that wildlife needs come first, existing refuge lands and waters are closed to public uses until they are specifically opened for such uses. Also as provided in Executive Order 12996, the bill establishes a new process for identifying compatible wildlife-dependent recreational activities prior to the acquisition of new refuge areas, thereby avoiding the temporary closure of ongoing compatible recreational activities.

This bill is the result of extensive negotiations by my Administration, the Congress, and environmental and sportmen's groups. Starting from widely differing positions, they worked intensively to reach the compromise reflected in this legislation. The bill is proof that when there is a shared commitment to do what is right for our natural resources, partisan and ideological differences can be set aside and compromises can be negotiated for the benefit of the common good. It is clearly the most significant conservation legislation to emerge from this Congress to date. I hope and trust the process by which this bill was enacted will serve as a model for future congressional action on other environmental measures.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
October 9, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 1420, approved October 9, was assigned Public Law No. 105–57.

Statement on Signing the Oklahoma City National Memorial Act of 1997

October 9, 1997

I am pleased to sign today S. 871, the "Oklahoma City National Memorial Act of 1997." This Act establishes the Oklahoma City National Memorial as a unit of the National Park System to recognize the profound changes brought to so many lives on the tragic morning of April 19, 1995.

The significance of the tragedy of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, and the meaning and implications of this event for our Nation, compel the establishment of this memorial as a visible and prominent national shrine. After the bombing, I proclaimed a National Day of Mourning for those lost in the tragedy. The people of the United States prayed for them and their community as we gathered in our places of worship around the country. When I traveled to Oklahoma City to participate in a memorial service for the bombing victims, I pledged to do all I could to help heal the injured, to rebuild the city, and to stand by the people of Oklahoma City.

The Oklahoma City Memorial Foundation has done a tremendous job of involving the public, defining its mission and goals, and holding a design competition for the memorial. Building upon these local efforts, this Act establishes the Oklahoma City Memorial Trust to manage the memorial. This Trust, a Federal Government corporation, will operate within the Department of the Interior in cooperation with the National Park Service to ensure the fulfillment of the obligations and requirements of the laws and policies that govern units of the National Park Systems (NPS).

Through the partnership, the National Park Service will provide technical assistance to the

Trust for 2 years, after which time the Trust will reimburse the Park Service for any further services. As part of this partnership, it is my expectation that the National Park Service will establish a position of superintendent or site manager to work closely with the Trust in managing this NPS unit.

Section 5(v)(1) of S. 871 vests the powers and management of the Trust in a Board of Directors consisting of the Secretary of the Interior and eight other members appointed by the President. These Presidential appointments would be made from names submitted by the Governor of Oklahoma, the Mayor of Oklahoma City, and the Oklahoma congressional delegation. Because the Constitution does not permit limiting the executive branch's appointment power by requiring nominations from lists of recommendations, I will regard any lists submitted pursuant to that section as advisory.

I commend all those who worked so hard to memorialize the lives of the innocent victims of the Oklahoma City bombing.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
October 9, 1997.

NOTE: S. 871, approved October 9, was assigned Public Law No. 105–58.

Message on the Observance of Yom Kippur, 1997

October 9, 1997

Warm greetings to all those observing Yom Kippur.

On this most solemn of Jewish holy days, Jews across America and around the world acknowledge the transgressions of the past year and come before God to atone for their sins. It is a time to rectify mistakes, to repair broken bonds between family members, friends, and neighbors, and to reaffirm their sacred covenant with God. Rich with tradition and ritual, observed with strict fasting and devout prayer, the Day of Atonement offers the Jewish people a powerful reminder to begin the new year by seeking what is most important: the mercy of God and the forgiveness of those whom they may have failed.

As our nation embarks upon a season of renewal and reconciliation, Americans of all faiths can learn from the lessons of Yom Kippur. By acknowledging the divisions among us and seeking forgiveness from one another for past injuries and mistakes, we can strengthen our families, communities, and nation and enter the future as a more compassionate and united people.

Hillary joins me in extending best wishes to all for a blessed Yom Kippur.

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 9.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner

October 9, 1997

Thank you. Only a fool would speak after both a Baptist minister and a rabbi. [*Laughter*] Thank you, Steve. And I thank Vernon and Ann for having us here. Hillary and I and Chelsea, we've been here a lot over the last several years. This has often been a home away from home and on occasion, in difficult times, a real refuge for us. This is the largest crowd with whom I have ever dined in this room, with the fewest number of people related to Vernon and Ann. [*Laughter*] But we're all family in a way here, and I thank you for being here.

I thought what might be good to do tonight is maybe I would just talk a couple of minutes and follow up on something that Vernon and Steve talked about, and then see if any of you

had any questions or comments you wanted to make or anything you wanted to say.

Let me begin by thanking you for helping tonight and, for many of you, over many years. I've been feeling rather nostalgic lately, as you might imagine. Last week was the sixth anniversary of the date I declared for President. And we just took Chelsea off to school. A couple of days from now is my 22d wedding anniversary. I'm not feeling so young anymore. And almost five-eighths of my Presidency is over, which I have a difficult time believing.

Let me tell you why I think what we're doing is important. I never will forget when I was trying to make up my mind whether to run for President in 1991. I didn't especially feel compelled to do it. I was having the most wonderful time of my life as a Governor, enjoying enormous success, great approval from our people; our family, our friends, everything was going great. I was very concerned then that our country seemed to be sort of lurching toward this new century and this incredible new era without any real strategy for how to proceed.

And I was also concerned, very frankly, about the quality of the political debate in Washington in both parties. It seemed to me kind of stale and not very helpful. There was a lot of emphasis on what I thought of as "old think," you know—liberal-conservative, left-right, in yesterday's terms—and a whole lot of emphasis on the politics of personal destruction which, regrettably, I have not quite succeeded in eliminating from Washington. It may be part of human nature.

I read a great biography of General Grant the other day, pointing out that his commander in the Union Army, even though he kept winning and his men loved him and everybody thought he was great, was trying to replace him until finally he won at Vicksburg and no one could question whether he was the lead dog in the hunt—whereupon the guy immediately rushed to Lincoln and started talking about how great he was. So maybe this is just part of this town and the way it works.

But I didn't like it very much, because it seemed to me then—it seems to me now—that we have all these incredible opportunities, but we have to be thinking about them in the right way. There is a great role and a need for two parties in this country, but they need to be having a principled debate about the future, not yesterday's debate about things that don't really matter anymore.

And so, I set about doing what wound up winning the campaign in '92, saying that we had to focus on keeping the American dream alive, reasserting America's leadership in the world, and rebuilding America's community at home, and that we needed to focus on the future, not the past; on change, not the status quo; on unity, not division; on policies that helped everybody, not just a few. And I think it's fair to say it's worked pretty well, because not only is the economy doing well but crime has dropped for 5 years in a row. We have the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history now—3.6 million people tonight are living in families with payrolls who were living in families with welfare checks 4 years ago. That's something our country can be proud of. We have advanced the cause of the environment and public health. The country is better off.

But if I look ahead to the future, I will say again, the reason this is important, why you're here tonight, and the reason it's important that we continue to be active in the political process and not be apologetic or believe there's anything wrong with it, is that we still have these huge decisions to make and we desperately need a principled debate about the future. That's what we owe our children. That's what we owe this country.

Now, let me just give you a few. The major challenges confronting America for the remainder of this century and for the foreseeable future will be those posed by the globalization of the economy and the society, and the changing nature of the way we work and live as a result of the information and technology revolution. Among other things, one big challenge will be, how do you maintain individual opportunity and give everybody who is willing to work a chance with all this dynamism in the economy, number one? Number two, how do you make sure that we have the requisite set of policies—and maybe most important—to keep this economy going and competitive? That's what I think the fast-track issue is about. Number three, since we have a higher percentage of Americans than ever before in the workplace, how do we help people balance better the demands of work and family, since the most important job anyone ever has is still raising children properly? Nothing else compares to that. If we fail at that,

we can all work like crazy, and then when we're gone, the whole thing will crater.

On the other hand, people shouldn't be asked to choose and face not succeeding as a parent because they can't balance these demands. That's why I worked so hard for the family leave act and the Kennedy-Kassebaum health care bill and the part of the balanced budget that will enable us to provide health insurance for 5 million more kids and working families who don't have it, because we have to find a way for people to succeed at rebuilding childhood in America and strong families and still keep growing this economy like crazy.

The third thing that I want to say—or the fourth one, on globalization—we also, it seems to me, as Americans, have to put our minds more to bringing the strategies that have brought so many of us so much prosperity into the areas that have not been affected one way or the other by the good things that are happening. And I think we shouldn't miss that. There are areas that have not been affected one way or the other, that just are still static, and they are a great market for America. They're a great growth potential. They're a great potential strength for our future. So, there's that set of challenges.

Then I think we have a set of generational challenges. I think we have to not only preserve Medicare and Social Security for future generations but we have to do it in a way that frees us up to focus on the fact that an enormous number of our children are still born into and reared in poverty and are, therefore, relatively disadvantaged compared to those of us who are not young. And we pay a big price for that.

The next big challenge I think we have is, how do we deal with the very real and, I'm convinced, quite profound environmental challenges that will be presented to the world if China, India, and other countries grow quite wealthy, if they all get rich the same way we did? The President of China is about to come visit me, and we once had an interesting conversation in New York when he said, "Sometimes I think the United States is trying to contain us. And we don't want to be a threat to you, and we don't want you to think we are." And I said, "The only threat you propose to us right now is I'm afraid you want to get rich the same way we did, because if you do it in exactly the same way we did, all your cities will be clogged with pollution and will be heating up the atmosphere so fast that nothing I do will turn it around." And I could tell he'd never thought about it in those terms.

This climate change issue, I think, is a very real issue. It's only one of many environmental challenges we have to face, but we have to prove that we can do it in a way that permits us to continue to grow the economy and doesn't make us look like we're trying to hold down people in countries that at long last are beginning to come into their own and give their kids a better future. It's a huge challenge. Science and technology—how are we going to deal with the potentials of it? Are there ethical dilemmas? I think there are. I've talked about them in some cases. But the United States has to maintain its leadership in these areas.

Just two more that I think are very important. The world we're living in now, with no cold war and no clear divisions, gives us both an enormous opportunity to advance peace and freedom and democracy and our own security and prosperity, but it also presents us with a whole lot of new challenges that cross national lines. I don't know how many of you saw the article that was in our local paper within the last 2 weeks about how the South American drug cartels are linking up with the Russian mafia gangs who are far more diversified in their operations. So, they're becoming a cash cow for people who don't have as much money but have more connections in more different illegal and violent activities. That's just one little example of what happens.

If you break down all these barriers to information, to movement, to money—all the things that are making it possible for many of you to do so well in the world—organized forces of destruction can equally take advantage of those declining barriers to cause us new and different problems. So you will have—in our lifetime, we'll have to face problems of terrorism, organized crime and drugs, and ethnic and racial and religious hatreds spawning wars, not to mention the fact that diseases will travel across international borders more quickly, especially if there are compounding environmental problems.

These are new challenges. We have to be thinking about them. We cannot afford to be mired in a debate that either makes us smaller than we are, keeps us torn up and upset all the time, or distracts us away from the real challenges of our people. And I have to say,

you know, you've all heard me say this in the beginning, but I think the two most important things that we can really do for our own people are make sure that we give genuine excellence of education to every child and give everybody in America the opportunity to go to college who is willing to go and work for it, and find a way to make a strength rather than a weakness of our diversity.

I can't tell you—I don't want to embarrass him, but I had a wonderful talk with Dr. Wong at dinner, whom I admire so much, and he was telling me that he and the President of China graduated from the same university from the same department a few years apart. So we have an American, who has done a great thing in our country, who can be a part of our attempts to have a peaceful future with China.

We also have people from India, from Pakistan, from every country in Latin America, from every country in Europe, from every country in Africa. This is an incredible gift, and we should not blow it. And a lot of people think I talk about this more than I should, but it's great. If you saw what I saw and the way I see it, how much time I have to spend getting people around the world to stop killing each other and essentially stop behaving on primitive or childish impulses, whether it's in Bosnia or the Middle East, or Rwanda and Burundi, or Northern Ireland, and you realize that these people—oftentimes they go along for years and they do just fine, and then something snaps, they're poorly led, and they disintegrate into destructive behavior. We need to be able to be a model to the world that will stand as a stern rebuke to that kind of conduct so that we can spread it around.

Now, these are the kinds of things that political debates ought to be about. We will always have a difference with our friends in the Republican Party, but it's not yesterday's difference. Fundamentally, I believe that what we stand for is—if I could just sort of ad lib with the quote that Steve gave about relationships—what we believe is that our individual lives are more fulfilled when we work together through strong units—families, communities, businesses—and that Government is one of those, and that there are some things we have to do together that we can only do through Government, that we can't do in other ways.

And I say that as the man who downsized the Government more than President Reagan did, gave more authority to State and local governments, and privatized more operations than President Reagan did, but stood strongly for doing more in education and health care and research, in science and technology, in environmental action than Presidents of the other party and Members of Congress of the other party.

I think this is what we're about. And we have to be—we have to imagine the future and then try to define it. And we should welcome a principled debate on the other side. We should welcome debates within our party. I noticed there has been a lot of publicity lately about the debates within the Republican Party about whether they should just keep on their Government-hating tirade or whether they should have a more sophisticated view, and they're debating that. I think that's a healthy thing for them. And it will be a good thing for the country.

We need this. And that's what you're contributing to. I'm telling you, if we find a way to really provide opportunity for everybody, if we find a way to resolve our intergenerational responsibilities, if we can find a way to grow the economy and preserve the environment and even improve it, if we can keep America ahead of the curves and live together as one country, and finally, if I or my successors can persuade a heavy majority of the American people that we have to lead in this world that we no longer dominate—the most frustrating thing for me in terms of communication is, no matter how many talks I give or how many times I give this speech, most Americans, I think, still don't—they may trust me to do it, but they still don't necessarily agree that it's in our interest to be involved in an aggressive way with other countries and their future. But if we can do these things, the best days of this country are still out there.

And that is what your contribution is about. It's about giving us a chance to do that, and I hope you'll be very proud of it. You ought to be happy with the results today, but the main results will come when most of us aren't around anymore. And that's just as it should be.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:35 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Steve Grossman, national chair, Democratic National Committee; dinner hosts Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., and his wife, Ann; President Jiang Zemin of China; and dinner guest Dr. C.J. Wong.

Remarks on Internal Revenue Service Reform

October 10, 1997

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for your work. Mr. Secretary, thank you. Mr. Summers, Mr. Sperling, Commissioner, Mr. Tobias, members of the task force, employees of the IRS who are here today, and others who are concerned about this. And especially I thank the Members of Congress who are here who are supporting this endeavor and the others in Congress, including Senator Kerrey and Congressman Portman, who have shown such interest.

Let me say, as someone who had not worked in Washington until I became President, I have spent most of my life talking to people who were on the receiving end of the IRS, for good or ill. And I took particular interest in the recent congressional hearings into the problems of IRS policy and some specific examples of taxpayer abuse. Like most Americans, I was genuinely angered by the stories of our citizens harassed and humiliated by what seemed to them to be an all-powerful, unaccountable, and often downright tone-deaf agency.

And since I took office, as has already been said, our administration has worked hard to give the American people an IRS that is fairer, more efficient, easier for the public to understand and to deal with, with the electronic filing and filing by telephone, with the second Taxpayer Bill of Rights, with our efforts to reduce the conflict between the IRS and people's religious expression, just to name three examples.

It is clear that we have more to do. The IRS should be above reproach. Americans who work hard and pay their taxes deserve to be treated fairly, and no one should ever have a home, a car, a livelihood threatened by unaccountable actions of Government. Abuse or bullying or callousness by officials of our Government are unacceptable whenever and wherever they occur. If they occur once, it's once too many. But especially in connection with the IRS, it is important that they be rooted out.

Let me say that it's important, too, for the American people to know that the IRS is made up overwhelmingly of hard-working and dedicated people who put in long hours in public service. The vast majority of them do their jobs well, and the vast majority of them were just as outraged by the case studies profiled in the congressional hearings as other Americans were.

It is clear that in spite of our best efforts in the past, there remain significant problems and challenges at the IRS. That's why last May the Vice President and the Secretary of the Treasury initiated their effort to deal with problems, many of which have been a long time in the making but which have to be addressed, and addressed now.

Their initiatives will take significant steps toward ending abuses, protecting taxpayers, and making the IRS more customer-friendly. Their recommendations are strong and sound and I believe represent the right way to reform the IRS. I'm instructing that they be put into effect just as soon as possible, and I'm asking Congress to pass legislation where necessary to make them the law of the land. And again, I thank the Members here who have agreed to support that endeavor.

Let me say, I can't go over all 200 recommendations, although I hope that most of them will be widely reported to the American people. But let me give you just a few. The package of reforms says to every taxpayer, first, you will have a tax collection agency that is reinvented so that it serves its customers and taxpayers every bit as well as the best private companies serve their customers. As the Vice President said, reinvention begins with a ban on the use of dollar goals to evaluate IRS employee performance, goals that can give some IRS agents the wrong incentives, just as parking ticket quotas can give police officers the wrong incentives. And the IRS will trim paperwork, increase hours, make sure that phones are answered, expand electronic filing, and move toward a systematic review of all taxpayer penalties.

Second, you have rights as a taxpayer that will be protected. I'm calling on Congress to pass a new—the third—taxpayer bill of rights, to build on the law I signed last year. This will extend the refund period for taxpayers with health problems that keep them from seeking refunds in a timely fashion, it will protect innocent spouses from paying for the dishonesty of

a spouse or former spouse, and it will take other steps to expand taxpayer rights.

Third, as a taxpayer you will have recourse when you believe you've been treated unfairly. We're greatly strengthening the taxpayer advocates, who already fight effectively for taxpayers in individual cases, by expanding their resources and giving them greater power to award taxpayers immediate relief. And we are creating new, independent, locally based citizen advocacy panels throughout the country. These independent watchdogs will be able to monitor how local IRS offices treat taxpayers, publicize problems, and help taxpayers to get relief. A taxpayer who has been treated unfairly should have somewhere to go, someone to fight on his or her side, someone to make the agency listen. With a stronger taxpayer advocate and these new citizen panels, they will have just that.

Fourth, we will strengthen the governance and oversight of the IRS. The steps I have taken today are building on the reforms already put in place and described by Secretary Rubin. In order to strengthen public accountability, I am seeking legislation to establish a new IRS board of trustees with the majority of members from the private sector. This board will review IRS performance on customer service, strategic plans, performance measures, and citizen advisory panel recommendations to ensure that taxpayers do, in fact, receive the treatment we say they deserve. The board would report independently, and at least annually, to the Secretary, the President, and the Congress. It will provide the private sector input we need. All of this should help to assure that leaders of the executive branch fulfill their responsibility to the American people to effectively oversee and govern the IRS. It is the right way to reform the agency.

In conclusion, let me say that I believe the attention given to this issue and the information made public by Congress has served the public and the public interest well. We have an opportunity to build on the reforms already put in place and to use this moment to extend them further, so that the IRS achieves its purposes and serves the public in the spirit of the best institutions, both public and private.

I don't suppose anyone will ever enjoy paying their taxes, and the agency that collects taxes will undoubtedly never be the most popular part of our Government. But it's important work, and all the more important that it be done properly. If we act now, we can make sure that the IRS genuinely earns and deserves the trust of the American people, and we are determined to achieve that goal.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:57 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Lawrence H. Summers; National Economic Adviser Gene Sperling; Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue Michael P. Dolan; and Robert M. Tobias, president, National Treasury Employees Union.

Statement on Signing the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998

October 10, 1997

I have today signed into law H.R. 2378, the "Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998," which provides $12.8 billion in discretionary budget authority for various programs in the Department of the Treasury, the United States Postal Service, the General Services Administration, the Office of Personnel Management, the Executive Office of the President and several smaller agencies.

The Act provides funding for the Department of the Treasury of $11.4 billion, including $131 million for violent crime reduction programs. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is funded at $7.8 billion, including $325 million for Information Technology Investments. While this funding level is $175 million below my request, I believe that the funds will strengthen the IRS's ability to provide timely and accurate data for American taxpayers. The bill also includes $138 million for the Earned Income Tax Credit compliance initiative and $377 million for Year 2000

conversion requirements for IRS computer systems. Law Enforcement bureaus within the Department of the Treasury are funded at $3.1 billion.

The Act provides $195 million for the Office of National Drug Control Policy's (ONDCP) national media campaign. This money will enable ONDCP to develop a national media campaign targeting drug consumption by youth. The campaign will be a model public-private partnership, exposing 90 percent of all 9 to 17 year-olds to anti-drug messages at least four times a week.

The Act repeals cooperative purchasing authority that would have allowed States and localities to buy products off the General Services Administration's Federal supply schedule contracts. I am disappointed by this repeal, which will deprive us of the opportunity for potential savings achievable by leveraging the combined purchasing power of the Federal Government, States, and localities.

Section 640 of the bill prohibits the use of appropriations to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Federal Government who interferes with certain communications or contacts between other Federal employees and Members of Congress or congressional committees. I understand this provision is intended to protect "whistleblower" employees who wish to inform the Congress of evidence of violations of law or other wrongdoing in the Government. Any broader interpretation of the provision that would apply to "nonwhistleblowers" would raise substantial constitutional concerns in depriving the President and his department and agency heads of their ability to supervise and control the operations and communications of the executive branch. I do not interpret this provision to detract from my constitutional authority in this way.

I urge the Congress to complete action on the remaining FY 1998 appropriations bills as quickly as possible, and to send them to me in an acceptable form.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
October 10, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2378, approved October 10, was assigned Public Law No. 105–61.

Message to the House of Representatives Returning Without Approval Partial Birth Abortion Legislation

October 10, 1997

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1122, which would prohibit doctors from performing a certain kind of abortion. I am returning H.R. 1122 for exactly the same reasons I returned an earlier substantially identical version of this bill, H.R. 1833, last year. My veto message of April 10, 1996, fully explains my reasons for returning that bill and applies to H.R. 1122 as well. H.R. 1122 is a bill that is consistent neither with the Constitution nor sound public policy.

As I have stated on many occasions, I support the decision in *Roe v. Wade* protecting a woman's right to choose. Consistent with that decision, I have long opposed late-term abortions, and I continue to do so except in those instances necessary to save the life of a woman or prevent serious harm to her health. Unfortunately, H.R. 1122 does not contain an exception to the measure's ban that will adequately protect the lives and health of the small group of women in tragic circumstances who need an abortion performed at a late stage of pregnancy to avert death or serious injury.

I have asked the Congress repeatedly, for almost 2 years, to send me legislation that includes a limited exception for the small number of compelling cases where use of this procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. When Governor of Arkansas, I signed a bill into law that barred third-trimester abortions, with an appropriate exception for life or health. I would do so again, but only if the bill contains an exception for the rare cases where a woman faces death or serious injury.

I believe the Congress should work in a bipartisan manner to fashion such legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
October 10, 1997.

NOTE: The Office of the Press Secretary also made available the President's earlier veto message, dated April 10, 1996, which was published in *Public Papers of the Presidents: William J. Clinton, 1996 Book I* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997), p. 567.

The President's Radio Address
October 11, 1997

Good morning. We have worked hard to help parents pass on their values to their children and to protect them from bad influences. Today I want to talk about a powerful new tool in our arsenal to help parents and to protect our children from the dangers of drugs.

Of all the investments we can make in our children's future, none is more important than our fight against the greatest threat to their safety: illegal drugs. Under the leadership of our national drug czar, General Barry McCaffrey, we've fought to keep drugs away from our borders, off our streets, and out of our schools with a tough and smart antidrug strategy. Working together with State and local law enforcement, we've made real progress. But unless we teach our children about the dangers of drugs, our efforts will be in vain.

Make no mistake; without our guidance, children are more likely to use drugs. Although overall drug use has declined dramatically, drug use by our young people has doubled. Among eighth graders, typically 13 and 14 years old, drug use has nearly tripled. We do not understand all the reasons for these unsettling statistics, but we do know this: While illegal drug use by young people has risen, the number of antidrug public service ads has fallen by more than a third.

In the meantime, movies, music videos, and magazines have filled the gap—and our children's minds—too often with warped images of a dream world where drugs are cool. We know that the media can powerfully affect our children, for good or ill. That is why we acted to protect our children from tobacco advertisements and why we've urged the liquor industry to refrain from running hard liquor ads on television. Now we must take the next step and give our children the straight facts: Drugs are wrong, drugs are illegal, and drugs can kill you.

Young people who have not used illegal drugs by the age of 21 probably never will use them. That's why we must reach our children with the right message before it's too late. I just signed into law legislation that includes $195 million to launch an unprecedented high-profile, prime-time media campaign to reach every child in America between the ages of 9 and 17 at least four times a week. For the very first time, we'll be able to use the full power of the media—from television to the Internet to sports marketing—to protect our children from drugs. Teaching our children about the dangers of drugs today can mean saving their lives and our shared future tomorrow.

I am pleased that the Partnership for a Drug-Free America and the Ad Council will serve as advisers for this vitally important project. I'd like to say a special word of thanks to the Partnership for a Drug-Free America and its chairman, Jim Burke, for the outstanding example they have already set in showing us what good ads can do. And I urge business leaders all over our country to help us reach our goal by matching the funds that the Congress has appropriated. Finally, I ask all Americans to join in this crusade.

Above all, I ask the entertainment industry to do its part as well. Never glorify drugs; but more important, tell our children the truth. Show them that drug use is really a death sentence. Use the power of your voice to teach our children and to help shape our Nation's future.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 2:47 p.m. on October 10 in the Oval Office at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on October 11.

Statement on the 20th Anniversary of the Community Reinvestment Act
October 12, 1997

On the 20th anniversary of the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA), we should all be proud of what that law has meant for low- and moderate-income Americans of all races. Although we still have a long way to go in bringing all Americans into the economic mainstream, under CRA the private sector has pumped billions of dollars of credit to build housing, create jobs, and restore hope in communities left behind.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 11 but was embargoed for release until 12:01 a.m. on October 12.

Remarks on Arrival in Caracas, Venezuela
October 12, 1997

President and Mrs. Caldera, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the entire American delegation and all the American people, let me first say, *Saludos, amigos*. It is good to be in Venezuela.

When the first explorers came to the Americas centuries ago, there was no distinction in their minds between North and South America; it was simply the New World. Now we have an opportunity to bring the Americas together again; a land united by shared values from Alaska to Patagonia; a place the rest of the world can look to and say, this is where the future lives.

Indeed, we are present at the future. Every country but one in our hemisphere is now a democracy. Command economies have given way to free markets and the more widespread prosperity they bring. We tear down trade barriers and create good jobs for all our people in the Americas, North and South.

Even as our governments are devoted to free markets and enterprise, we assume the necessary responsibility for meeting their challenges: to educate our children, to protect their health and the environment, to defend their liberty and human rights. If we stay this course, in the 21st century the Americas can be a stronghold for security and prosperity; a model to the world that democracy, open markets, and cooperation can deliver blessings to all our people.

Venezuela has been a driving force in this quiet revolution. Your democracy is strong after weathering difficult challenges. Your economy is growing in the wake of real sacrifice. The strength you find in Venezuela's diversity is indeed an inspiration to every nation in our hemisphere.

The United States is proud of its partnership with Venezuela, proud that we share a fundamental optimism about the future and a common resolve to work toward securing the benefits of peace and prosperity. From an abiding faith in democracy to a willingness to fight crime and corruption, from energy development to environmental protection, from music to baseball, we are united by our concerns and by our passions.

Thirty-six years ago, John Kennedy became the first American President to visit Venezuela. In speaking to the people here, he cited his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and his earlier efforts to promote friendship between the nations of this hemisphere—and I quote—"united by nature and united in their common

aspirations." Today, I proudly follow in the footsteps of both men, committed to sustain their impulse to reach across borders and learn from our friends and neighbors for our mutual benefit.

As we stand on the edge of a new century in a new millennium, we are very much like the first explorers who came here centuries ago; we can see a new world in the making. That is our chance and our responsibility. Let us seize it together.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:10 p.m. at La Carlotta Air Base. In his remarks, he referred to President Rafael Caldera of Venezuela and his wife, Alicia.

Remarks at the Venezuela-United States Agreements Signing Ceremony in Caracas

October 13, 1997

President Caldera, Foreign Minister Rivas, Energy Minister Arrieta, Dr. Tablante, Secretary Peña, Secretary Albright, Special Envoy McLarty, to all the Venezuelan and American officials here, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. President, our hemisphere is coming together in a spirit of mutual respect and equality rooted in democracy, which you have championed for so long. And now we can become a stronghold for security and prosperity, and an example to the world that market democracies can deliver for all our people. These agreements on energy and counternarcotics are practical results of the partnership between the United States and Venezuela, which is strong and growing stronger.

Last year Venezuela became the United States' number one supplier of foreign oil. But for the last 80 years, Venezuela has been a rock of stability, staying out of the oil embargo, stepping in to boost production in moments of crisis from World War II to the Gulf war. The investments we have made in each other's energy sectors have created good jobs and spurred innovation in both our countries. The people of the United States are grateful for the benefits of our modern partnership.

Today's energy agreement will strengthen that partnership for tomorrow, helping us to provide cleaner energy from more sources to more people more efficiently. Let me thank Secretary Peña and Minister Arrieta for their hard work and their teamwork in getting this done, and for the example of leadership they set for our entire hemisphere.

The Alliance Against Drugs we embrace today also enhances our partnership and our future. For throughout the Americas, drugs threaten the very fabric of civil society. They destroy lives. They spread violence to our streets and playgrounds. They corrupt and kill law enforcement officials. They create instability that can sweep across borders. Drugs are not simply a problem for the United States or for Venezuela; they are our common problem, and we must fight back together.

In the United States we are working hard to reduce demand, with the largest antidrug effort in our history. But we must also be relentless in attacking supply. The Alliance Against Drugs is an important step forward. New equipment and training for Venezuela's drug fighters, including patrol boats and surveillance planes; deeper cooperation between our law enforcement communities to speed prosecutions and extraditions; a Joint Intelligence Coordination center to share information and coordinate antidrug operations: each of these initiatives will make us stronger in the fight against drugs, and our children safer for the future.

Mr. President, Minister Rivas, Dr. Tablante, Secretary Albright, General McCaffrey, thank you for making the United States-Venezuela Alliance Against Drugs a reality. And let me thank all of you here for taking the partnership between our two countries into the 21st century.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 a.m. at Miraflores Palace. In his remarks, he referred to Venezuelan Minister of Foreign Affairs Miguel

Angel Burelli Rivas; Minister of Energy and Mines Erwin Jose Arrieta; and Minister of State and National Commission Against Illicit Drug Use President Dr. Carlos Tablante.

Declaration of the Presidents of the United States of America and of the Republic of Venezuela

October 13, 1997

Meeting in the city of Caracas, we, William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States of America, and Rafael Caldera, President of the Republic of Venezuela, have had a fruitful dialogue about developments in our bilateral relations and the shared perspective and objectives of both countries in the hemisphere and in the world.

We reaffirm that our reciprocal relations are inspired by the highest ideals of liberty and democracy, and we express our satisfaction for the existence of that form of government in almost all the countries that make up our hemisphere.

This meeting has also permitted us to agree on the necessity of promoting at the international level respect for and guarantee of human rights, cooperation in the struggle against corruption and terrorism, and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In short, we reaffirm the long history of shared friendship and cooperation between Venezuela and the United States of America and we express our willingness to expand and deepen the ties in all areas of common interest.

We reaffirm the commitment to continue working toward the creation of a Free Trade Area of the Americas by the year 2005, and in this sense give our support to the comprehensive negotiations which to this end will begin during the 1998 Summit of Santiago, Chile, on all the subjects related to this theme listed in the Miami Declaration. We reaffirm the commitment made in the Declaration of Miami that concrete progress toward the attainment of this objective will be made by the end of this century.

We recognize the importance of the expansion of commerce and bilateral investment to improve the standard of living of the people of our countries and for this reason reaffirm our political will to sign a high-standards Bilateral Investment Treaty which meets the interests of both parties and satisfactorily resolves those issues over which agreement has not yet been reached. We recognize the progress reached in the negotiations which we have conducted, and have instructed our representatives to aim to conclude this treaty as quickly as possible. Furthermore, we express our willingness to reinitiate talks on a basis that leads to the signing of a treaty to avoid double taxation.

As an expression of our close bilateral association in the field of energy, we note with great satisfaction the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding on Energy Cooperation that extends ties in petroleum matters to new areas such as renewable energy, energy efficiency, development of natural gas, and integration of energy resources that will promote still more reciprocal investment in the energy sector.

In view of the importance of the strengthening of the process of hemispheric cooperation and integration in the area of energy, we support the initiative of the Government of Venezuela to convene a hemispheric meeting of ministers of energy in January 1998 as an important step prior to the Hemispheric Summit of Santiago de Chile.

Given the active cooperation of our two countries in the struggle against narcotics trafficking and related crimes, we welcome the signing of the "Strategic Alliance Against Drugs" as the expression that our governments continue to give the highest priority to combat this scourge together and without quarter. Thus we reaffirm the desire to initiate negotiations as soon as possible to sign a new comprehensive maritime cooperation agreement for the struggle against drugs. We note with approval that the United States of America continues to cooperate with Venezuela in counternarcotics activities through the provision of equipment, training teams and other useful measures.

We salute the initiative adopted by both governments to sign a Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty as well as a Customs Cooperation Agreement that will facilitate our combating more effectively crimes of corruption, money laundering, and in the customs area.

Finally, we confirm our political will to maintain and deepen the ties of friendship and reciprocal assistance that we have maintained at all times and express the conviction that our respective peoples will continue to benefit from those gifts conferred by our proximity and our common destiny.

For the United States of America

WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON

For the Republic of Venezuela

RAFAEL CALDERA

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this declaration.

Remarks to the Citizens of Venezuela in Caracas
October 13, 1997

Mr. President, let me begin by thanking you for your warm introduction and your invitation to speak at this sacred place. I am deeply honored to be the first foreign leader ever to address the people of Venezuela at the Tomb of Simon Bolivar.

To the people of this city, I thank you for the extraordinary welcome you have given to Hillary and me and to our entire delegation. *Todo esta chevere en Caracas. Todo esta chevere en Venezuela.*

Let me welcome especially all the young people who have come here today and say a special word of appreciation to the National Youth Orchestra, which played our national anthems and my favorite march so magnificently. It is the young and their future that I wish to speak on this day.

It is especially fitting that we meet here at the Panteon National, for the liberator belongs not only to Venezuela and the other nations of the Andes; Bolivar belongs to all the Americas. He stands alongside Washington and San Martin and the pantheon of liberty's heroes. He was the first to imagine a hemisphere of democracies, united by shared goals and common values. His example stirred the hearts of men and women throughout our region. Indeed, today, we in the United States can still mark the frontier of our Nation in the 1820's by finding our towns, our counties, our villages named Bolivar in the States of Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, and West Virginia.

When the liberator died, his vision of freedom and peace in the Americas seemed an impossibility. How I wish he were here today to see his spiritual heirs here in Venezuela and throughout the Americas turning his dream into a reality.

Our hemisphere is growing closer every day. Driven by shared values and common purposes, we have put the age-old dream of a democratic and prosperous family of the Americas within our reach. In the last decade, every nation in the Americas but one has embraced democracy, giving its people a vibrant free press, free elections, and the rule of law. Decades of coups and bloody civil wars have given way to the peaceful transition of power. Stifling command economies have been replaced by free markets, giving innovation and more jobs and higher incomes. We are joined in the search for social justice within market economies. And we are all working to leave our children a planet as healthy and bountiful as the one we inherited.

I come here today to salute the people of Venezuela for the extraordinary part you are playing in this quiet revolution of the Americas, and especially to salute President Caldera for a lifetime of leadership for liberty. You, Mr. President, have carried the torch that Bolivar lit for more than half a century, and we are all in your debt.

Other nations in our hemisphere have been drawn to the path you have blazed. For Venezuela is a world center of energy: oh, yes, petroleum, but also energy for peace and freedom; energy for democracy and prosperity; and I might add, energy for world-class baseball players.

Your democracy has weathered powerful challenges, but never wavered. Under the leadership of President Caldera, you are building a state that is popular, just, and moral; a state in which, as Bolivar said, the rule of law will signify the triumph of equality and freedom.

Americans look to Venezuela and see a growing economy, renewed and strengthened by sacrifice. We know the hardships you have endured; but look what you have achieved. You have cut your debt and cut inflation by more than half. You are moving industries into the competitive free market. You are opening your doors to foreign investment to create new opportunities for Venezuelan workers. And your determination will pay off in more jobs, higher incomes, and better prospects for your children in the coming century.

We Americans also look to Venezuela and see an example of how different people can come together as one community and one nation. On this day, we recall the moment when Columbus joined the peoples of the Old World and the New World. Venezuela shows all of us how we can draw strength from the joining of different peoples.

From Bosnia to Central Africa, from Northern Ireland to the Middle East, one of the greatest challenges to peace and freedom in the world comes from people who hate others because of their religious or racial or ethnic differences. And they claim those differences as justification for taking away their political rights, their homes, their freedom, sometimes even their very lives.

Venezuela has shown us a better way. Here, the children of Europeans, indigenous Americans, and Africans live together as one people. Here, every Venezuelan is a *ciudadano.*

For all the progress we have made together to advance democracy, free markets, and full citizenship, we much acknowledge that a great challenge remains to make these forces work to the benefit of all our people. To do that we will have to intensify our efforts for economic growth, social justice, and environmental protection and against the common threats to our security.

At the Summit of the Americas in Miami, our nations pledged to create a free-trade area of the Americas by 2005, uniting the creative energies of 800 million of us, from Alaska to Argentina. We will tear down the barriers of the past and open wide the doors of the 21st century. The speedy exchange of goods, ideas, and investment will bring benefits of the new economy to all people, including the people of Venezuela—from the oil workers of Monagas to the ranchers of Llanos to the entrepreneurs of Maracaibo.

I want the United States to do its part, and I am seeking the fast-track negotiating authority from Congress that every American President has had for over 20 years, so that we can work with our partners to open markets, create jobs, and raise living standards for all.

We must also recognize that no democracy, including the United States, has yet found the perfect formula for growing a free economy while preserving and extending the social contract for all our people. That is why we must work harder together to alleviate poverty, lift the conditions of working people throughout the hemisphere, and give everyone a chance to be a winner in the new economy.

While we do not have all the answers, we do know we must begin with the reality that whether we all like it or not, global economic integration is on a fast track. And therefore, we must give all our people the tools necessary to compete and succeed in it.

Because we want all our people to succeed we have, from the Summit of the Americas in Miami to next year's summit in Santiago, put education at the center of our cooperation. All our children must be ready for tomorrow.

And we owe it to our children to see that today's progress does not come at tomorrow's expense. We must do more all across the Americas to improve our stewardship of the environment, clean our air, clear our water, keep toxic chemicals out of our soil, and reduce the volume of greenhouse gases we put into our atmosphere, risking dramatic and dangerous changes in the climate for our children and our grandchildren.

And just as we work together to seize the opportunities of this new era, so we must also move together swiftly and strongly against the new threats it has produced. In both our countries, drugs poison our children and threaten our neighborhoods. The United States is working to reduce drug demand at home and to attack drugs all along the pipeline that brings them into our streets and our schools. Today our Governments signed wide-ranging agreements that join us in an alliance against drugs.

Thank you, Venezuela, for the tough stand you are taking in this fight for our common future.

And I thank President Caldera for leading this hemisphere in the fight against corruption. Corruption destroys confidence in fragile democracies, erodes free markets, saps the strength of law enforcement. It undermines all we are working so hard to build. Venezuela's leadership has led to a common commitment to fight corruption, to beat it back, to stamp it out.

To the people of Venezuela, I want you to know the United States is determined to work with you in a spirit of respect and equality, as friends and partners to claim the benefits and carry the burdens of this new era.

Now, on this day when we remember Columbus' remarkable arrival over 500 years ago in the Americas, we embark on a new voyage toward a new century and a new millennium, steering our course by the stars of freedom and democracy, partnership and respect, prosperity and security, not for just a few but for all our citizens.

Here, before the Tomb of Simon Bolivar, let us pledge to redeem in full the vision of the liberator. More than 160 years ago, he spoke to us of a Western Hemisphere that commanded envy and respect, as he said, "Not so much by virtue of her area and wealth, but by her freedom and her glory."

Today, I pledge to you, *hijos de Bolivar*, that by our work, now and into the new millennium, we will secure that freedom. And with it, the glory of all the people of the Americas.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:10 a.m. at the Plaza El Panteon.

Exchange With Reporters Aboard Air Force One
October 13, 1997

Brazil-U.S. Relations

Q. Are you going to get a bad reception in Brazil?

The President. I don't think so. You know, historically, there have been strained relations between the United States and Brazil. I met with President Cardoso when he was President-elect at the Summit of the Americas, and of course he's been to see me. And we worked very hard on this. I think it will be a very good trip.

1996 Campaign Finance Inquiry and White House Communications Agency Videotapes

Q. Janet Reno says she might want to interview you as the investigation goes on. Do you have any problem with that?

The President. As I said before, I'll do anything that is necessary to get her and the Justice Department the information they need. I just want them to have the information they need and then be free to make the right decision.

Q. Do you understand why she's mad, and have you done anything to try to prevent it from happening again?

The President. Of course I do. You think she was mad; you should have been there when I heard about it.

Q. So you were mad, too?

The President. Of course, but I'm—first of all, I think Lanny Breuer was on television yesterday explaining what happened on the delayed notification. And, you know, I think he made a mistake—but he said that. And he's worked very hard at his job. And they're all—as you can imagine, they've got all this work that any White House Counsel would have and then all this to do. But I think it was a good thing that he and Mr. Ruff went on and explained the facts of what happened.

And as far as WHCA is concerned, what they—I don't think they intended to mislead anybody. They've been working hard to try to find all the information they've got. I think they've got a few more tapes which, as I understand it, won't surprise any of you that have been going to the fundraisers with me for the last years. They basically just—as I understand it, that's what they are, they show events. And they're going to turn them over.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—any of these tapes of you directly soliciting or anything like that. You don't think——

The President. Look at them. I think they're perfectly fine. But I want the committee to have them, the Justice Department to have them.

WHCA tries to take a little snippet of everything that I'm involved in so they have it recorded for history. It's fine. I do want to make it clear that—as I understood the inference of the first—I was unaware of this because I never saw the request for information or the efforts to provide it. But I think Mike has made it clear that we never had any sort of secret taping system like was—the Kennedy or Nixon or Johnson administrations did. We've never done anything like that.

Q. Mr. President, is Congress nitpicking with you—the committee nitpicking by wanting all this information and wanting names of people who handled the tapes and all these other, what seem minute, details? Is that nitpicking?

The President. We had given them 100,000 pieces of information before—the committee—and we'll give them whatever they need to do their job.

But I think they'll find, for example, on handling the tapes—you know, all these WHCA people that I've dealt with, they're career servicepeople, they're not political. They're trying to do their job, as they see it, to get some video record of the things a President does. And they're doing their best to fully comply. They're career military people, not politicians, and for all I know they've never been involved in anything like this before. And I think they've done their best. They've worked like crazy to try to find out if they had anything else on file. And I think they're doing—I think the Senate and the House and the Justice Department will be satisfied that all those folks did their best.

Attorney General Janet Reno

Q. Attorney General Reno has been under a lot of pressure from a lot of quarters. Having been a State attorney general, what kind of standard do you have for how an attorney general should handle this kind of a situation and deal with the——

The President. There is one quarter from which there has been no pressure—ours. I have gone out of my way to have no conversation with her—about this or, frankly, anything else, which I'm not sure is so good, except I saw her at the event the other day, that we did the other day, that we did for the police officers, where we announced the trigger locks on handguns.

I think the Republican attacks on her have been completely unwarranted. It's interesting—it would be hard to make a case that she was reluctant to follow this law. There are facts, there are standards, there are all kinds of procedures set out about how this law is supposed to operate. And she ought to be left alone to implement it.

Q. When you say that it's been not so good that you haven't been able to always have contact with her, do you mean there have been times you would have reached out to her on some issue or some subject that you haven't because you were afraid about how it might be perceived?

The President. I haven't even entertained it one way or the other. I just think that, at least until she finishes her complete review of this and makes a decision one way or the other, it's better if all the contacts be sort of in official channels unless some huge national emergency arises. You know, Mr. Ruff talks to the Justice Department all the time. I just want to make sure, particularly with all this unwarranted political talk in the air coming from other quarters, I just want to make sure that we don't compound it in any way, shape, or form. I think that these are legal judgments that have to be made on the basis of the facts, on the basis of what the practice is, and of course the law, all the things that are in that law. It's very explicitly set out, and so I think she should be left alone to do it. That's what I'm trying to do.

White House Communications Agency Videotapes

Q. There is this one tape, in which a fellow who turned out to be a—says, "James Riady sent me." And Republicans are trying to make a big deal out of that. What do you say about that? Is there anything nefarious there?

The President. That's the wealthy Asian who was a resident immigrant that gave the DNC a lot of money over a long period of time? Well, first of all, until the DNC decided to return his contributions, I was unaware that he had given and certainly how much he had given. But I don't think there is anything to be made

of that. He was an Indonesian. He was a friend of James Riady, who—I have known James since the 1970's in Arkansas. So I draw no inference from that, and neither should anybody else.

You know, I've already testified—discussed that, that the Riadys, when they came—James came to see me in the meeting that's been discussed. He basically said he supported my China policy and urged me to stick with it. That was it.

As I've said repeatedly, a lot of other people, in a way that was totally appropriate, in discussing the Middle East with me or the expansion of NATO or the problems between Greece and Turkey, you know, have been much more explicit and specific in detail than saying, "Here's what I think we ought to do." That's part of the way a democracy works; people should express their opinions. I took no offense at it.

Q. As you watch these tapes, these moments, the same kind of scene again and again, what goes through your mind? All the work that was involved? I mean, you seem to——

The President. I haven't watched, so I don't know. But as I have said repeatedly, and I know that some of you have scoffed at me for saying it, the coffees in particular I found quite helpful, because they brought in all kinds of people from all over America and they just talked. Most of the times—I would say the vast majority of the times—the issues raised by people at the coffees did not bear directly on their personal business activities. And I wish, I have said repeatedly, that we had at least a print reporter at all these coffees, so they would have been reported, and there wouldn't have been any undue suspicion about it. It never occurred to me one way or another, because Presidents have meetings all the time without reporters there. But in this case—we still meet with groups of people, although not necessarily just political supporters. I think those kinds of things are good.

But in terms of the fundraisers, when I see the films of those, it just reminds me of how hard we worked last year. And we knew we were going to be outspent, and we just didn't want to be outspent too bad, so we did a lot of fundraisers.

1996 Campaign Finance Inquiry

Q. Mr. President, Janet Reno, by Wednesday, has to make a decision about whether to proceed to the next stage of the investigation of the fundraising phone calls. Early reports say she won't go forward because there is no direct proof that you made phone calls. How do you feel facing that deadline and those reports?

The President. I do not want to say anything that interferes with her decision in any way. I have no comment.

Q. Are you saying uncategorically that you would speak to her if she wanted to interview in connection to that?

The President. I think, first of all, it's up to them to decide—the task force, the Attorney General—whether they have the information from me they think they need. If they think they need more, as I have repeatedly said, I will do whatever I can to get them whatever information they think they need.

Q. Including speaking to her?

The President. If she wishes to interview me.

Brazil-U.S. Relations

Q. Can I switch the subject? Back to Brazil, where do you think this American bashing is coming from? How do you account for it?

The President. You mean, the recent press lately? Well, I don't know. There is some speculation that there were some problems with the advance team in Brasilia, something like that. Is that right? I don't know about that; I can't comment on it. But this is a rather challenging trip for the advance team because we have so many Members of Congress and so many Cabinet members. It's sort of a big group to move around.

I hope that our people haven't done anything inappropriate. I know that that's something we worked very, very hard on. When I became President, I heard sort of generic criticisms that often the Presidential team—everywhere, I don't mean my predecessor, I mean just generically—sometimes they were thought to be a little overbearing. So we've done a lot of kind of training work on that topic, and we try not to do that.

So I don't know anything about the facts; if we did anything we shouldn't have done, I'm sorry. But I can tell you this, the relationship that I hope that we have with Brazil is better than it's been in a very, very long time, maybe ever—but certainly in a long time. And the relationship we need to build with Brazil is critical to the future. If you go back to Ron Brown's list of 10 emerging nations, go back to anybody's analysis of which countries will really have a huge impact on the future, particularly for us in our backyard, Brazil is one of them and one

of the leading potential candidates for a much larger role in the world in the 21st century. And I view that as a positive thing.

I think it's an exciting, interesting place with a fabulous culture—great music. I was down here listening to my Brazilian music I brought along with me.

Q. You brought some?

The President. Oh, yes.

Q. What did you bring?

The President. I've got a lot of my old Antonio Carlos Jobim records. But I also have some newer records back at the house; I left some of them back.

I feel basically quite positive. I think Cardoso has been an exceptional leader, defending Brazil's national interests, understanding its unique challenges, and trying to form a constructive partnership with us while building a MERCOSUR alliance and reaching out to other countries on the South American continent. So I feel very upbeat.

But if there are a few scratches on the record that you hear as we go in, keep in mind, you have to see this against the background of the historic relationship between the United States and Brazil, which was much more tense and conflicted than it is today.

Relevance of Trip to South America

Q. Mr. President, for the average person back home, what would you hope that he or she would draw from your experiences that you're having here in South America—the trip itself, your message?

The President. Well, I would hope that the average person would think, number one, it's a good thing for America that these countries believe in democracy and free markets, because that means that it's less likely that we'll have the kind of difficulties we had 30 or 40 years—actually going back to the beginning of the century in the Americas because of political upheavals, military dictatorships, things of that kind.

Number two, I am convinced that there is an increasing determination among the South Americans to join us in a common fight against drug trafficking and crime, and that's important.

Number three, I hope they will see, through your reporting and the pictures you send back, that there is an enormous amount of economic potential down here, and it's a great market for America's goods and services, and we ought to be selling more to these people. They have been very willing to buy our products. Seventy percent of our increase in trade in the last year has come from Canada to the tip of South America, and we need to do more. I hope that—and I hope all of you when you leave here will think that we made a better case for fast track just by being down here, just by seeing the enormous economic potential and how the Latin Americans can use things that we have to sell in ways that benefit us both.

Fast-Track Trade Authority

Q. [*Inaudible*]—until now?

The President. Well, I think there are a lot of reasons. But I think one problem is, there is a lot of residual over NAFTA. The people who were against NAFTA are against this. But in the case of NAFTA, you had Mexico on our border with 100 million people and a set of very specific terms in the trade agreement, so that there were a lot of winners as well as people who thought they were going to lose. So the scales of the debate were more evenly balanced. Plus the other consequences—the political consequences, the immigration consequences, the drug consequences, as well as the economic benefits, were all much more stark and immediate with Mexico and NAFTA.

The fast-track vote is a process vote to give the President the power to present other trade agreements to the Congress. Two categories of them have generally been very popular with both Democrats and Republicans; that is, anything that expands global trade under the WTO, which is good for us because we're competitive; and sector-specific agreements, like the information technology agreement we negotiated which is going to create tens of thousands, maybe even a couple hundred thousands good American jobs in the next few years.

The third category is where the controversy is. It would give Ambassador Barshefsky the ability to try to negotiate an agreement with other individual countries. Except here, the people who weren't for NAFTA or the people who think that it didn't work or the people who were worried about something else, they have their worries out there, but we don't yet have the specific benefits out there except in a conjecture, because I don't have an agreement. NAFTA was a specific agreement. So, in a way, the opposition can burn a little whiter heat and show a little more intensity. And I think that that's a difficult thing for us.

I also think, in fairness to the Democrats, we have raised the issue—all of us, I'm not using the Presidential "we"—our party put the question on the agenda, really, about the role that labor standards and environmental standards should have in the trade equation. And we're having an in-house debate about what the best way to do that is.

You know, Senator Moynihan, for example, who's got a very strong pro-labor record at home and abroad and a very strong trade record, thinks that there shouldn't be trade sanctions applied for specific environmental or labor issues, but we ought to be able to go at it in other ways. Mr. Gephardt believes we shouldn't have another trade agreement unless it contains trade sanctions for labor and environmental reasons, or at least that we ought to try to negotiate that.

What I tried to do is to leave most of our options open there so that I could get the best agreement I can. But knowing that, regardless, I'm not going to negotiate an agreement that I do not believe is in the best interest of the United States. Congress will be able to review it and decide whether it helps create jobs and a better future for us. And I think that engaging these countries will increase our ability to influence them as they try to raise labor standards and deal with environmental issues.

The Venezuelans—we were talking—they understand that they can't preserve their democracy in a free market economy unless they try to strengthen the social compact. They've got to figure out a way for more people to do well, and they've got to figure out an intergenerational strategy that not only supports education for children but protects the environment.

So I think that we're going in the right direction, the direction that the opponents of fast track want to go in—that is, those that are really interested in the labor and environmental issues.

There are some people who simply think that globalization always works to our disadvantage, and I just don't agree with that. And I think that it's not a realistic option. The global economy is on a fast track. The Europeans are reaching out to the MERCOSUR nations. Even though our exports have grown a great deal to Latin America, the European exports have grown even more and now outpace ours. And their trade union movements in their country, for example, and other people like—they seem to understand that, because of what they have to sell and because of the trade relationships, they're going to come out, net, ahead. That's what I believe is the case in America and why I'm pushing this so hard.

Q. Are you going to win?

The President. I think so. It's a tough fight, but I think we'll win. But it's just a—it's really a debate over principle with me. And I believe the United States has to create more high-wage jobs for the future so that we can start growing together again. The last couple of years, we've finally got some indication that the bottom 40 percent of our workers are beginning to raise their incomes equal to and after taxes maybe even a little more, in percentage terms, than the upper 20 percent. But that's after 20 years of complete stagnation.

And the evidence is not clear yet. We have to change the job mix every year. The last 2 years, more than half our new jobs have paid above-average wages—dramatic contrast from the eighties and the early nineties. The only way for us to keep that trend going and accelerate it is for us to trade more in areas where we have a competitive advantage, where we make things that are sophisticated, with workers who make good incomes; we make more of that. That's the first thing.

The second thing is, I believe the United States has to send a signal to our allies, particularly in this hemisphere and our allies in Asia and in Africa, that we know we're in a new world and it's a world in which we're interdependent and which we want to lead through partnerships.

So I think the political interest we have in having stable countries growing more successful, being firmly democratic, working with us on issues like labor and environmental conditions argues overwhelmingly for the adoption of fast track and giving the President the authority to go do this work. There is a principle at stake here, so I would be fighting for it if I thought I had no chance to win, because it relates centrally to the way I see the world unfolding and the ties that I've tried to create for the United States in the Americas, in Asia, in Africa, as well as reaffirming our historic ties to Europe.

NOTE: The exchange began at 3:15 p.m. en route from Venezuela to Brazil. In his remarks, the President referred to President Fernando

Henrique Cardoso of Brazil; Counsel to the President Charles F.C. Ruff; Press Secretary Michael D. McCurry; and businessman James Riady of the Lippo Group. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on Signing the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998

October 13, 1997

I have today signed into law H.R. 2203, the "Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998," which provides $20.7 billion in discretionary budget authority for the discretionary programs of the Department of Energy (DOE), the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation, the Army Corps of Engineers, and several smaller agencies.

The Act provides necessary funding to continue DOE's commitment to ensuring the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile and DOE's investment in developing advanced renewable energy technologies. The Act also provides essential funding to develop and protect the Nation's environmental resources.

I hereby declare $5 million from the Construction General account of the Army Corps of Engineers for the construction of an emergency outlet for Devils Lake, North Dakota, as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(I) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

I urge the Congress to complete action on the remaining FY 1998 appropriations bills as quickly as possible, and to send them to me in an acceptable form.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
October 13, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2203, approved October 13, was assigned Public Law No. 105–62.

Statement on the Death of John Denver

October 13, 1997

Hillary and I were saddened to learn of the death of John Denver. His soaring music evoked the grandeur of our landscape and the simple warmth of human love. He was a dedicated champion of the environment, spending many hours on the vital work of protecting natural heritage. And he opened many doors to understanding among nations through his tours of the Soviet Union, China, and Vietnam. Our thoughts and prayers go out to his family and to his millions of fans.

Remarks at a Reception With President Fernando Cardoso of Brazil in Brasilia

October 13, 1997

President and Mrs. Cardoso, members of the Brazilian Government, my fellow Americans, honored guests. Let me say, on behalf of all of us who are here, it is wonderful to be in Brazil, but it is especially wonderful for me. I have wanted to come here for a long time,

and even more since Hillary returned from her fantastic visit here.

When President Cardoso made his state visit to the United States, I pledged to return the favor. And finally, the day has arrived, and I am in the City of the Sky, glad to be here. Thank you.

Brazil has haunted my imagination for over 30 years, since I first fell in love with your music as a young man. And Brazil has loomed large in my vision of the future of this hemisphere and the world since I became President. I come to Brazil to strengthen our partnership in a spirit of respect and equality, a partnership rooted in common values and common aspirations.

We have been friends in freedom for a long time. In 1824, the United States was the first nation to recognize Brazil's independence. In World War II, Brazil stood by America's side on the battlefields of Europe with a force of 25,000 troops to fight for liberty's survival.

Now, at the dawn of the 21st century, the freedom we cherish is ascendant. Every nation in our hemisphere but one is a democracy. Open markets are taking root. Cooperation and trade are expanding. We have an opportunity to make all the Americas a stronghold of freedom and prosperity, of peace and security, advancing our own well-being and serving as a beacon of hope to others.

With the largest populations and the largest economies in the Americas, sharing both the virtues and the challenges of our size and our diversity, Brazil and the United States both have a special obligation to lead this historic revolution now underway in the Americas.

I applaud President Cardoso, his Government, and the Congress for all you have done to put your country squarely on the path to prosperity, with difficult decisions on economic reform. I hope your reformers and our actions to balance our budget for the first time since 1969 will lay the foundation for a new burst of growth and opportunity throughout our region.

I hope we can work even more closely together to lift the lives of our people by creating new jobs through open markets and open trade, improving education to enable all our children to thrive, expanding access to modern technology to connect all our people to the information age, combating drugs and organized crime, protecting the wonders of our shared environment, and helping our neighbors throughout the hemisphere to resolve their conflicts peacefully.

Already, Brazil has given so much to the United States. You have given us artists like Candido Portinari, whose murals hang in our Library of Congress in Washington; innovative writers like Jorge Amado; and explorers from Alberto Santos-Dumont, the father of aviation, to the Brazilian astronaut who will soon come to NASA to train for the international space station. You have given us athletes, from the magnificent Pele to the World Cup champions who made Los Angeles feel like Rio for a day.

And no matter what language our people speak, you have given us all reason to sing, from the *batucada* of Bahia to the *bossa nova*, from the rhythm of *samba* to the rock of *tropicalismo*, from the quiet *choro* to the lively *forro*. In Brazilian music, many influences come together to form something wonderful and unique. In the same way, the rich diversity of your people and the American people make both our nations special and strong.

Both of us have a long tradition of welcoming immigrants from distant shores who want to build a better life for their children. We share a belief that we can live together and learn together, work together and grow together, no matter what our color, our creed.

In a world where nations are still torn apart because some people fight over their differences when they should respect, accommodate, even celebrate them, Brazil and the United States have a special ability and a special responsibility to show a better way.

Mr. President, as we reach for the future, America reaches out to Brazil with a hand of friendship and a pledge of partnership. We share a vision of a better tomorrow. When I first met you shortly before you were inaugurated President, I said to myself, there is a person who can imagine the future. I hope we will build it together.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:22 p.m. in the Brasilia Room at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In his remarks, he referred to President Cardoso's wife, Ruth.

The President's News Conference With President Fernando Cardoso of Brazil in Brasilia

October 14, 1997

President Cardoso. Mr. President of the United States of America, William Clinton; ladies and gentlemen. May I say to you first what a pleasure it is, Mr. President, for me and for Ruth, my wife, to welcome both you and Mrs. Clinton. And I'd like to take advantage of this opportunity to state our pleasure and, I'm quite sure, the pleasure of the Brazilian people as a whole. This is particularly due to the excellent relations between the two of us, which I think makes it obvious to everyone that there is a friendship that joins these two Presidents and that we share a great many interests—and by "we," I mean our two peoples.

On both sides, we are interested in ensuring that we will draw closer together and bring our societies closer together as well in very practical ways. We've had a number of opportunities in which to chat. We've covered, I think, just about every problem that was on our agenda before this meeting, including the most general problems, such as peace throughout the world, including the possibility of working together in a number of situations which might require more direct action on the part of the United States or Brazil, not just—in our region, of course, but also views were exchanged, opinions were exchanged about a number of international problems as well. And I can assure you that we both agree with regard to the overall objective which is to increase the prosperity of peoples on the Earth as a whole.

It is also our conviction that prosperity is something that needs to be made a general phenomenon. The prosperity of one nation should not harm the prosperity of any other nation, and nothing leads us to believe this. On the contrary, we feel that what's good for Brazil is good for the United States, and what's good for the United States is good for Brazil as well.

Just in terms of commercial relations, for example, the United States is our number one trading partner. But Brazil, as we like to say, is also a major global trader. We have excellent relations with the MERCOSUR countries, other countries in Latin America, with Europe and Asia, not to mention Africa. And it is with a full understanding of the comprehensive nature, the global nature of our relationships that we, in turn, have been able to reach a closer relationship.

We have underscored our commitment to the sort of endeavor that we have embarked upon, for example, in MERCOSUR, which is a very important part of our foreign policy in Brazil, which we feel to be an example of the success of the work of these four countries: Paraguay, Uruguay, Brazil, Argentina—and now Chile as well.

Much agreement has been reached with regard to trade, democracy, keeping peace. And we also believe that by working together we can move towards the integration of the Americas as a whole in such a way as to avoid harming our MERCOSUR interests and in such a way as to avoid harming the interests of the NAFTA countries. But we should integrate the hemisphere as a whole in line with the view that has already been expressed just a moment ago; in other words, prosperity for all is best for each and every one.

On the other hand, it also became quite clear that we agree on a number of other issues, even at a personal level. For example, our take on problems is quite similar in our two countries. An example of that fact can be seen via the declaration that we are now signing in the area of education, one of the social area endeavors. I was extremely pleased when I heard President Clinton's State of the Union Address because he spoke about education, and what he said certainly made me feel quite enthusiastic. What he said moved us. As a former professor and as two human beings, I'm sure that we agree that education is an instrument which will allow us to equalize relations within a society and to do away with so many of the differences and asymmetries that can exist among countries as well.

In this meeting, we would like to reaffirm our full commitment to all the programs in the educational field as a symbol of our concern vis-a-vis social issues. The integration that we are seeking to pursue at the regional, sub-regional, and even at a broader level, as soon

as that becomes timely, is going to be integration that will exclude no countries, no fragments within countries, either. Integration is designed to improve the standard of living of the peoples who integrate.

Another thing that we can go over is a list of key issues that have to do with, for example, the climate change. President Clinton, for example, holds the view that I think is quite proper vis-a-vis climate change. He talks about shared responsibility. He talks about the fact that responsibility should exclude no segment of humanity because the climate is something that involves the preservation of the conditions of life for future generations throughout the planet. So, we must come up with mechanisms which will allow us to reduce the greenhouse gas effect. We should reduce the greenhouse gases, but in such a way as to ensure that we're not harming the interests or the development of any country—the United States, Brazil, or developing countries. These things should be done in a balanced way to ensure that we will solve the problems and do so in the best way for our countries, which is what we're going to try to do in Kyoto in December.

Another thing that we're doing is broadening our cooperation in the field of space studies in a clear demonstration of the number of possibilities that exist for cooperation between Brazil and the United States, certainly in terms of advanced technology.

I don't want to take up too much time, but may I reaffirm the fact that—very simply, because we did cover such a broad range of topics—the fact that we avoided no single topic is a clear sign that we can reach an understanding even upon those things that we have some slight misunderstanding on. And of course, misunderstandings usually just reflect the interests of our individual countries that we, of course, must defend properly, but at the same time in a way which shows that we have an old friendship, a long-term friendship, and this friendship allows us to deal with these issues in such a way.

I'd like to repeat something I said in the Planalto Palace. Since the Second World War, never have we seen so many possibilities for cooperation in so many broad fields, certainly nothing compared to the many opportunities that are opening up for Brazil and the United States right now, which is why I'm particularly pleased to speak via the media to the peoples of our countries to reaffirm the tremendous satisfaction that I feel in being able to welcome this great President, Bill Clinton, in our country.

Thank you so much.

President Clinton. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Let me begin by thanking you and Mrs. Cardoso and the representatives of your Government for the warm welcome you have given to us, including our very large delegation, the senior members of our administration, a big percentage of our Cabinet, and the distinguished delegation from Congress. We are delighted to be here.

I believe this visit marks a new phase in the long friendship between the United States and Brazil. This is clearly a unique moment of opportunity in the Americas. A quiet revolution is bringing our hemisphere together around common values of democracy, free markets, mutual respect, and cooperation. It gives us the opportunity to advance the welfare, the freedom, and the security of all of our people in a way that has not been possible before.

Because we have the largest economies and the most diverse populations in the hemisphere, Brazil and the United States have both a special ability and a special responsibility to help lead the Americas into the 21st century. Under President Cardoso's leadership, Brazil clearly is meeting that challenge in fulfilling its destiny as a great nation. Through your own remarkable economic reforms, your strategic partnership with Argentina, your leadership in MERCOSUR and throughout the hemisphere and increasingly on the wider international stage, Brazil has helped to consolidate peace and democracy and to promote prosperity and stability.

Brazil and the United States share a fundamental belief that opening the markets of our hemisphere to trade and investment is the best way to create good jobs and strengthen democracy and cooperation in all our countries. Three years ago, when we met at the Summit of the Americas in Miami, we pledged to pursue a free-trade area of the Americas by early in the next century. Today the President and I agreed that at the next Summit of the Americas in Santiago, we should launch comprehensive and balanced negotiations to achieve that goal, turning our common agenda into a common plan of action.

If I might, I'd like to just speak a moment about what I think has been the cause of some misunderstanding between our two countries,

which is the question of what the American attitude toward MERCOSUR is and what its relationship to our support for a free trade area of the Americas is.

I support MERCOSUR. I think it has been a good thing for Brazil, a good thing for all the member nations, a good thing for stability, for growth and cooperation in the region, and quite a good thing for the United States. Our exports to the MERCOSUR countries have grown substantially since 1991. And we believe that these sort of regional trade arrangements everywhere—if they serve to open borders, to increase economic activities, and to promote growth—promote stability and opportunity that benefit Americans.

We believe that we can create a free-trade area of the Americas consistent with MERCOSUR and the leadership and role of Brazil and the other members in it. And so to me, this is a false choice that we don't intend to ask the Brazilians, the Argentineans, or the other members of MERCOSUR to make. We believe we can build on this and go forward to a free-trade area of the Americas.

Trade has produced about a third of the economic growth the United States has enjoyed since I became President in January of 1993. And I'm working hard to continue to expand our capacity to trade and to create good high-wage jobs in our own country by securing the Presidential negotiating authority necessary to tear down more of the trade barriers of the past so that we can open wider the doors of the future to good jobs and higher incomes.

Now, let me say that as we promote more free markets and more free trade, I believe that all of us must work harder to extend their benefits to all citizens. No great democracy has succeeded in doing that so far. We know we have to begin by ensuring that all of our citizens receive the education and training they need to succeed in this new economy. And I applaud the President's emphasis on education.

The education declaration we have just signed focuses on what I believe the keys to making education work in both our countries are: first, high standards for what children must learn and testing to measure their progress; second, training our teachers so that those to whom we entrust our children's future are themselves well-prepared; third, intensive parent and community involvement; and fourthly, something the President has worked very hard on, access to technology to realize the possibilities of the information age for all of our children.

In the United States, we're working hard to make sure that every classroom and library in our country is hooked up to Internet by the year 2000. We're giving discounted rates to our schools so that they can afford to be on the Internet. And we are finding something I am certain will be the experience in Brazil as well, and that is that very often the largest benefit of this technology revolution will flow to the children who are most in need, who tend to be in isolated rural or urban school districts where they have not had the chances and the opportunities many of our other children have. So I think that the Internet can be an instrument by which we democratize as well as increase the excellence of educational opportunity.

We've also agreed that we can't have today's progress at tomorrow's expense. The President talked a little bit about our common commitment to the environment. The clean energy agreement we have signed will help Brazil to continue to grow, fueled by renewable and efficient energy technologies. Our park services will work together to protect wetlands like the Everglades and the Pantanal Park in Brazil. We share Brazil's determination to conserve the Amazon, one of the most wondrous and biologically diverse environmental habitats in the world. The United States will contribute another $10 million to the G–7's cooperative program with Brazil to sustain the rainforests. And we will help Brazil to put 21st-century technology into this effort, including research done by Brazilians in space. The fires throughout the Amazon have added urgency to these efforts, and the uncertainties about the climatic effects of this El Niño, both in South America and in the United States, have also added urgency to our efforts.

We did, as the President said, discuss the challenge of climate change. Five years ago in Rio, the world community began to chart a common course to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that lead to global warming. Developed countries have a special responsibility to lead. I told President Cardoso that the United States will meet that responsibility with a commitment to limit our emissions when we meet in Kyoto on December 6th. But as we do our part, I believe so, too, must the developing world. Climate change, after all, is a global problem that requires a global solution.

So here is the question, it seems to me—and I would like to talk a little about this because I think it's quite important—I think it's very important that the people of Brazil understand that just as with the trade issue and MERCOSUR, the United States would never knowingly make any suggestion that would undermine the growth of Brazil or any other country. It is not in our interest. We, after all, only have 4 percent of world's people. We enjoy a very high standard living. We can only maintain our own standard of living if you grow. If there are more good jobs for Brazilians, higher incomes, more people are brought into the social compact in this country, then you can be a stronger partner, not only for us but for your neighbors in this continent and throughout the world.

So our strategy is to aggressively support the growth of the emerging economies of the world, the strength of their democracies, and our capacity to cooperate together. I do not believe that any reasonable person can look at the world of today and imagine the world of tomorrow and believe that America can gain by someone else's economic loss. We have an interest in finding a way to grow together.

By the same token, the world will not gain if some countries limit their greenhouse gas emissions and other countries grow in the same old way with the same old energy base so that the climate continues to warm more rapidly than it has at any time in the last 10,000 years. So what we want to do is to find a way for the developing countries to fulfill their responsibilities within the framework of Kyoto, recognizing that those of us in developed countries must do more but that we must all participate. And we want to be very explicit that any participation on your part would not come at the expense of economic growth.

Developing nations have an opportunity to chart a different energy future than some of the developed countries. And if we share our technology and we share our knowledge, then we can achieve that. This is very important. Brazil has already gone a long way toward proving this point, because you have developed so many nontraditional fuels, biologically based fuels, for running your vehicles. So you have given evidence to the general point that I hope will be embraced by all the countries of the developing world. And I encourage that.

Finally, let me say, we talked about expanding our cooperation in regional and global security. And I want to say a word of appreciation to Brazil as the guarantor of the Peru-Ecuador peace process, and appreciation for its historic decision to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. In all these actions, Brazil has taken its place as a world leader for peace and security.

Today the mutual legal assistance treaty we signed will help us to crack down on drug production and trafficking, and fight transnational crime in a way that benefits all of our people.

President Cardoso said 2 years ago when he visited me at the White House—and I quote—"The vocation of Brazil and the United States is to stand together." I believe we stand together today as never before. The issues we face are central to the well-being of both our peoples. The fate of our hemisphere, with strong democracies, a commitment to fight crime and drugs, to work for lasting peace, the future of the new economy, preparing our people for the 21st century—that's what this trip is all about. These are all objectives we share, and they really matter to ordinary citizens in both our nations and throughout this hemisphere.

Thank you.

President Cardoso. President Clinton, I'd like to ask you to begin, if you don't mind.

1996 Campaign Finance Inquiry

Q. Mr. President, Attorney General Reno has made her decision and will extend her inquiry into your telephone fundraising to determine whether a special counsel should be named. How do you feel about that hanging over you for another 60 days at least?

President Clinton. I feel nothing about it. There is a law, and there are facts. And I feel that it would be much better if she were permitted to do her job. I know I didn't do anything wrong. I did everything I could to comply with the law. I feel good about it. But I told you yesterday, the thing I don't feel good about is the overt, explicit, overbearing attempt to politicize this whole process and to put pressure on more than one actor in it. That's wrong. There's a law. There's a fact-finding process. And I'm going to cooperate with it in every way I possibly can.

Brazil-U.S. Trade Strategies

Q. Mr. Clinton, will the recent—[*inaudible*]—between the European Union and MERCOSUR affect how you formulate your strategy for commerce in the Americas?

And for President Fernando Henrique, the question is, what is the relative importance of Europe as far as Brazil's commercial strategy or trade strategy's concerned, especially vis-a-vis the United States?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, if I were in Brazil, I would be trying to sell as much as I could to America and to Europe. I think that's the way this market works. Both the European Union and the United States have increased our exports to Brazil and to the MERCOSUR countries in the last few years markedly. So I don't feel threatened by it, I just want to make sure we're fully competing. And if we don't fully compete, it will be our fault, not yours and not Europe's.

That's one of the reasons that I'm seeking the fast-track authority. It's up to the United States to decide whether it's going to be a fully competitive nation; but we have—in the last 2 years, for the first time in a long time, more than half our new jobs have come in the higher wage categories. And it's the direct result of our aggressive pursuit of trade opportunities.

So I'm prepared to compete, and all I want is a fair chance to compete with the Europeans here or anywhere else. But I don't see that as a bad thing. If I were in your position, I'd be trying to sell more to everybody.

President Cardoso. Well, I believe that what President Clinton said is most helpful to us. The more competition we have between the United States and Europe for trade, the better it is for us because it makes our products much cheaper. So I agree with President Clinton. It is true that Brazil's number one individual client is the United States today. But the European Union as a whole, or taken as a whole, imports and exports a bit more than the United States, actually. We are now, as I said before and I'm going to repeat this, global traders. We actually trade with a number of countries and areas throughout the world, and we're very interested in increasing these trade flows.

With regard to the United States, we have increased such trade flows. Unfortunately, we have an increasing trade deficit as a result of the increased trade with the United States. So we have to review this situation and try to balance it better to the benefit of both. We want to increase imports and exports. We don't want a zero-sum game, and we don't want a game in which one loses and the other wins. We want a win-win situation in the trade arena.

That is why we say that our trade policy with Europe is very active. It will continue to be very active. But I agree wholeheartedly with President Clinton; we cannot think about such economic blocs as isolated fortresses. They have been designed to increase trade, and we're going to take advantage of every opportunity that we can find to intensify our trade abroad, to sell things abroad. We will do so whenever we can. We're not going to close off our economy, because our competitiveness, our progress in the area of technology, and the cheapening of the products for our own people depend on such trade.

Thank you.

Alternative Energy Sources

Q. Mr. President, in Venezuela your discussions included alternative energy sources. Here you've also discussed safe or clean energy sources. I wonder, given that in the United States there is opportunity for improvement in the area of both energy incentives and also reducing the amount of emissions, do you find it difficult to discuss this topic while abroad?

President Clinton. No, because I don't think the two things are inconsistent. I think we are under a real responsibility in the United States to do energy conversion. We were on that path, ironically, 20 years ago when our experts underestimated the amount of natural gas reserves that would be available to us in the United States and throughout the world. And we thought we could move to a clean coal technology and do the job. We now know that that decision was not accurate. But the people who made the decisions 20 years ago did it based on the best evidence they had at the time.

So I think we're going to have more reliance on natural gas and other forms of energy that are even cleaner. And we have to do more conservation. If you were there at the climate change conference we had at Georgetown a couple of weeks ago, we learned, among other things, that two-thirds of all the heat generated in the production of electricity is wasted. If we can recover half of that waste heat, we will generate enormous new capacity for growth

without adding one single pollutant in the form of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere. So we've got a lot to do on our own account.

But as I said—let me reiterate what I said. What I want to do is to try to help the developing countries grow their economy just as fast as would otherwise be the case, but chart a different energy future than the one we charted in the past when we were at the same stage of development. And the question is, can they do that? I think it's absolutely clear, crystal clear, that they can.

And this is a big problem. In China today, bronchial disease is, among children, the number one health problem for kids in the country already. So I want the Chinese economy to grow and the Chinese people to prosper, but I think they should choose a different energy course for the same growth. And I think they can, and we should be trying to help them. If we don't do it, then no matter what we in the developed countries do, within 30 to 40 years we'll be right back in the same pickle we're in today, except worse.

Brazil-U.S. Trade Strategies

Q. I have two questions for both Presidents. For President Clinton, since 1995 both governments have worked on the bilateral trade with you, but so far they have no concrete results. And the perception is that Brazil is still complaining about trade barriers and better access to the U.S. market. So I'd like to know if both Presidents have now a new orientation toward a new phase in the trade bilateral relationship.

For President Fernando Henrique, my question is, if there is no fast-track authority, if this is not granted, would Brazil be willing to negotiate—if there is no fast track, do you believe that there will be any continuity in the negotiations of FTAA? And if there isn't, would MERCOSUR take on this role, in other words, the role of the principal protagonist in terms of trade in the region?

President Cardoso. I don't want to make any bets on American policy. If there is going to be this sort of a policy or not is the United States' problem. I think that President Clinton is going to be in a position to get the fast-track authority he wants.

But integration, whether we're talking about integration throughout the hemisphere or MERCOSUR, are two processes that are very interesting to our economies, quite aside from any political issues, which will simply decide the speed at which such issues are decided. So what President Clinton said was crystal clear when he talked about his view of MERCOSUR and FTAA. He said there is no clash between the two, there is no opposition. There is simply a situation, and we have to give ourselves enough time so that we will be in a position to prepare for increased competition. It's just a matter of time, procedures, so that we will be in a position to participate fully in conversations and understandings.

So with or without a fast-track authority, the question is, is it good or bad for us to increase international trade? And the answer is always the same: It's always good to increase international trade. So I would say that the other factors are just conditioning factors, but the key objectives are out there, and they're unchanging.

We will continue to work to our utmost to consolidate MERCOSUR, but simultaneously to work on the FTAA. We signed an agreement in Miami—I didn't sign it myself personally, but I was just the President-elect, but President Clinton was kind enough to ask me to come and observe. And this is not just a commitment on paper. It's a real commitment; we really want to increase our trade foundation.

Now, people are talking about the United States, Europe, and so forth; trade is trade. We have to look at things one question at a time, how we're going to deal with the interests that are being affected, how can we build bridges in such a way as to benefit the parties involved? All of this involves a long construction process.

President Clinton. Let me say, first of all, I would only add to what the President said that I believe, and I think he believes, as well, that if we can proceed with this free trade area of the Americas, it's also a way of stabilizing the democratic governments of many smaller countries in our hemisphere and giving them some assurance that, if they stay with democracy and reform, their people will also be able to reap some economic benefit from it.

So I think it is important that Brazil assume a leadership role in this fashioning of this whole agreement. And I hope they will, because I think what we're trying to do is to say, this is, first and foremost, about economics, but economics supports freedom and democracy and stability if we do it properly.

Now, on the question you asked me, the trade question, let me just briefly say, we went over

the specific trade issues that Brazil has with the United States and the specific trade issues the United States has with Brazil. And we—obviously, neither one of us are trade negotiators and these are somewhat specific and, in some cases, almost arcane issues involved, but what we did is we resolved that we would give both sides instruction that we want these matters resolved if at all possible and as quickly as possible. They're dragging on; they're an irritant to our relationship. And they're, in the context of our larger objective, a negative rather than a positive force, and we'd like to have them resolved. And that's basically the decision we made.

Attorney General Janet Reno

Q. Mr. President, just to go back for a moment to Janet Reno and her investigation, I'm wondering if you can tell us, has this whole affair complicated your relationship with her and your ability to actually function with your highest ranking law enforcement official? For instance, do you find yourself not talking to her because you're hesitant to have too much contact with the Attorney General?

President Clinton. Well, I don't really have anything to add to what I said yesterday about that. I think you all are perfectly capable of drawing your own conclusions and evaluating whether this puts our political system in balance or out of balance, and I don't think that we should discuss it here.

The most important thing is we've got a law; we've got a fact-finding process. The fact-finding process should proceed with integrity. The law should be implemented without pressure either way. I am doing my part. I wish others were doing as well.

Brazil-U.S. Relations

Q. Mr. Fernando Henrique, I hope you don't mind if I ask Mr. Clinton the question. Mr. President, your visit was preceded by diplomatic turmoil. A document was disseminated that said that Brazilian corruption was endemic. This was commented on by the American Ambassador, and his comments made things worse. The head of the Supreme Tribunal, the superior court in Brazil, reacted badly, as did some other people in the Federal Government—even a Governor of the Federal District. And they also reacted not just to this issue but to a number of other issues in which excess security was demanded by some of your advisers. Brazilian authorities called these people's attitude rather aggressive. Not only authorities but people as a whole in Brazil felt that they had been badly mistreated. I would like to know your view, sir. Do you think there was any exaggeration? Do you think there were any diplomatic mishaps in this situation?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I became aware of this document and the characterization of Brazilian culture after it had been released. The document was wrong, and it represented an appalling error of judgment for anybody to write such a thing. It has been decisively rejected by every American authority, beginning with the Ambassador here now. And it has been excised from the document.

So I regret very much that it happened, but once in a while such a thing may even happen in Brazil, where someone who works for some agency will put out something in printing which shouldn't happen. I can only ask the Brazilian people not to infer that that is the feeling of either the Government or, more importantly, the people of the United States toward Brazil. I assure you that no Brazilian could have been any more upset about it than I was. I thought it was terrible, and I did everything I could to correct it.

Now, in terms of the trip here, I just don't have enough facts to know. I know that our people historically, because of the problems that have periodically affected our Presidents—always on our own home turf, I might add, always when we're at home—that the security for an American President often seems to others to be too rigid and too uncompromising. But as I said, we've never had problems with our President's security in a foreign country. But we've had enough problems at home, over the last 35 years and before, that I hope you will at least understand that. But I try to make sure that our people are as understanding and cooperative with the people in every country and community they visit as possible, and I hope they have been. That's all I can say; I don't know the facts.

1996 Campaign Finance Inquiry

Q. Sir, does it embarrass you when these questions about fundraising follow you on foreign trips, as they have on this one, or does it embarrass the country?

President Clinton. Well, I can't be embarrassed by other people's judgment. I have no control over what you decide to ask about. That's your decision, not mine. That's a question you should ask somebody besides me. I didn't have anything to do with what was asked. I think other people sometimes in other countries wonder what it's all about, especially when everyone concedes that there was no request or improper public action in any way, nor did any occur as a result of whatever communications are in dispute.

But that's a decision for you. You have to decide what questions you're going to ask. I can't be embarrassed about how you decide to do your job.

Brazil-U.S. Relations

Q. I have a question that I want to ask both Presidents. People who monitor relations between Brazil and the United States feel that the problems that we have had most recently are often exacerbated by the bureaucracies of our two countries simply because there's not enough involvement of the Presidents and the leaders of the two countries. This is criticism that's been leveled against our countries. I wonder if you would agree?

The United States has a difficulty, being a superpower, and the only superpower, to deal with an emerging power in the Americas that is asserting its leadership as a democracy, as a freer market. Former Secretary Kissinger told me recently that he believed that really you have to adapt, because you are not used to that; you have to adapt intellectually to that. I'd like you to talk about this issue. Does our emerging role bother Americans or the United States of America?

President Cardoso. Well, at least as far as the Brazilian side is concerned, I was so very pleased because the touchiest issues are always being brought up for President Clinton. No one is asking me these touchy questions. I was so pleased up until now.

However, my involvement and President Clinton's involvement can only be that of people who are involved at a very general level involving problems between our two countries. Of course, there are always going to be some sort of bureaucratic problems, but I'm quite sure that we can deal with them quite easily. I think bureaucratic problems and redtape dissolve as soon as people see the warmth of our warm and direct personal relations, which are much more important than any bureaucratic entanglement.

Now, of course, we do understand fully that for security reasons, you do have some problems of your own. Luckily enough, we in Brazil don't have to face these major threats. It's not the case of every country. The United States particularly has had to face some very difficult situations. Of course, our security forces try to pay attention at all times in Brazil. But I'm always breaking the rules in Brazil, and so far nothing has ever happened. And things are very tranquil, and I'm sure they'll continue to be so in the future.

But I'm quite sure that anything that comes up can be dealt with quite easily because of the warmth and the openness that President Clinton and Mrs. Clinton have shown to us in Brazil at all times. They have shown to all Brazilians that their trip is an open-hearted visit.

President Clinton. I'd actually like to respond, if I might, to both your questions. Because the question you asked the President—I think the answer to your question is a lot of—people who work in government bureaucracies the world over are following established policies, and they tend to acquire an interest in maintaining the established policies, and most of them don't have the authority to change it, which is why these kind of personal relationships are so important. Because it's our responsibility, if we want to change the direction of the country, not to blame the people who work for us, and particularly the people who may not even be political appointees—they work through from one administration to another—but to try to give different instructions, to send different messages down there.

And that's why—sometimes I think, with all respect, sometimes members of the press and even our own publics say, well, why did they spend all that money and do that foreign trip, all the money we spent to come here, all the money you spent to entertain us; why did they do all that? There didn't seem to be any great earth-shaking specific agreement. And the main reason is the very thing you said, that we have to increase understanding, we have to increase sensitivity. And even subtle shifts in our position can send a different message to those down in the governmental hierarchies that have to implement these decisions on a daily basis. So I think that's a very good question.

The second thing is, does the United States, at the end of the cold war, left as being the world's only superpower, feel threatened by the emergence of Brazil or any other country? The answer to that is, I actually support the emergence of countries to a greater role of influence and responsibilities, as long as they share our basic values—not agree with us on everything but share our basic values.

If they're committed to freedom and democracy, if they're committed to open trading systems, if they're committed to giving all their people a chance to participate in the wealth that the global economy generates, if they're committed to a responsible global approach on the environment, if they're committed to working with us against threats that cross national borders—terrorism, weapons proliferation, criminal syndicates, and drug trafficking—if they're committed to those things, then I don't see this as competition. I see this as people emerging to take on more responsibility. And if we work together, more good will happen.

I'll give you another example. When I became President, there was the question of whether the United States would object if, in addition to NATO in Europe, there were an independent European security force working with NATO. And I made it clear from the beginning, I support this. I don't see these things as competing.

We have to change, because most of the threats to nations in the years ahead will come not from other nations but from threats that cross national borders—guerrillas, terrorists, weapons proliferation, drugs, crime, environmental and disease problems—number one. And because most of the benefits that nations can derive for their own people require them to cooperate with people beyond their borders, we will have to change our conception of how national power and influence is acquired. National power and influence is acquired, ironically, by becoming more interdependent and cooperative with others who are strong and self-sufficient and self-reliant but need to be allied with you. And I do believe, frankly, that this will require a big change in the way people look at politics, not just in the United States but elsewhere.

1996 Campaign Finance Inquiry

Q. Since you spoke yesterday on Air Force One, it's been reported that the White House and the Justice Department have been negotiating to figure out a way that you could speak to investigators about campaign finance. Have you reached such an agreement? And under what conditions would you speak to the Justice Department?

President Clinton. I know nothing about that I didn't say yesterday. I literally—no one has talked to me about it, and I know nothing to add to what I said yesterday.

Trade Policy and International Relations

Q. President Clinton, Mr. President of Brazil, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Brazil defends negotiations with the FTAA in complementation to tariff laws. Now, what complements are we talking about specifically as long as Brazil adheres to the calendar?

And for President Bill Clinton, last night, Mr. Clinton, you said that you felt touched by Brazil and had felt touched by Brazil for over 30 years. Have you been touched enough to say that you're going to give support to Brazil's candidacy on the Security Council so that Brazil will become a full member of the Group of Nine as well next year?

President Cardoso. Okay, I'm going to break a couple of the rules here once again. Go ahead, one last additional question very, very quickly before we answer.

Q. The United States Government wants that Brazil open the Brazilian market, but there are many restrictions against Brazilian products, like orange juice or steel. My question is, why not the U.S.A. don't change the situation, keep the situation, and allow the free commerce for many Brazilian companies?

Fernando Cardoso, I would like to know what the Brazilian Government's view on these nontariff barriers against a number of Brazilian products that are trying to get into the U.S. market.

President Cardoso. All right, I'm going to begin by answering the question on the additional agreements or side agreements to the FTAA. I think that President Clinton talked about his views very clearly when he talked about the meaning of the overall proposal for hemisphere-wide integration. And he made his comments in a way that I think was quite proper. He said it's not just a matter of tariffs—I'm going to talk about the tariffs in a minute—but it's not just a matter of tariffs. It's a much broader concept that we're fighting for here, because we're talking about the fact that there are some political considerations that come into

play. And of course, political considerations are based on values: a common desire, a shared desire to keep the peace, to control drug trafficking, to avoid criminal activities on the international level or in the international sphere.

So we're not just talking about trade here, so much so that what we proposed in the meetings that we've had thus far and that we're going to continue to have over the next few days, is that the key topic be education. And in Santiago, we're going to keep insisting on education as the key issue, because people can say, all right, very generously, let's talk about something that will move people, but that means that we have to talk about something that goes beyond tariffs. Tariffs, of course, are very important to countries and their economies and especially interesting to specialists. But countries have much more that they talk about and disagree with in the area of international relations aside from tariffs. And we have to talk about things that will bring our people closer together.

Education is ideal because the basic tenet of education is equality, and I think that what President Clinton said here pretty much follows along the same line of thought. And we do not want to limit our relationship to issues that don't even require a meeting between Presidents because technical-level meetings will be enough; what we are here to express and symbolize is something far greater than this. It's the desire for democracy and greater equality. A country such as Brazil, that has no reason to hide its problems, especially our social problems, which are so great in nature, is in a position to want very much to improve the standard of living of its people. Within MERCOSUR, outside of MERCOSUR, we're very interested in seeing that all agreements be broader in scope, just as President Clinton just said.

So with regard to the specific issues that were brought up—you talked about steel and orange juice and footwear and—everywhere throughout Latin America where President Clinton goes, he's going to hear the same issues being brought up, and elsewhere as well, because the French, the Japanese, the British, they all have the same problems. To the degree that our countries move forward and progress, especially Brazil, where the industrial sector is growing rapidly, of course we're going to begin to compete and problems are going to crop up. And of course, some moment in time is going to require arbitration of some nature, which is not meant to be just political in nature. But the greater our understanding is, the better our possibilities will be of reaching an understanding as to these issues.

Now, there are specific points on the agenda of demands of our two countries that neither one of us have really talked about them much. Some were brought up now, but we both know what they are. And when President Clinton goes back to the United States, people are going to ask him, "Did they ask you about this, that, or the other?" I'm not even going to mention what they are. He's going to say, "Yes, I did talk to President Cardoso about it. What did he say? Well, President Cardoso said he's going to give utmost consideration to these issues." And that's what I'm going to say to you. We're both going to work hard to try to solve these issues.

President Clinton. Let me say again, on balance, the United States has a lower tariff structure than virtually any country in the world, and fewer restrictions on trade than the European Union, for example. And I hope we can work these last remaining areas out. If you think about how big and complicated our countries are and the fact that we have now two-way trade in the neighborhood of $23 billion a year, the number of disputes is actually relatively small, and I'm encouraged by that.

I'm not going to ignore the gentleman's clever question on the United Nations. First of all, you should know that today Brazil has been elected to a 2-year term on the Security Council. Congratulations, Mr. President, that's a very good thing for the United Nations, as well as for Brazil.

The United States position has been that the Security Council ought to be expanded, that a permanent seat ought to be given to Latin America, and that the Latin American nations themselves should resolve how that permanent seat should be filled. This really is one of those areas where I don't think it's our place to tell the people of Latin America how to proceed here. I hope we will proceed and give a permanent seat on the Security Council to Latin America, because I think that the actions of the last several years clearly warrant that. And again, that's another one of those questions like the gentleman who asked me about Brazil's emergence. The more there is a stable, constructive presence in global affairs presented by

Latin America, the better off the world's going to be.

White House Communications Agency Videotapes

Q. Thank you, Mr. President, and good afternoon. Based on your comments yesterday on Air Force One, sir, it would seem that you've been briefed on the videotapes that are soon to be released. What is your understanding of what's on them? And is there anything on them that causes you any concern?

President Clinton. No, I think it's the same old stuff. As I said, those of you who have been going to the fundraisers with me, you've already seen it live, so the replay will probably be boring for you. That's what I understand, and I'm not worried about it.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Q. Mr. President, most of our allies are already saying that—[*inaudible*].

President Clinton. I've not made a decision yet about what to do. But let me say this, I intend to take a strong position there, and I expect to probably be criticized by all sides. The United States, as our friends in Europe are well aware, is in a particularly difficult position when the benchmark is 1990, for three reasons.

Number one, we've had economic growth since 1990 far greater than Europe, so our greenhouse gas emissions have gone up more, which means we have more to do to go down.

Number two, the Europeans are—particularly if they're treated together—benefit from the incorporation of East Germany into Germany and the dramatic drop in production in East Germany, which had a high level of pollution. Therefore, they get a big reduction in pollution for something that—not because of any independent policy action taken but because of the incorporation of East Germany into Germany.

And thirdly, the presence of the North Sea oil for Great Britain gave Britain the ability to sell the oil, which is relatively polluting, to other countries and keep the natural gas, which is quite clean, and substitute that for coal. So using the 1990 base mark, they have a lot of inherent advantages over the United States in terms of the degree of rigor required to meet any given target.

Nonetheless, I think there's so much we can do through technology and different purchasing patterns and conservation patterns, that I think that we can do quite a great deal. And I intend to propose that we do a great deal. What I'm trying to do is to put together a comprehensive agreement in Kyoto that will actually do what everybody wants, which is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere substantially in the next century.

Right now we're at about double the volume of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere that existed before the dawn of the industrial age. If we don't do something, we'll triple the volume by the middle of the next century, and we know that something bad will happen. Even though the skeptics on the other side say we don't know exactly what and when, we know enough to know it's not going to be good, and we've seen enough evidence of that so far.

So I'm going to have a credible plan. I'm going to do my best to get everybody involved in it. I hope I'll even have some success at selling it to the Congress. Right now, it may be a lot easier to sell it to the environmentalists and to the business community than to sell it to the Congress, but I'll do my best.

Line Item Veto

Q. Mr. President, have you decided against using your line item veto authority? And am I mistaken, or is this becoming habit forming?

President Clinton. Well, it's not habit forming but, yes, I used it again today, as I told you yesterday I would, on I can't remember exactly how many projects, but more than a dozen worth more than $140 million that were not either in my budget or recommended by the Department of Defense. I thought it was appropriate.

I know that a lot of Members that voted for the line item veto in Congress now wonder whether they did the right thing, now that I'm exercising it. But I'd like to remind you that again I have deferred, in great measure, to Congress. Congress put in 750 projects not requested in our budget or in the Defense Department plan and reduced overall weapons procurement, reduced overall research and development to pay for virtually all of them.

And I'm hoping that in the years ahead I won't be using it as much and future Presidents won't use it as much, because it will lead to a different kind of negotiation in the budgeting process. But I think what I did today was responsible and quite restrained. And I believe

that it's important to send a signal to the American people that we're going to stay on the budget track we started on and we're going to stay within these numbers and balance the budget. That's one of the things that's given us the big economy we've got.

Alternative Energy Sources

President Cardoso. I'd like to thank all the Brazilian and American journalists for having joined us and for being so good about answering all our questions.

And may I say that the emphasis that President Clinton has put on the environmental issue is one that I would like to bring up for Brazil as well. We have an energy matrix that is very, very clean. We use hydro power and now gas, natural gas. And we are strengthening our links with regard to the energy matrix throughout the rest of Latin America. So I think that our dialog in terms of climate has been extremely positive.

Thank you to everyone.

NOTE: The President's 151st news conference began at 1:40 p.m. in the Garden of Alvorada Palace. President Cardoso spoke in Portuguese, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. During the news conference, a reporter referred to former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

Declaration of the United States-Brazil Partnership for Education
October 14, 1997

We the Presidents of the United States and Brazil recognize that a new reality is reshaping the world and that our citizens must be prepared to meet the challenges of a globalized world in the 21st century. Education is the key to the future. We recognize that working together we will harness inevitable change to the benefit of families in our countries.

Literacy and a first-class educational foundation are critical determinants to the well-being of our citizens, the strength of our economies, and preserving the values we as democratically-elected leaders hold dear.

Skilled and educated people are the foundations of strong democracies and market economies. We must, therefore, ask more of our educational systems than ever before. Our governments have similar initiatives promoting the development of modern information infrastructures that will facilitate economic growth and will be the foundation of new ways to teach and learn. Our students must be able to compete in a new and constantly-changing job market. This requires access to life-long learning programs and the ability to participate in and benefit from varied cultures outside our borders as well as to process and organize more disparate information than ever before. Education is needed to participate actively and knowledgeably in democratic, plural and diverse societies.

The democracies of our hemisphere, which will take part in the next Summit of the Americas to be held next April in Santiago, agree that education must be a central element in our shared agenda. Bearing in mind the urgency of prompt, effective action, as a top priority we have separately launched, within our respective countries, new initiatives to raise the quality of education, particularly in the primary and secondary levels.

And together, today, we hereby establish the United States-Brazil Partnership for Education. Expanding exchanges, upgrading standards, enhancing teacher training, increasing participation by the family, community and business as well as incorporating new technology underpin our partnership.

Cooperation in the Development and Use of Technologies in Education

New technologies make possible the broad dissemination of information and permit new teaching methods and practices such as distance learning and the use of computers. In addition, students must also master new technologies in preparation for a changing workplace and take part in economic development. We will take advantage of technologies such as the Internet to broaden cultural and language contacts for our students and teachers. We will jointly test and evaluate existing technologies, and facilitate development of appropriate new technologies, while engaging the private sector to assist with their introduction into the classroom.

Ensuring that Every Child Learns Through Educational Standards, Assessments, and Indicators

Evaluating the performance of educational systems requires a clear definition of what schools should teach and what students are expected to know, as well as effective tools for measuring progress. Our governments will each establish standards for student performance in key subjects at appropriate levels, as well as the means to measure them. We will share experiences and information regarding progress on a continuous basis.

Strengthening Preparation and Professional Development of Teachers and School Managers

Excellent schools require excellent teachers and managers. We will seek to have qualified, dedicated teachers in all classrooms, at all grades. To support this goal, we will exchange experiences and evaluate alternative models for teacher preparation and training for school management officials. We will especially consider ways to improve training for science teachers of scientific disciplines at the primary and secondary levels.

Increasing Educational Exchanges Between the United States and Brazil

Already sharing a wide array of public and private educational exchange programs, the United States and Brazil will seek to expand exchanges at all levels, focusing on the priorities in this declaration. We will utilize existing and new mechanisms to establish a student exchange program for university students in mutually agreed areas such as engineering and technology. We will also consider a program of exchanges for language teachers to strengthen language skills and cultural ties between our countries. To assist private programs, we will explore methods for linking institutions to promote mutual recognition of educational credits.

Enhancing Family, Community, and Business Involvement in Education

Opportunities for learning extend beyond the formal classroom. Parents, family members, employers, employees, older students, and volunteers can effectively participate in the education of children, especially in literacy enhancement. We re-affirm that the private sector is partner in education and will promote its involvement in such areas as combatting illiteracy and student dropout rates and enhancing school administration and overall school development.

Implementing the Partnership

Finally, to ensure our partnership is vigorously implemented, we hereby establish the Education Partnership Implementation Commission (EPIC). Through regular meetings, EPIC will monitor implementation of actions outlined in the annex to the Memorandum of Understanding to which our governments subscribe today, as well as periodically formulate new actions. In furtherance of the precepts set forth in this Declaration, EPIC will also seek participation of the private sector and members of the public in implementation of this agreement. Working together, we will reinforce our common resolve, deepen our bonds of friendships, and prepare our children for the coming century.

WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
FERNANDO HENRIQUE CARDOSO

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this declaration.

Statement on Line Item Vetoes of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998

October 14, 1997

Over the past 4½ years, my administration has worked hard to cut the deficit and to ensure that our tax dollars are used wisely, carefully, and effectively. We have reduced the deficit by 85 percent even before enacting the historic balanced budget legislation this past summer.

The line item veto gives the President an important tool to save taxpayers money, avoid unnecessary Government spending, and ensure that the national interest prevails over narrow interests. It will enable America to continue the fiscal discipline that has helped create our strong

economic expansion. And by allowing a President to sign important legislation while canceling projects that do not meet important national goals, it will change the way Washington works.

America must—and will—continue to have the world's strongest military. We have an obligation to manage our defense budget with both national security and fiscal responsibility in mind. Every penny of our defense dollars should be used to sustain and strengthen the best trained, the best equipped, and the best prepared Armed Forces in the world.

Today, for the third time, I am using the line item veto to cancel 13 projects inserted by Congress into the Department of Defense's appropriations bill. These cancellations will save the American taxpayer $144 million. This use of the line item veto will help ensure that we focus on the projects that will best secure our strength in the years to come.

I canceled the projects because they were not requested in my fiscal year 1998 budget, and because either they were not contained in our future years defense program or the Department of Defense determined that they would not make a significant contribution to U.S. military capability. In two cases, I canceled items that had broader policy implications for longstanding U.S. national security policy. I have been assured by the Secretary of Defense that none of the cancellations would undercut our national security or adversely affect the readiness of our forces or their operations in defense of our Nation.

As I said last week, I will continue to scrutinize other appropriation bills, using appropriate criteria in each instance, and I will exercise the line item veto when warranted.

NOTE: The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on October 15. H.R. 2266, approved October 8, was assigned Public Law No. 105–56.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting Line Item Vetoes of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998

October 14, 1997

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

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel the dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998" (Public Law 105–56; H.R. 2266). I have determined that the cancellation of these amounts will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachments, constitute a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Compoundment Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on October 15.

Remarks to Business Leaders in Sao Paulo, Brazil

October 15, 1997

Thank you very much, Mr. Miller, for your introduction and your statement. Thank you, Governor, for your moving words. And thank you all for coming out this morning. I am delighted to be here and to be joined by a distinguished delegation of Americans, including the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Education, the United Nations

Ambassador, my Special Envoy to Latin America, the National Security Adviser, and four distinguished Members of the House of Representatives: Congressman David Dreier, Congressman Jim McDermott, Congresswoman Nydia Velázquez, and Congressman Rubén Hinojosa. We also have the Brazilian Ambassador to the United States here, the minister of the Brazilian Government, and the mayor, and I thank them all for coming.

I think this bespeaks the importance of the relationship between the United States and Brazil. I'm delighted to be in Sao Paulo, the economic engine of this great nation and the commercial heart of the new Latin America. I often hear it said now that Brazil is the land of the future. I think that in this city, the future is here. I thank you for giving me the opportunity to discuss the partnership that I hope our two nations will forge for the 21st century.

All of you know that over the last decade, a genuine revolution has swept across this hemisphere. As never before, the Americas are coming together in the embrace of common goals and common values. We have a special responsibility and a special ability, Brazil and the United States, to work together with the other nations of the Americas to lead this process, with the largest populations and the largest economies, rich natural resources, enormous and fascinating diversity among our peoples. Most important, both of us cherish the same ideals: freedom and equality; respect for the individual and the integrity of the family and community; social justice; and peace.

Our partnership is already broad in scope and ambition. We fight drugs and the spread of nuclear weapons together. We work to protect the rainforest and to explore the heavens together. We work to help others in our hemisphere turn from conflict to cooperation together. But nowhere can we make a greater difference for our people than by leading all the Americas down the path to prosperity in the new economy of the 21st century.

The United States has worked—watched with respect and admiration as Brazil has embraced strong reform. With President Cardoso's Real Plan, with the support of the public and the Congress, Brazil has slashed inflation from 2500 percent to 5 percent in only 5 years—a truly astonishing accomplishment. In the course of so doing, 13 million Brazilians have been lifted above the poverty line, growth of more than 4 percent a year has been achieved. Brazil has become a magnet for billions of dollars of foreign investment, a good deal of it from the United States.

Brazil's growing prosperity is good news for Brazilians but also good news for Americans. Last year our bilateral trade totaled more than $21 billion. The United States is Brazil's largest single trading partner, larger than the Andean Pact, the Central American common market, CARICOM, and MERCOSUR combined. We buy about a fifth of Brazil's exports, and our exports to Brazil have more than doubled since 1992. As Mr. Miller said, American businesses know that Brazil is a great place to bet on for the future, it's a good place to do business, and today there is, I understand, also in this audience a first-rate trade delegation from Seattle trying to support that proposition.

Our big trade numbers sometimes mask a lot of individual stories, not always from large companies. The Snider Mold Company of Mequon, Wisconsin, sells molds for making water tanks to companies in Brazil. Brazilian firms use the equipment to replace old tanks with safer models, supporting jobs in both countries and providing healthier drinking water for families in Sao Paulo. The lives of real people are changed for the better by this kind of trade.

And in Brazil, we see a large snapshot of what is happening indeed throughout our region, where barriers are falling, trade and investment are booming, trade among MERCOSUR countries has more than quadrupled since 1990. In that same period, the United States exports to Latin America have grown by more than 100 percent. This all promotes greater efficiency in economic growth in the Americas and brings people better opportunities to build better lives for themselves and their children.

Early in the next century, as open markets continue to spread, 20 nations around the world, home to half the world's population, will lift themselves from the ranks of the poorest countries into the ranks of middle-income countries. Their gain in skills and jobs and wealth will be our gain as well.

I want America to lead the process of economic integration and rising living standards here in our hemisphere and around the world. In the last 4½ years, we have concluded more than 220 separate trade agreements with expanding trade accounting for one-third of our

own strong growth. Now I'm working to persuade our Congress to renew the President's fast-track negotiating authority so that we can do more.

In the past few weeks, the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, on which Congressman Dreier and Congressman McDermott who are here with me sit, have approved this legislation with bipartisan support. And we're going to do all we can to pass the bill this year. I hope, if I might be forgiven this on foreign soil, I hope that those of you representing American companies will urge Members of Congress of both parties to support the legislation. I need all the help I can get. [*Laughter*]

I have also attempted to see that the United States puts special emphasis on Latin America. We hosted the Summit of the Americas in Miami in 1994. I appointed my longtime friend and former Chief of Staff Mack McLarty to be a Special Envoy to Latin America to send a signal to the continent that we are serious about a long-term sustained and comprehensive partnership. The United States welcomes all constructive efforts by others to bring our hemisphere together and, especially, Brazil's leadership role in those efforts. Brazil and Argentina, through their strategic alliance, are providing a decisive impulse for democracy, economic reform, and regional security cooperation. MERCOSUR has expanded trade among its members and with the outside world. It has also bolstered democracy and promoted peace as a growing integration and interdependence make yesterday's hostilities unthinkable today.

We hope every step in the process of hemispheric integration, whether in MERCOSUR, NAFTA, CARICOM, or elsewhere will build momentum toward our common goal of a free-trade area of the Americas by 2005, first endorsed at the 1994 Summit in Miami.

Our nations are committed to launch comprehensive negotiations at Santiago in April and, as we agreed at the Miami Summit, to achieve concrete progress by the turn of the century. Just imagine the potential of an American market with 800 million people, from Alaska to the southern tip of Argentina, buying each other's goods, spurring each other's creativity, enriching each other's lives, investing in each other's future.

But even as we seize these possibilities, we must also work even harder to bridge the gap between the haves and the have nots. The age-old curse of Latin America, the constant undercurrent of all advanced economies of the last 20 years, has got to be dealt with more seriously not only by government but by people in the private sector working in partnership with government. We have to give everyone who will work for it a place in the future we are trying to build.

In your country and mine and throughout the hemisphere, many people still question our course, fearing the pressure of competition, feeling as yet no benefit from the changes underway. Knowing that as yet, no nation has found the perfect formula for both embracing the global economy while preserving and extending the social contract. Globalization is irreversible. Protectionism will only make things worse. But while we cannot turn back the winds of change, we can and must do more to harness their force to everyone's advantage and make sure that the benefits and burdens of expanding trade are fairly borne.

That means deepening democracy and the rule of law, including a free press and an independent judiciary. It means insisting on worker protection so that trade enhances working conditions and living standards instead of undermining them. It means equipping all our people with the education, training, and skills to succeed so that progress is everyone's friend.

Since 1993, we in the United States have been working hard to come to grips with these two competing challenges. We have more than doubled our worker training funds directed at those in the work force who may be displaced by technology or trade. We have established the North American Development Bank to try to make investments in communities that have been displaced by our increasing integration with Canada and Mexico. We have worked to improve joint environmental inspections and enforcement and to jointly agree to stop using some kinds of chemicals and other things which are damaging to the environment.

We have set up special empowerment zones to give our private sector incentives to invest in communities which are not touched by trade one way or the other because their economies have developed so little. All these things have not had perfect results, but they are making a difference, and they show that there is a way to have strong economic growth, an open economy, an openness to trade and investment, and

still care about extending opportunity so that more and more people who are willing to work have a chance to work and succeed.

We must also do more to protect natural resources and the environment. The United States rejects the false choice between economic growth and environmental protection. We believe in sustainable development, making sure that today's progress does not come at tomorrow's expense. Trade-driven growth need not bring environmental quality down. Indeed, trade must maintain and improve the quality of our environment.

Brazil and the United States share a commitment to meeting these challenges, all of them, head on. We can set a standard of success for the Americas, showing that democracy and free markets deliver, protecting our planet for future generations, making education and the wonders of technology the modern birthright of every citizen.

I am especially impressed with President Cardoso's determination to improve education. Both of us are working to ensure that every school has high standards, that every child, rich or poor, has the knowledge to succeed in the new economy. America's new balanced budget includes the biggest new investment in education since 1965. Our agenda is sweeping but straightforward. We expect every 8-year-old to be able to read, every 12-year-old to be able to log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old to be able to go on to college, and every adult to be able to continue learning for a lifetime.

Brazil spends nearly 6 percent of its GNP on education and is working hard to increase enrollment and to help more children complete their early years of school. Now, through our new partnership for education that President Cardoso and I signed yesterday, our nations will work together to teach our children for tomorrow.

This afternoon I look forward to visiting the Mangueira School in Rio, where Brazil is proving every day that every child has the potential to succeed. I commend the Brazilian business community for investing in education, and I thank the Sao Paulo American Chamber of Commerce for your leadership in this effort which Mr. Miller referenced in his remarks.

Even as we speak, the First Lady is visiting one of the schools you have adopted so that she can see your success first hand. Your programs have helped to keep children in school, helped teachers to learn, and helped to raise standards. Now they will help to broaden access to educational technology. I urge you to do as much of that as you can.

Brazil and the United States share the vision that all our citizens should be connected to the information age. We have both adopted ambitious programs to link our schools to the Internet. We are attempting to make sure that every classroom and library in the United States will be hooked up to the Internet by the year 2000. When we do that and when Brazil does that, no math, no book, no tool of learning will be beyond the touch of our children, regardless of the wealth of their families or the part of town where they live. And when that happens, no dream will be beyond their reach.

Already, Brazilian-American partnership is bringing world-class technology to boys and girls in Brazil. Ashford International, a small firm from Stone Mountain, Georgia, recently launched a project with Sao Paulo's local government supplying 5,000 multimedia computers for 1,000 area schools. That's good for the students and good for the Stone Mountain company and its workers.

Even as computers and the Internet are expanding the world of learning, they also bring new opportunities for electronic commerce. When I took office in 1993—just think of it, in 1993—only high-energy physicists had heard of the World Wide Web. Now, even my cat, Socks, has a webpage. [*Laughter*]

I was meeting with one of the young men who has made a small—perhaps a large—fortune in figuring out how to commercialize the Internet in California the other day, and he said that the Internet was the fastest-growing organism in human history, that no one could measure its expansion.

Today, there are as many as 50 million people on the Internet, and for Brazilian net browsers, the surf is up. Since 1996—since 1996—the number of Internet hosts in Brazil has risen by 535 percent. Electronic commerce can improve productivity, facilitate global communications, help small companies sell to a worldwide market, create a revolution in the way we all market and sell. But in order for this digital economy to flourish, it must not be weighed down by the heavy hand of government regulation and fees.

President Cardoso and I discussed the importance of creating a market-led environment in

which this new medium can succeed. I feel very strongly that all nations have a responsibility to facilitate, not undermine, this process; it will have enormous economic implications that are quite positive for every country if we can do so.

Working together on behalf of new technologies, by the way, has long been a mark of our relationship. You may know that in 1876, Brazilian Emperor Don Pedro II came to our Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia where he helped draw attention to a new invention of Alexander Graham Bell, the telephone. Today, Brazil's telecommunications sector is the largest in Latin America. Your Government predicts it will net investments close to $70 billion by 2003. And earlier this year, America's Bell South, teaming up with respected companies in Brazil, won a bid to provide cellular telephone services here in Sao Paulo.

A century ago, Brazil saw promise in our technological future. Today, we are proud to be investing in yours. New education and new technologies will help carry our nations forward. But we will soar only if we also maintain our oldest values. Your country and mine have a generous tradition of welcoming people from all around the world. One of our greatest strengths is our commitment to live together and work together and learn together, regardless of our backgrounds of race, religion, or ethnicity. I commend President Cardoso for his human rights plan and his emphasis on racial equality.

In our country, in one public school district across the river from Washington, DC, which I can see from the White House, there are students from more than 150 nations—in one of our school districts—speaking more than 100 different languages. The neighborhoods of Sao Paulo are a window on the world. The colors of Italy enliven Bexiga. The flavors of Japan infuse Liberdade. The spirit of the Middle East fills Bom Retiro. The rhythms of Africa pervade every quarter. People from everywhere call this place home.

It must be truly mysterious to you as it is to many of us when we see people from Bosnia to Central Africa, from the Middle East to Northern Ireland still determined to hate one another and fight and sometimes rob people of their freedoms and their very lives because of their differences. Our differences make it much more interesting to live in our communities and our Nation and, frankly, much more profitable to go into the future.

So, as we make the most of this age of opportunity, we ask ourselves, which nations will do best in the global economy? The nations with the globe inside their borders. This, too, is a lesson that Brazil and the United States must, first, never forget for ourselves and, second, try to impart to the rest of the world.

In the 19th century, we forged a friendship grounded in our common love of freedom. The United States was honored to be the first nation to recognize Brazil's independence. In the 20th century, we fought side by side to prevail in World War II and to preserve freedom's light. The United States is still honored that Brazil came to provide soldiers to fight with us for freedom in both the great World Wars of this century. Now, on the eve of the 21st century, a bold, new challenge awaits us: to secure the blessings of freedom and prosperity for all the people of our hemisphere and throughout the world.

Our nations share a vision for the future of the Americas, where every child has quality education, all our people reap the benefits of modern technology, open societies linked and lifted by open markets create new opportunities for all people and protect their freedom to seize them. That is the future we are working to build. And together, I am quite confident that we will succeed.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:30 a.m. in the Auditorium at the Memorial America Latino. In his remarks, he referred to Daniel Miller, president, Sao Paulo American Chamber of Commerce; Gov. Mario Covas of the State of Sao Paulo; Brazilian Ambassador to the United States Paulo Tarso Flecha de Lima; and Mayor Celso Pitta of Sao Paulo.

Remarks at the Vila Olimpica da Mangueira School in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

October 15, 1997

Hello! Governor Alencar, Mayor Conde, Mr. Dos Santos, teachers and students of Vila Olimpica, family and friends of Mangueira. It is a special pleasure for me to be once again with Pele—or should I say Minister Pele. After he turned Brazil into a soccer superpower, he attracted millions to soccer in the United States and around the world. But his most important work is now being done as he shows that sport can serve our children for a lifetime. Thank you for your passion and your dedication and especially for your work here. Thank you, Pele.

Thank you, Flavia, for your words of welcome. Didn't she do a good job? [*Applause*] As the first student from Vila Olimpica to attend university, you bring pride to your family, your school, the entire community of Mangueira. You're an inspiration to young people everywhere who are striving to make the most of their God-given potential.

The students may wonder what we are doing here today. We are here because children are the future of the partnership between Brazil and the United States. Children are the future of our world. And I did not come alone; my wife and I brought with us the American Secretary of State, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Commerce, the Ambassador to the United Nations, our envoy to Latin America, the head of our program to keep our children away from drugs, five Members of the United States Congress, the United States Ambassador to Brazil, and the Brazilian Ambassador to the United States. They all came. I'd like to ask our American delegation, the people from the White House, stand up and let the children see that we care about their future. [*Applause*]

On this Brazilian teachers day, I congratulate Director Francisco Carvalho, the teachers, and staff of Vila Olimpica for all you have accomplished. And I thank Xerox of Brazil for the vital support they, along with other companies, give to Camp Mangueira. Xerox is a good citizen of Brazil and of the United States. Today Xerox Business Services back home has been awarded the prestigious U.S. Department of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige Award for good citizenship. Thank you for what you do here, and thank you for what you do back in America.

I know it is not easy for young people like you to sit in the hot sun and listen to an older person like me give a speech. I will try to be brief. But I want you to know why it's important for me to be here and important for you to be here. We should not stop until every child in Brazil and throughout the Americas has the opportunity you have here at Mangueira. For here, school attendance is nearly perfect. Dropout and juvenile crime rates have plummeted. The Camp Mangueira work-study program helps young people find apprenticeships, putting them on a fast track to good jobs and good incomes. And you're preparing high school students of the Ciep High School to work in Brazil's high-tech economy. Very simply, you are giving Mangueira's children a future. Every day you prove that if we in positions of responsibility do our job, then all the children of this neighborhood and every other one like it throughout the Americas will be able to build a better life for themselves and for their children.

This morning in Sao Paulo I spoke to business leaders about the remarkable possibilities of the new economy and about the practical and moral obligation we have to give everyone who will work for it a chance to be a part of the future we are building, beginning with excellent education for all our children. Only then can they compete and succeed in the new economy, keep our companies on the cutting edge of the world's marketplace, and build here and elsewhere a great middle class to strengthen democracy and stabilize society.

It is wrong for only a few to reap the benefits of the wonderful changes going on while the many remain mired in poverty. That is a betrayal of our values of individual integrity and equal opportunity, and in the end, it will erode faith in democracy and free markets. Those who have will do better by giving a hand up to those who deserve their chance too. In the information age, after all, the true wealth of nations lies in the minds and the hearts of our people, especially our children.

Brazil and the United States have made education a top priority. And I salute President Cardoso, himself a teacher, the husband of a teacher, the father of a teacher, for his determination to improve primary and secondary schools so all Brazilians can make the most of their lives. President Cardoso has targeted some of the profits from your farsighted privatization program to education. It's the only example of the money not going to reduce Brazil's debt. In so doing, he has made it clear that he believes Brazil's most important debt is to its children. Educating all of them is the best investment Brazil can make.

We are also committed in Brazil and the United States to making technology available to all of our students. A few moments ago, I met with four students from here—Jamilla DeAbril Belasa and three young men, Daniel, Antonio, and Marcos Frederick—and we were on the Internet talking back and forth to students in other schools. Jamilla and I used a Vila Olimpica computer to exchange messages over the Internet with students in Woodbridge, Virginia, including a young exchange student from Brazil.

Proper technology and instruction, new methods of distance learning, place a universe of knowledge at the hands of all of our students. Windows replace walls and open new horizons for children here in Mangueira and everywhere. We can light the fire of the imagination and put the dreams of all children within their reach. We are going to work with Brazil to give all students access to this kind of technology, to set standards to measure progress, to improve teacher training, to increase more exchange of students between our nations, and to help more families in communities and businesses get involved in the education of our children.

I want to especially thank the International Data Group of Brazil for coordinating the formation of the Tech Corps of Brazil, helped by Gary Beach, who founded the United States Tech Corps. These volunteers will assist schools with planning and support and training as they bring the kind of new technologies into their classrooms that I saw here today.

We must do more. And we must be honest with our children. We know that education and technology alone will not abolish poverty and inequality, but they do give people what they need to lift themselves up, to join the emerging global society, and to make the most of their own lives.

We have to understand what is at stake here. World-class education for all children is necessary for the economic well-being of our nations, vital for maintaining the fairness that holds societies together, and essential for fulfilling the most basic needs of the human spirit. In one sentence, we do not have a single child to waste.

Every child enters this world with a great gift from God, the power to dream. But that gift can be lost through poverty, relentless deprivation, the daily defeat of hope. We have no greater responsibility than to nourish that power to dream with education for the children of Mangueira, Brazil, the United States, all the Americas. For it is the dreams of our children that will shape our lives in a new century, in a new millennium.

Thank you, Mangueira, for making those dreams come alive. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:10 p.m. on the soccer field. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Marcellor Alencar of the state of Rio de Janeiro; Mayor Luiz Conde of Rio de Janeiro; Elmo Jose Dos Santos, president, Mangueira Community Association; former professional soccer player Pele, Minister of Extraordinary Sports of Brazil; Flavia Pecanha, who introduced the President; and Francisco Carvalho, director, Vila Olimpica da Mangueira.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Narcotics Traffickers Centered in Colombia

October 15, 1997

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

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report concerning the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that

was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

1. On October 21, 1995, I signed Executive Order 12978, "Blocking Assets and Prohibiting Transactions with Significant Narcotics Traffickers" (the "Order") (60 *Fed. Reg.* 54579, October 24, 1995). The Order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of four significant foreign narcotics traffickers, one of whom is now deceased, who were principals in the so-called Cali drug cartel centered in Colombia. These persons are listed in the annex to the Order. The Order also blocks the property and interests in property of foreign persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, (a) to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia or (b) to materially assist in or provide financial or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the narcotics trafficking activities of persons designated in or pursuant to the Order. In addition the Order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, persons designated in or pursuant to the Order (collectively "Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers" or SDNTs).

The Order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDNTs, and any transaction that evades or avoids, has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, the prohibitions contained in the Order.

Designations of foreign persons blocked pursuant to the Order are effective upon the date of determination by the Director of the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the *Federal Register*, or upon prior actual notice.

2. On October 24, 1995, the Department of the Treasury issued a Notice containing 76 additional names of persons determined to meet the criteria set forth in Executive Order 12978 (60 *Fed. Reg.* 54582, October 24, 1995).

The Department of the Treasury issued another Notice adding the names of one additional entity and three additional individuals, as well as expanded information regarding addresses and pseudonyms, to the list of SDNTs on November 29, 1995, (60 *Fed. Reg.* 61288).

On March 8, 1996, OFAC published a Notice in the *Federal Register* adding the names of 138 additional individuals and 60 entities designated pursuant to the Order, and revising information for 8 individuals on the list of blocked persons contained in the notices published on November 29, 1995, and October 24, 1995. (61 *Fed. Reg.* 9523).

3. On January 21, 1997, OFAC published a Notice in the *Federal Register* adding the names of 57 individuals and 21 entities designated pursuant to the Order, and revising information for 58 individuals and 1 entity (62 *Fed. Reg.* 2903). In addition, the name of one individual specially designated narcotics trafficker was removed from the list. These changes were effective January 15, 1997.

These 78 new names brought the total list of SDNTs to 359. Each of the 78 newly designated entities and individuals has been determined to be owned or controlled or to act for or on behalf of the Cali cartel's Helmer "Pacho" Herrera Buitrago organization. The newly identified SDNTs included several large poultry processing plants and farms, investment and import/export firms, real estate businesses, a consulting firm, a lumber distributor, and a construction company, all located in Colombia.

The additional name and address information includes one previously designated company controlled by the Herrera Buitrago family and 58 previously designated individuals from either the Herrera Buitrago or the Rodriguez Orejuela organizations of the Cali cartel.

Effective February 28, 1997, OFAC issued the Narcotics Trafficking Sanctions Regulations (NTSR), 31 C.F.R. Part 536, to further implement the President's declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia (62 *Fed. Reg.* 9959, March 5, 1997).

4. On April 17, 1997, OFAC added to appendices A and B to 31 C.F.R. chapter V the names

46 individuals and 11 entities, and revised information concerning 25 individuals, who have been determined to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia or have been determined to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, other specially designated narcotics traffickers (62 *Fed. Reg.* 19500, April 22, 1997).

On July 30, 1997, OFAC published the names of seven businesses and seven associated individuals determined to be acting as fronts for the Cali cartel in Colombia (62 *Fed. Reg.* 41850, August 4, 1997). The seven newly designated companies are successors to firms previously designated because they were owned or controlled by the Rodriguez Orejuela, Herrera Buitrago, or Santacruz Londono families of the Cali cartel. This action is part of the ongoing interagency implementation of Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995. These 14 names were added to the previous SDNT list bringing to a total of 428 businesses and individuals with whom financial and business dealings are prohibited and whose assets are blocked under the Order. All 428 SDNTs were determined to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, persons designated in or pursuant to the Order.

The seven newly named companies include a major poultry farm as well as investment, construction, and real estate firms that have undergone name changes since the time of their original designations as SDNT entities. The OFAC has determined that the kingpins and agents of the Cali cartel continue to exert ultimate control over them. The seven newly designated individuals all have been determined to act for or on behalf of these seven successor entities. The OFAC, in coordination with the Departments of Justice and State, is continuing to expand the list of SDNTs, including both organizations and individuals, as additional information is developed.

On September 9, 1997, OFAC amended appendices A and B to 31 C.F.R. chapter V by removing the names of two individuals previously designated as specially designated narcotics traffickers. All real and personal property of these individuals, including all accounts not otherwise subject to blocking in which they have an interest, are unblocked; and all lawful transactions involving United States persons and these individuals are authorized (62 *Fed. Reg.* 48177, September 15, 1997). Copies of these amendments are attached to this report.

5. The OFAC has disseminated and routinely updated details of this program to the financial, securities, and international trade communities by both electronic and conventional media. In addition to bulletins to banking institutions via the Federal Reserve System and the Clearing House Interbank Payments System (CHIPS), individual notices were provided to all State and Federal regulatory agencies, automated clearing houses, and State and independent banking associations across the country. The OFAC contacted all major securities industry associations and regulators. It posted electronic notices on the Internet and over 10 computer bulletin boards and two fax-on-demand services, and provided the same material to the U.S. Embassy in Bogota for distribution to U.S. companies operating in Colombia.

6. As of August 15, 1997, OFAC had issued nine specific licenses pursuant to Executive Order 12978. These licenses were issued in accordance with established Treasury policy authorizing the completion of presanctions transactions and the provision of legal services to and payment of fees for representation of SDNTs in proceedings within the United States arising from the imposition of sanctions.

7. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from April 21 through October 20, 1997, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers are estimated at approximately $800,000. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of Justice, and the Department of State. These data do not reflect certain costs of operations by the intelligence and law enforcement communities.

8. Executive Order 12978 provides this Administration with a tool for combatting the actions of significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia, and the unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm that they cause in the United States and abroad. The Order is designed to deny these traffickers the benefit of any assets subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and to prevent United States persons from engaging in any commercial dealings

with them, their front companies, and their agents. Executive Order 12978 demonstrates the U.S. commitment to end the scourge that such traffickers have wrought upon society in the United States and abroad.

The magnitude and the dimension of the problem in Colombia—perhaps the most pivotal country of all in terms of the world's cocaine trade—is extremely grave. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers and their violent and corrupting activities as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Remarks at a Wreath-Laying Ceremony in Buenos Aires, Argentina
October 16, 1997

Mr. President, Mr. Mayor, distinguished members of the Argentine Government, to the people of Argentina. It is a great honor for me, distinguished members of our Cabinet and the United States Congress, to stand on behalf of the American people before the tomb of a true hero of the Americas, General Jose Francisco de San Martin.

I thank you, Mr. President, and all the people here for the warm welcome we have received. Mr. Mayor, I thank you for the key to the city. And I thank our friends in the press corps for showing me how to hold the key to the city. [*Laughter*]

Before the monument to San Martin, it is well to remember that as we enter a new era and a new century, all our nations have become so far began with courageous visionaries, who dared to dream of independence at the dawn of our national histories. General San Martin often has been compared to George Washington, our first President and the commander of our forces in the Revolutionary War. Each man rose to the defense of his native land, though the risks were great and the odds of success were long. Both inspired confidence with their simple manners, modesty, and quiet but unbending determination. Both fought for liberty, not conquest. And after their victories breathed life into our fragile new nations, they refused the temptation of despotic rule, preferring instead to embrace the role of citizen.

In 1819 a United States diplomat wrote to his superior of San Martin, "I think him the greatest man I have seen in South America." General San Martin was a proud Argentinean but also a citizen of the world, who gladly lent his aid to other nations seeking their freedom as well, and thus he became liberator and captain general of the Republic of Chile, generalissimo of the Republic of Peru. Even when he retired to France, the Belgians sought his leadership in their quest for independence.

Today, at long last, the democracies of the Americas are living up to the legacy of San Martin. They respect each other's independence, stand ready to help each other and other countries beyond the hemisphere to prevent war, preserve peace, and prosper. In these endeavors, Argentina stands out. As guarantor of the Rio protocol, you are joining Chile, Brazil, and the United States in helping Ecuador and Peru pursue lasting peace. Your sons and daughters in the Argentine Armed Forces take on some of the most demanding missions of good will, helping war-torn lands around the world turn from conflict to cooperation. As close to home as Guatemala and Haiti, as far away as Bosnia, Cyprus, and Mozambique, Argentina has answered the call to peace. Some of your peacekeepers are with us here today. The United States, others who have worked with you, and most of all, the people you have helped around the world are in your debt, and on all their behalf, I thank you. In recognition of your country's extraordinary contributions to international peacekeeping, I have notified our Congress of my intention to designate Argentina as a major non-NATO ally under our laws.

Our alliance of values goes beyond our efforts against threats to peace and security, but it begins there. It also includes a commitment to freedom and democracy, a conviction that open markets are engines for progress, a determination to give all our people a chance to contribute and be rewarded for their efforts in the future we are building, a passionate belief in the potential of every child and the right of all children to a good education, a profound concern for the environment that we hold in trust for future generations.

Near the end of his long life, General San Martin said, "All progress is the child of time." Here at his final resting place, I say to you, I believe he would applaud the progress Argentina and all the Americas have made and the direction we are taking toward a new era of peace and prosperity. But I also believe he would remind us of the work still undone, the challenges still unmet. He would urge us to press on to make progress the child of this time.

Clearly, we have the chance and the responsibility to redeem the promise of San Martin, beyond even his visionary dreams. And so, Mr. President, with high hopes, strong resolve, and generous spirits, let us take our chance and do our duty together.

Thank you, and God bless the people of Argentina and the United States.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 9:20 a.m. in the Plaza San Martin. In his remarks, he referred to President Carlos Saul Menem of Argentina and Mayor Fernando de la Rua of Buenos Aires.

Statement on a Line Item Veto of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998

October 16, 1997

I have used my line item veto authority today to cancel a provision of the 1998 Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act that provides an open season for certain Federal employees to switch retirement systems.

This line item veto will save $854 million over 5 years by preventing a hastily conceived, undebated provision from becoming law. In addition, my action will keep agencies from having to reallocate another $1.3 billion in limited discretionary resources to pay higher retirement benefits, rather than spend it on other priorities, such as pay increases, or essential agency needs.

I did not propose this provision in my 1998 budget, it was not the subject of public hearings, and it was not considered by either the House or the Senate. Instead, it was added at the end of the legislative process, in a House-Senate conference committee. I believe that by canceling this provision, I am using my line item veto authority in an appropriate manner.

I am committed to ensure that the Federal Government can recruit and retain the quality individuals we need to administer Federal programs. I will work with Congress to ensure that our Federal civil servants are compensated fairly for the essential work they do for the American people.

NOTE: The report detailing the cancellation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 17. H.R. 2378, approved October 10, was assigned Public Law No. 105–61.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Line Item Veto of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998
October 16, 1997

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

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel the dollar amount of discretionary budget authority, as specified in the attached report, contained in the "Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998" (Public Law 105–61; H.R. 2378). I have determined that the cancellation of this amount will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachment, constitutes a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The report detailing the cancellation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 17.

Remarks in the Univision Townhall Meeting in Buenos Aires
October 16, 1997

The President. Thank you, Jorge and Maria Elena. And I thank Univision for giving us the chance to have this conversation. I want to thank all the young people here in Buenos Aires and joining us from Miami and Los Angeles for being a part of this.

I am near the end of a remarkable trip which my wife, Hillary, and I, a distinguished group from our Cabinet and the United States Congress, have taken to Latin America to celebrate the changes that have taken place: the moves from dictatorship to democracy; the moves from closed economies, high inflation, and big debt to stability and growth; the moves that are bringing all of us closer together.

I came here to talk about what we have to do to prepare for the 21st century, how we have to work together to seize the promise of education and technology, to shoulder the burdens of preserving our environment and dealing with new security threats from drugs and crime and terrorism. Most of all, I came to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to be a good partner with Latin America as we move ahead and especially to emphasize the fact that our fastest growing minority of Americans are Hispanic-Americans. We are growing together in more ways than one, and today I hope we'll talk about what we can do to build the kind of future we all want, together.

Maria Elena Salinas. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I'd like to ask you for your permission to introduce your wife. Mrs. Hillary Clinton is here with us today. Mrs. Hillary Rodham Clinton, of course, has been accompanying Mr. Clinton throughout this Latin American tour, but she herself has traveled through several Latin American countries promoting programs to benefit women and also programs that alleviate poverty. So we want to welcome her especially. And many Latin Americans of course read your weekly column. Welcome.

[*At this point, moderator Jorge Ramos introduced a National University of Buenos Aires law student from Colombia.*]

Antidrug Efforts

Q. Mr. President, can you show the world a reduction in drug consumption which is proportional to the reduction of production and cultivation of drugs?

The President. I think the short answer to that question is yes, we can do that, we can show that a lot of our drug consumption is going down. Overall drug consumption has been going down in America for the last several years. But

to be fair, we have one big, troubling thing, which is that drug consumption among our younger people, people under 18, is still going up. And since in America children of school age now are the largest number they have ever been, that's a problem we have to continue to work on.

So the answer is, we've made some progress; we have to do much more. I just secured from the Congress a program to dramatically increase our efforts to reduce drug demand at home, especially to reach out to our younger people with messages from people they respect telling them that drugs are wrong and illegal and that they can kill them. Now, in addition to that, of course, we are working more closely—we spend more money in Colombia than any other country working with the authorities there on antidrug campaigns. But this is an issue that will increasingly involve all the nations not only here on our own soil in the Americas but throughout the world, and there is no easy answer. You must fight all the chain of supply, and you must change the whole psychology of demand. And we have to give a lot of our young people hope so that they have something to live for, something to say yes to, some reason to do things that are constructive and good not only for society but for themselves as well.

Mr. Ramos. Mr. President, a question related to this. As you yourself have recognized, the United States is a country that consumes more drugs in the world—one out of every three U.S. citizens, according to the polls—and many believe that the certification process is unfair. Is it true that at the Summit of the Americas in Chile next year you are going to announce the end of the certification process?

The President. We have made no decision about that. Several years ago, our Congress passed a law which requires us every year to certify that the people in authority in countries are doing all they can to help us to fight the drug problem. The decertification process and some intermediate steps are extreme measures taken under unusual circumstances. But even in the case of Colombia where there was a decertification decision, we still continue to invest more money in Colombia than any other country in working with local authorities there and Federal authorities to fight the drug problem.

So I think what we have to emphasize is that our approach is partnership. Whether it's Mexico, Colombia, any other country in the world, what we prefer is to work with people. And we recognize that in a lot of the producing countries, it requires enormous courage—enormous courage—and people putting their lives on the line to try to stand up to the narcotraffickers. And what we want is a world in which we work more closely with them and we reduce American demand. And as I said, we have now seen American demand go down, but our children are still using too many drugs.

[*Ms. Salinas introduced an employee of the Foreign Ministry in Argentina.*]

Q. Mr. President, good afternoon. Over the last few months there's been a lot discussed about the role of the armed forces in our region in the fight against drug trafficking. There are messages, although not all of them homogeneous, from your country that would seem to favor such a role. And specifically, in our country there are certain fears. And since you know the tragic history we've suffered here, I would ask for your personal opinion on this.

The President. Well, first of all, let me say that one of the great things that should make all Argentineans proud is the changing nature of the role of the armed services in the last several years. Now Argentina is recognized—when people think of the Argentine military around the world now, they think of peacekeepers, from Bosnia to Cyprus to Mozambique to Haiti. This is very different than it was in former times. And I would say you wouldn't want to do anything to change that.

Now, in different countries there will be different capacities for dealing with this issue. And different nations may want to find some role for the military; it may be necessary. In our country we use the National Guard, to some extent, to fight the drug problem. But I think we all recognize that it is a national security issue. We all recognize that these people are wealthy and powerful and well-armed and capable of killing large numbers of people in a short period of time. So the question each country will have to face is, how am I going to deal with this? How am I going to fight it? And if you use the military in a domestic situation, then there must be extraordinary precautions, obviously, taken to avoid the kinds of abuses which would be possible. In most cases in our country, such things are not legal anymore because we're so sensitive to it. But I wouldn't want to make a judgment for every nation. I

would just say every nation should do what is necessary to deal with the security threat but should do so in a way that protects the civil liberties and the human rights of the people and guarantees civilian control of the military, because that's one of the great triumphs of Latin America in the last 15 years or so, and it should not be sacrificed.

Ms. Salinas. As we said earlier at the beginning of the program, we are not just going to have questions in Argentina. We're also going to have questions from Los Angeles and also Miami. We're now going to hear Teresa Rodriguez in Miami, a city that many times has been the northernmost Latin American city.

[*Miami, FL, moderator Teresa Rodriguez introduced a high school student.*]

Freedom of Information

Q. Good day, Mr. President. Freedom of expression and access to information are two basic ideas for any democracy as an example of a hemispheric initiative to provide more information for North and South America. My question is, which of these events or which of these things do you think are necessary, or what should happen in order to increase access to information? And also, how we, as a hemispheric community, how can we incorporate countries like Cuba where actually there is no respect for freedom of expression?

The President. Well, let me answer your bigger question first. I think it's very important not only that we have freedom of speech and freedom of the press, freedom of association in every country in the Americas but that we take the initiative to try to increase the information available to people. I just came from Brazil, for example, where I visited a school in a poor neighborhood in Rio. And they had computers there which were placed there through a joint operation of private companies and the government. And we spoke over the Internet to students in an American school just across the Potomac River from Washington, DC.

One of the things that I have been trying to do on this trip is to get all the leaders of South America to work with me, especially in Argentina and Brazil, to dramatically increase the technology available to students and then the use of the Internet. In addition to that, the United States is trying to get all the countries in the world to promise not to overly regulate or tax or burden the Internet so that we can get more information out.

The technology available today enables us to bring education to children who could never get it, enables us to bring information to people who want to make a living, who never would have been able to get that information. It can revolutionize the way we do business in a positive way if we do it. And eventually I think no society can remain closed to it. Cuba will inevitably get this information and respond to it, and it will lead to a rising democratic impulse, just as it did in the former Communist countries of Eastern Europe. So you should be optimistic about that. We just have to push this technology out there for education and for opportunity, to all people. It's one of the ways we're going to sort of close the gap between the haves and have-nots and not leave all the poor people that are still in Latin America behind—and still in our country, I might add.

Mr. Ramos. We're jumping back and forth. We're going to jump from Cuba to other subjects. Let's go to one of the most multicultural and multiracial societies in the world, Los Angeles, with Maria Antonietta. Go ahead, please.

[*Los Angeles, CA, moderator Maria Antonietta Collins introduced an immigration lawyer.*]

Immigration

Q. Mr. President, on behalf of—[*inaudible*]—in Los Angeles and the Central American community in the United States, I'd like to thank you for the leadership you have demonstrated through the initiative of the legislation presented to Congress several weeks ago. As you well know, last week two Republican Members of Congress announced an agreement which has not yet been finalized and a legislative proposal. My question is, what possibility is there to see legislation passed that is fair and just in the way that Salvadorans, Nicaraguans, and Guatemalans are treated, all of these people who are under special immigration programs?

The President. Just very briefly, for the benefit of all the people here in Buenos Aires and who are listening to this who may not know what we're talking about, in the political upheavals of the eighties in Central America, the United States gave special permission to people who were affected by these troubles to come to the United States, in theory for a limited amount

of time until democracy or peace had been restored to their country; then they were to return home. By the time that happened, they had been here quite a long while, particularly Guatemalans, Salvadorans, and Nicaraguans. Under the law passed by our Congress last year, they would all have had to go home immediately. So our Attorney General, working with me, issued an order to stop that while we tried to fix it.

I think the chances are excellent that we will be able to at least return to the former system, where we'll be able to leave people here on humanitarian grounds who have made marriages and made families, had children, and started their lives. And I'm encouraged that finally we have also gotten a positive response from some of the Republican Members. Some of that legislation, as you know, is directed to benefit only Nicaraguans. I think that we should help them, but I don't think we should forget about the Guatemalans and the Salvadorans either. I think the chances are excellent that we will have legislation which will enable us to do the humane, decent thing.

Let me also say, if I could just make a point about Los Angeles. While Hispanic-Americans are the fastest growing group of Americans, Los Angeles County, our largest county, has people from at least 150 different racial and ethnic groups—in one of our counties. So we are becoming a multiethnic democracy in ways that we never have been before, and if we do it properly, it will be a great thing for our future.

[*Ms. Salinas introduced a patent lawyer.*]

U.S. Trade Policy

Q. Good afternoon, first of all, Mr. President. The United States on the one hand is promoting the establishment of the free trade area of the Americas, the FTAA, and has now embarked on its own regional integration project, which is NAFTA. On the other hand, it says that it would be against integration blocs in Latin America that would limit the exports or imports of third parties. Now, my question is this: How can you simultaneously hold both positions, which at first sight seem to be contradictory?

The President. Well, first of all, let me tell you what my position is. I supported the establishment of NAFTA. I supported the strengthening of MERCOSUR. I support the Andean Pact. I support CARICOM. Why? Because when countries that are neighbors lower their barriers and trade with each other, they increase growth and wealth. They also acquire a political closeness that makes former conflicts unthinkable. And they begin to look to the future and to their children, instead of to their past prejudices or difficulties. They tend to work together to solve problems, the way we're working with Argentina and Brazil, for example, to help Peru and Ecuador resolve their problems on the border.

Secondly, I believe that being for MERCOSUR, being for NAFTA, being for these other pacts is sort of a first step toward trying to have a larger hemispheric economic integration. If you imagine—all of you here are younger than I am—imagine what your life will be like 20 years from now. Imagine all the people who live in Argentina who couldn't come here wearing a coat and tie yet. How are they going to have opportunities in the future? How are they going to live out their dreams? If we can integrate the markets from the northern part of Alaska to the tip of Tierra del Fuego so that you have 800 million people who are, in a deliberate fashion, trying to work together and grow together, that will change the future of people that otherwise won't be touched. So to me, I say yes to hemispheric integration, but let's build on what's happening now that's working.

1996 Campaign Financing

Ms. Salinas. Mr. President, of course, you have tried to keep the focus throughout this tour on trade, which is one of the main points. But unfortunately, other subjects have come up that you would have preferred to leave at home. Some people in Latin America criticize Presidents because they use their position to benefit from power and from elections, and there are people who criticize you perhaps for the same thing, by making phone calls from the White House or perhaps holding coffees for people who could finance your campaign. Do you think there is anything valid in any of those criticisms?

The President. No. [*Laughter*] But it's true that I tried to win reelection, and it's true that I asked people to support me, and it's true that from time to time I actually talked to my supporters. I think that's how democracy works.

But on the other hand, I don't mind people saying that, well, in their opinion we should

have done it one way or the other. The fundamental problem in America is there is no effective limitation on spending. There is no access by national candidates or Federal candidates for our Congress to free or reduced air time, and so we have increasing costs of communication in campaigns. And one of our big problems—if we want to preserve our democracy in a way that has the trust of the people of our country and gets participation back up, people in public life and people who want office should be doing more things like this. And there should be strict limits on spending in return for access like this to the public, so that people feel that they're participating. That's the real problem. We ought to pass the finance reform legislation that I'm supporting or some other version of comprehensive campaign finance reform. Every nation should do that.

[*Mr. Ramos introduced an Argentine lawyer.*]

Domestic Violence

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to ask you with regard to domestic violence, which recently has been publicly recognized by the nations of the world as a serious social problem that especially victimizes women and children, what are your policies—active policies to prevent it and eradicate it?

The President. First of all, I think—I thank you for working in the field, and I think it's very important that domestic violence is being recognized as a human rights issue. My wife should be answering this question. She has done a lot more work on this than I have. She went to Beijing to the International Women's Conference to talk about this, among other things. She spoke with women from Argentina today, just today, about this and has talked about it all over Latin America.

It is not a cultural issue; it's a human rights issue, and it is a crime. What we have done is we set up a special division in our Justice Department with an advocate on violence against women. We established a toll-free long distance phone line so that people could call us from all over the country to talk about instances of domestic violence, to ask for help, to get—for treatment for people, for law enforcement support, for whatever. And it has been very well used. And we have done a lot of work to increase the sensitivity of our local law enforcement officials and to train them better, so that they know it when they see it. I know that may sound funny, but a lot of people don't know it when they see it, don't know how to respond to it.

And I think every country needs to do that. There needs to be an advocate; there needs to be a way ordinary people who aren't being heard in their neighborhoods or their communities can call and get help; and then there needs to be a comprehensive training program to change the priorities, the attitudes, the understandings of the people in law enforcement. It should be a priority in every nation of the Americas. And I would be the last to say we have solved the problem in America, but at least we are aggressively pursuing it. And I thank my wife for making sure we're trying to do the right thing anyway.

[*Mr. Ramos called on Ms. Rodriguez, who introduced a Costa Rican participant from Florida.*]

Human Rights

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. President. For the first time since the Carter administration, the United States has decided to promote human rights in Latin America. Given the fact that in the past the United States has demonstrated its will to intervene or even invade on behalf of causes such as democracy or to take away from power supposed criminals, alleged criminals, what possibilities are there for the United States to do that today for human rights?

The President. Well, the United States is being very aggressive in the support of human rights. It affects our other policies. It is a part of all of our dialog with countries where it's an issue. We are trying to move away from the period when the United States was eager to invade other countries in our hemisphere and our neighbors, toward a spirit of partnership and cooperation but a cooperation based not simply on common economic interests but most importantly on the shared values of freedom and democracy, of peace and prosperity, of cooperative efforts in environmental protection and education and other things. So you can't have a relationship like that if human rights is taken out of the equation.

And I might say—you're Costa Rican; if you look at the experience of Costa Rica, if you look at how wonderfully they have done, part of it is because they have observed basic human rights and did not have institutions within the

society that had a vested interest in holding people down and denying their human potential. That's a lesson we all need to learn.

So I wouldn't think that America would want to get into the invasion business. We did participate in the United Nations-sanctioned restoration of the elected Government of Haiti, but only after it became sanctioned by the international community, where there were serious human rights abuses but where an election had also been interrupted. But what we can do to have the most influence is just, day-in and day-out, find ways to work together to deal with it and hopefully in a multilateral situation. The OAS can do more, and we can do more bilaterally as well. But thank you for your question and for your concern.

[*Ms. Salinas called on Ms. Collins, who introduced the coordinator for inter-American affairs at the William C. Velasquez Institute.*]

Free Trade

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. President. Hispanic Congressmen here in the United States are against fast track, as a result of certain lacks in certain NAFTA programs for retraining workers who have lost their jobs as a result of NAFTA and others to create jobs for those same workers. My question is, don't you think that we need to improve NAFTA before we expand it to South America or before we negotiate any other free-trade agreement, before we ask for fast-track authorization?

The President. Absolutely not. Let's look at the economic facts here. First of all—and I would be happy to discuss this, but whether you believe NAFTA was a success or a failure—and I believe we are far better off economically and in our relationships with Mexico than we would have been had we not passed NAFTA—but we are the only developed country in the world with a 2,000-mile border with a country that is still developing. We have unique historical, cultural, economic, environmental, and other challenges in our relationship.

Our trade with the Americas has grown enormously in the last few years. It has gone up 200 percent since 1990. It's now over $109 billion. In the last year alone, 70 percent of America's trade growth has come from the Americas. So should we do something to trade more with Chile, with Argentina, with Brazil, with other countries? Yes, I believe we should. Should we wait while Europeans and others make agreements that help their workers? No, I don't believe we should. Are there political benefits as well as economic benefits to our cooperation? Absolutely.

Now, in the case of NAFTA—let's go back to NAFTA. We had a couple of rough years with NAFTA because of the peso crisis in Mexico and the recession which followed. But they were not nearly as bad and Mexico bounced back much more quickly than they did when the same thing happened to Mexico in the early eighties and there was no NAFTA, there was no trade.

We have not solved all the environmental problems along the border, but at least we have a financial mechanism and a testing mechanism now, and we have shown we have some examples of progress. I think you can rightly say that the North American Development Bank lost 2 years in the development, in '94 and '95. We've been working since early '96 to get it going. And just recently, I reached an agreement with the Hispanic caucus to dramatically increase the lending capacity of the North American Development Bank to help Americans displaced by NAFTA-related trade. We've already doubled worker retraining funds. I've reached an agreement with the Hispanic caucus to increase it another $450 million over the next 5 years.

So I think that we do have to do more to help Americans who are disadvantaged by trade, but that is not an argument against fast track. Fast track is about the future of Latin America and its future economic relations with us, and I think we'd be making a terrible mistake to delay. We should speed up, not delay. The economy down here is on a fast track. I can see it all around me. They're not waiting for us to do this. We just should be a good partner and do it.

[*Mr. Ramos introduced an Argentine pediatrician.*]

Q. Good afternoon.

The President. Good afternoon.

Health Care

Q. My question has to do with health, and it's this. Access to health care is a basic human right. The United States has many times helped to promote and defend human rights. How do you think the United States can help us now

to be able to gain access for the entire population to health care? And how does this work in the United States, immersed as you are in a free market economic system?

The President. Well, you know, that's a problem that we haven't fully solved. Hillary and I tried in 1994 to devise a system where everyone who could afford it would pay something, according to their ability to pay, for themselves and their employees to buy health insurance so everyone would have access to health care. That plan did not pass.

What have we done instead? We have tried to make it possible for health care to be more affordable. We've tried to protect people's health insurance when they have it so that they don't lose it. And we have a network of public health clinics throughout the United States that people can visit if they do not have access to health care. We just passed a law in our country with 24 billion U.S. dollars to provide health insurance to another 5 million children over the next 5 years. So we're trying.

But I think that we should—from my own point of view, we should support programs through the international financial institutions that help you and through AID, the USAID programs that deal with basic health care. Access to health care is, in my view, right up there with education in terms of what it will take to give every single child in this country and on this continent a chance to participate in the future we're building. And I think the United States should continue to have a high priority on health care at home and health care abroad.

And thank you for being a pediatrician.

[*Ms. Salinas introduced a Uruguayan English teacher.*]

Intercultural Education

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. President. I spent some time studying in the United States. Your universities and your schools in the United States are full of foreign students who seem to have understood the need to culturally interact in this era of globalization. Don't you think that more U.S. young people should be going out to the world in order to get to know it and get to know people and get in touch and not be so unaware of the needs of globalization?

The President. Yes, absolutely. You know, one of the reasons I have the attitudes that I have today is that when I was a young man I was given the opportunity to study in another country for 2 years and travel to other countries. I have strongly supported America maintaining the Fulbright scholarship program for that reason. And I believe that we should do all that we can to encourage more students from the United States to take a year or so and study abroad. I'm very glad that we have students from other countries in the U.S. I think there are now 2,000 students from Argentina in the United States. Are there any American students here? Good for you. Well, we have a few here, beating the odds. But I think it's very important.

Let me also say that there is a marked attitudinal change, though, now. Young Americans, Americans under 30, are far more likely to want to be involved with a foreign culture, to want to study overseas, to understand the importance of trade and political cooperation to their own future—far more likely. So I think that—I wouldn't be surprised if we don't see a big upsurge in the number of young Americans now who want to take at least a year and go overseas to learn about another culture, to master another language, to be a part of the world as it is developing. But you're absolutely right, we should do more of it.

[*Ms. Salinas called on Ms. Rodriguez, who introduced the president of the Puerto Rican Students Association at the University of Miami.*]

Puerto Rican Statehood

Q. Thank you. Good afternoon to everyone and good afternoon to you, Mr. President. This is my question. If Puerto Rico were accepted as the 51st State, what assurance could you give the Puerto Rican community that we would be able to keep our traditions, our culture, our language, and not lose our Puerto Rican identity?

The President. Well, first, let me state what my position is. My position is that the status of Puerto Rico should be for the Puerto Rican people themselves to decide. Whether a commonwealth, independence, or statehood, it should be totally up to the people of Puerto Rico. If Puerto Rico were to become a State, among other things, under our laws the educational system of Puerto Rico would be primarily the constitutional responsibility of the State of Puerto Rico, so that to whatever extent the State wanted to have a cultural support for

the native culture and the native customs and the native language would be a decision for the State to pursue that the Federal Government should not try to undermine.

So that's my position. I don't think you'd have to worry about that. There are complicating questions on both sides of that issue. But I think that the preservation of the unique and wonderful culture of Puerto Rico would not be a problem probably in either way, but there may be some specific problems I'm unaware of. But I would say that people should make their decisions about commonwealth and statehood probably based on what they think is best economically, rather than that. I believe that we'll be able to preserve the culture no matter what.

As a matter of fact, if you look at what's happening in Miami, what's happening in Los Angeles, what's happening in Chicago, what's happening in the Fairfax County school district across the river from Washington, DC, where there are people from 180 different national groups in one school district, we're going to do a lot of cultural preservation in the years ahead.

[*Mr. Ramos called on Ms. Collins, who introduced the coordinator of a Los Angeles human rights organization.*]

Immigration

Q. Yes, Mr. President. The new immigration law of 1996 has caused a major crisis for immigrant families. In the past, you have said that life was not going to be made more difficult for those immigrants who have complied with the law in this country and who are seeking the American dream. What I'd like to know is what do you plan to do so that the immigration laws are more humane for the people coming from those countries?

The President. First of all, I think it's important that you look at the changes that we just put into the recently passed budget. As you know, I was bitterly opposed to the immigration law changes made by Congress last year, and I said I would do all I could to reverse the harshest aspects of them. Those laws were largely reversed in their impact in the budget that we just passed.

Now, for people who are there without legal approval, they may be eligible to become legal immigrants and, if so, they should try to get legal status. For some legal immigrants that may still lose some public benefits, our information is that over 70 percent of them are eligible to become citizens. I would urge them to become citizens. We just had a big report from our immigration commission saying that we in the United States Government should do more to try to push citizenship and help new citizens to integrate more successfully into our society. So we're going to be looking at that to see if there are some people who have fallen between the cracks, that we can change their status so they won't be put in a perilous circumstance. But I'm confident that most of the people's problems were taken care of by the recent budget law. The others, I think, will have to work hard, particularly moving people into citizenship, because most of the people who don't have benefits now, because they're legal immigrants and not citizens, are old people who aren't in dire health conditions. But almost all of them are eligible to become citizens, and I think we have to move them through the system as quickly as we can.

[*Ms. Salinas introduced a Chilean computer company president.*]

Major Non-NATO Ally Status and Arms Sales

Q. Mr. President, in the United States seeking MNNA status for Argentina, the armed forces of Argentina, no doubt, would also be given a new status by the U.S. Government. Don't you think that a rivalry can be generated between these neighboring countries in the south and also produce democratic instability in the region in an arms race that could be unleashed through this decision?

The President. No, but let me explain why. Let me explain why. It's a fair question. And let me say if someone—an Argentine here might stand up and ask the following question: Mr. President, don't you think the fact that the United States is now willing to send—sell sophisticated jets to the Chilean Air Force could cause the same problem you just said? So let me answer both questions, if I might.

We accorded the major non-NATO ally status to Argentina because of the truly extraordinary efforts that have happened just in the 1990's, where Argentina has gone with us to Bosnia, has gone into Haiti, is working with British soldiers in Cyprus, is working in Mozambique. There is hardly a country in the world that

has anything approaching the record of the Argentine military in being willing to stand up for the cause of peace. We believe that we should be sending a signal that this is the policy that other countries should follow. There is nothing here designed to upset the military balance in South America. We want Argentina to be working with Chile, to be working with Brazil. It would be the height of stupidity for these countries to go to war with each other.

Now, why did we decide to say that we might sell aircraft to Chile? Because Chile was interested in our making a bid. We used to have—essentially, when the continent was governed by military dictators, we said we're not going to sell them planes because they'll use them to go to war with each other. Now that the continent is governed by stable democracies, I asked myself this question: Is there some reason I should continue to discriminate against Chile and treat them differently than I would France or Germany? And the answer was no.

So what we're trying to do, so that no arms—so that we don't have a new arms race in Latin America and people don't get scared about this, whether—I mean, Chile may or may not buy American planes, for all I know. But what we think ought to be done is that all the OAS members ought to say, "Look, we have militaries, we have to keep them properly equipped, but we're going to share information with each other about what we're buying and why." No more secrets, no surprises, no attempts to gain any advantage over one another; that's the answer there. So I think that we ought to just be very open and honest with each other about why we're doing these things, and if so, we won't be heightening the military tension.

Malvinas-Falkland Islands

Mr. Ramos. Mr. President, as a journalist, before going to the next question, I wanted to say this. Since Argentina is an ally of the United States, a non-NATO ally, what would happen if, for example, Argentina wanted to seek a diplomatic or military solution to the Malvinas-Falkland Islands? What would the United States do, ally itself with Great Britain or Argentina?

The President. The United States would say—we tried that once; it didn't work out so well. And the United States would say, here are two great countries following, in every other respect, farsighted policies. Great Britain is enjoying enormous success now in Europe in economic recovery, showing real responsibility in international affairs, trying to deal with the question we must all deal with, which is how do you have a free market and preserve the social contract, treat the poor fairly, grow the middle class. This is not the time to be going to war. These are our friends. They should get together and work this out. That's what the United States would say. The United States would say, for goodness sakes, don't spoil a good thing. We have two good countries here with two—with strong leadership. They should get together and work this out. This is not a cause for war; this is a cause for negotiations.

[*Mr. Ramos introduced Mexico's special envoy for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.*]

Youth Empowerment

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. President. This is my question. We young people are concerned about solving the problems that affect our countries, but the only thing we can do is show up these concerns because we don't have the proper platform for decisionmaking. I'd like to know, do you have concrete policies designed for young people to become part of strategic decisionmaking processes? And could this policy be used as a tool for better intercontinental integration?

The President. To be perfectly honest with you, I'd never thought of it in that way before. It's interesting; in the United States more and more of our school boards, for example, are having a student be a member of the board. More and more of our university boards of trustees are having a student be a member of the board, trying to actually share power with people who are even younger than you, to get young people into this. I haven't thought of this in the context you mention, but I would urge you and anyone else here who is interested in this, if you have any ideas, write to me about it. I will think about it, and I will see what can be done.

But since you're from Mexico though, let me make a specific suggestion. I believe President Zedillo did a very brave and good thing in basically genuinely opening up the Mexican political system, knowing that it would cost his own party positions in the Mexican Congress in the short run. Now you have a much more competitive democracy in Mexico. As a result of that, all

these parties are going to be looking around now for young people like you, with ideas and energy and values, people who can command the support of other people. And I think this is a very good time for young people in Mexico to try to make their influence felt in the political system. Because the old—the PRI, they desperately need now young people to come in and say, "No, we have new ideas. We have a future." The other parties that are competing are going to be open. And I think for young people who are of the age to be in politics, not just as elected officials but I mean as activists, there is an unprecedented opportunity in Mexico to affect policy now, because you've just opened up a new chapter in your political history.

On the other question, think about it. If you have any ideas specifically, write to me. I'm intrigued by it. I hadn't thought of it before.

Q. We'll ask for the address then.

Ms. Salinas. Mr. President, we've run out of the time we had for questions. Of course, there are so many young people here and in Los Angeles and Miami as well who wanted to take advantage of this opportunity to ask you questions. Others have been able to do that, and they're very grateful. But now, please, you take the floor.

The President. First, let me thank all of you for coming. Let me thank the people in Los Angeles and Miami. Let me congratulate the people in Miami. Their baseball team is going to the World Series faster than any new team has ever gone before. Let me thank the people of Venezuela and Brazil and Argentina for making us feel so welcome.

And let me say again, I am convinced that the best years in all of human civilization can be ahead of us if we take advantage of the revolutions that are now in play and honestly face our problems together. And if we define the worth of our lives by what we can accomplish by helping each other to make the most of their lives, then I think you will have a very wonderful time in the 21st century.

Thank you, and God bless you.

[*An additional question was asked in Spanish, but a translation was not provided.*]

Bilingual Education

The President. Believe it or not, I lost my interpreter, but I know what we're talking about. [*Laughter*]

Here's what I think about the whole bilingual education issue. Every country has a dominant language, and should. And the children in the schools should make every effort—should learn that dominant language and become proficient in it. I think more and more, our children in America will want to speak at least two languages and perhaps more.

What I'd like to see is a situation where we say, however—we can't say we're not going to have any bilingual education, because then children would come here, not just from Spanish-speaking countries but from any number of Asian cultures, and not be able to learn in school for 2 or 3 years. And when children come to the United States and they don't speak English, but they're school age, I think they should start school immediately. They should be able to get whatever instruction they have to have in the language that they do speak, but then they should learn to speak English in an appropriate time, so that we're always encouraging bilingualism or multilingualism.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:07 p.m. at the Univision Television Network Studio. In his remarks, he referred to Univision journalists Jorge Ramos and Maria Elena Salinas, who moderated the meeting in Buenos Aires; and President Ernesto Zedillo of Mexico. The President also referred to the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), Mexico's ruling political party.

Remarks at the State Dinner Hosted by President Carlos Menem of Argentina in Buenos Aires

October 16, 1997

Mr. President, Zulema, to the members of Congress and the Supreme Court, Mr. Mayor and governors, former President Alfonsin, members of the diplomatic corps, distinguished guests. Mr. President, thank you for your fine statement, your warm welcome, and the extraordinary hospitality that Hillary and I and our entire delegation of Cabinet, administration, and congressional members have received from the people of Buenos Aires and Argentina.

Mr. President, as you know, like you, I come from a small rural State, where some people still value their horse more than their automobile. [*Laughter*] And with this remarkable feast, you have reminded us with barbecue that we are truly at home.

Exactly 150 years ago, in the autumn of 1847, a young man from Argentina visited the United States and was profoundly affected by the experience. He thought that we Americans ate our meals too quickly—[*laughter*]—that our young people had strange courtship habits, and that the White House was not big enough for the President. [*Laughter*] Still, he was impressed by a nation in which individuals were valued for their capacity and their work, where education was prized as the great equalizing force of democracy, where a multitude of people of different backgrounds and languages came together, in his words, "as if they were one family, joining one another, mixing with each other, parts of old societies forming the new, most daring republic in the world." Mr. President, that young man was Domingo Faustino Sarmiento.

Today, 150 years later, America looks across the great expanse of our hemisphere at Argentina and we are inspired by Argentina today as Sarmiento was by America then. We see a nation shaped, like us, by waves of immigrants from the Old World and the experience of frontier life in the New World. Here, where so many languages are spoken, from Basque to Ukrainian, from Arabic to Welsh, we see a nation drawing strength from its remarkable diversity. Today, we see an Argentina grounded in democracy, committed to economic reforms that have put it on the road to more widespread prosperity and to educating its people for the demands of the new economy.

I speak for all Americans when I say how very pleased I am that in the last decade our nations have built a strong, new relationship, driven by shared values, based on partnership and respect. Argentina and America have joined together in common cause. We pledge to create a free-trade area of the Americas by 2005; to bring new prosperity to all people of our hemisphere; to turn the revolution in information technology to our children's advantage by opening a world of knowledge to all—all—our children. One hundred fifty years ago, education was Sarmiento's great passion. Today, it is central to our ability to prove that democracy works for all people and to the future we are trying to build together.

We are also partners in helping those around the world who take risks for peace. I thank the people of Argentina for sending peacekeepers into troubled places all over the Earth and setting an example for all nations. The robust bonds of friendship between Argentina and the United States are rooted in our shared commitment to peace and freedom, to prosperity and security, to the integrity of the individual, the family, and the community. They are at the heart of all we dream for our future.

President Menem, I salute you for the extraordinary leadership you have shown in helping our nations turn this corner in history. No one in our hemisphere has done more to seize the opportunities of this new era. Generations to come will remember this as a moment when our two nations served the deepest interests of our people. And tonight the United States is proud to work alongside Argentina, an Argentina that is fulfilling Domingo Sarmiento's greatest hopes.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us raise a glass to the new partnership between our people for peace and prosperity, here and throughout the world.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 9:40 p.m. in the ballroom at the Rural Center. In his

remarks, he referred to President Menem's daughter, Zulema Maria Menem; Mayor Fernando de la Rua of Buenos Aires; and former President Raul Alfonsin of Argentina.

Remarks to Business Leaders in Buenos Aires
October 17, 1997

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you, President Fedrigotti, President Menem, distinguished members of the Argentine Government, to the members of Congress and Cabinet in our administration who are here. Let me say on behalf of all of them, we are delighted to be here. We have had a wonderful stay in Buenos Aires. And we thank this distinguished group of Argentine and American business leaders for giving all of us the opportunity to join you this morning.

When President Bush came here in 1990, it was a very different time for Argentina. Inflation was soaring, output was plunging, trade was anemic. Today, the country has experienced a truly remarkable turnaround. It is a great credit to the people of Argentina, to wise decisionmakers, and to the direction that President Menem has set. You have cut inflation to almost zero. The expanded trade attracted a flood of foreign investment, spurred impressive growth. You are on the move—good for Argentina, and good for America, for since 1990, our exports to Argentina have more than tripled. In the same period, American investment has soared from $2 billion to approximately $12 billion, and it's still growing.

Trade has contributed a quarter of Argentina's growth over the past 3 years. And of course, behind these individual statistics lie many, many success stories that are paying off for people in human as well as economic terms.

To take just one example, General Electric Power Systems has sold state-of-the-art gas turbines and generators that will account for more than 30 percent of Argentina's new power generation capacity. That supports jobs for Argentinean and American workers alike and will provide Argentina with higher quality, lower cost, more environmentally friendly power to keep engines humming, classrooms lit, and the economy growing. It is clearly the kind of win-win situation we see repeated over and over again.

And of course, we see in Argentina a mirror of what is happening around the region today as barriers fall and trade expands and people everywhere gain greater opportunities for new jobs, new skills, and higher incomes. We see it also as a harbinger of what we might build in the future in all of this region for all of the people.

Since 1993, when I took office and established a new economic policy that focused on reducing our deficit, investing in our future, and expanding trade, expanding trade has accounted for one-third of America's strong economic growth. Now I am working to persuade Congress to renew the fast-track authority traditionally given to Presidents so that we can do even more to speed the falling of barriers and the opening of doors.

Latin America's emerging markets are expected to grow more than twice as fast as the economies of the advanced industrial nations. Now, it is clearly in the United States interest to be at the forefront of that for the next generation. But I want to emphasize to all of you that this is, for us, about more than economics. We also want to be genuine partners in seizing all the opportunities and meeting all the challenges of this new age. It's about far more than just trade figures. It's also about political partnerships, the preservation of democracy, the strengthening of the social contract to include all people who aspire to better lives, the ability to fight drugs and crime and terrorism, the ability to build a future that is consistent with the dreams of those who founded all our nations.

Argentina is at the heart of movements bringing our hemisphere together, working with your neighbors through MERCOSUR and your strategic alliance with Brazil to spur democracy, economic reform, and regional security cooperation. MERCOSUR not only expands trade and prosperity, it has also reinforced democracy and promoted peace, as greater independence and

shared hopes for the future make a return to past hostilities unthinkable.

The United States welcomes constructive efforts by others to bring our hemisphere together. Every step taken, whether it's MERCOSUR, NAFTA, CARICOM, the Andean Pact, helps to build momentum toward what I believe should be all our ultimate goal, a free-trade area of the Americas.

President Menem and I reached agreement that we should launch comprehensive negotiations at the Santiago summit in April, moving from a common agenda to a common action plan. This, after all, is the course we all embraced at the Summit of the Americas in Miami in late 1994. We share a vision of a thriving American market of 800 million people from Point Barrow, Alaska, to Patagonia, investing in each other's future, enriching each other's lives, strengthening each other's institutions for freedom and democracy and peace and security.

But even as we work to open markets, we need to make sure that expanding commerce closes, rather than widens, the gaps between the haves and have-nots in our hemisphere. We don't want to leave anyone behind, and it is not in our interests to do so, for in the 21st century, increasingly, the wealth of nations will lie in the minds and hearts of people. We can and must ensure that rising trade means a rising standard of living for all.

How are we to do this? Some, even in countries that have done very well, like ours, believe that we should become more protectionist. But it's not an option. It will only make things worse, for the world economy, whether any government likes it or not, is already on a fast track. None of us can shut the world out or pretend somehow that we can compete in the global economy by closing ourselves off from our neighbors. We are riding a great tide of change, and we can turn it into a powerful tide of progress for all people, provided the benefits and the burdens are shared fairly and the policies are wise and free people to fulfill their own destinies.

That means deepening democracy and the rule of law, including the free press and the independent judiciary that serve our citizens everywhere. The same rule of law that protects human rights upholds the sanctity of contracts and helps to build a stable investment environment. We must also insist on worker protections so that trade enhances working conditions instead of undermines them. We must promote sustainable development and prove that you can, and indeed must, protect the environment as we grow the economy. And we must equip all our people with the education, the training, and the skills they need to succeed in the 21st century world. We must master the new technology that can bring all people into the future and bring them all into the same world of knowledge, no matter where they live. We can make it so that every book, every map, every work of art is at every child's fingertips with the click of a computer mouse. But first they must have access to computers, and they need to know how to use them.

Just as the Internet is transforming education, it is also expanding the horizons of commerce. Already Argentines can purchase everything from books to computer equipment with the simple stroke of a keyboard. Trade on the Internet is growing so fast that in just a few years it will generate hundreds of billions of dollars in goods and services. It is, indeed, already the fastest growing social organism in all of human history.

If we establish an environment in which electronic commerce can thrive, free from unnecessary governmental regulations or other burdens, then every computer will be a window of opportunity for every business in the world. A global network of sales and distribution will be within reach of even the smallest or most isolated company. You can start a business today and trade around the world tomorrow. That's what the Internet will mean. But in order for the digital economy to flourish, it must be market led. President Menem and I discussed the importance of making sure that this dynamic medium is not weighed down by the heavy hand of government.

We live in a time of extraordinary opportunity. Revolutions in technology, information, and communications bring our people and our nations closer than ever before, opening new possibilities and also giving the organized forces of destruction new opportunities to reap ill-gotten gains through crime and drugs and terrorism.

The promise before us is bright, but it is not inevitable. We must seize the opportunities and we must meet the challenges and we must do it together. We have to focus on the future, not the past; on embracing all, not dividing our people as they have been too often; on building an economy that works for everyone who is willing to work in it. We have to make our common

commitment to peace and freedom, to prosperity and democracy, and we have to make it irreversible.

If we support these policies and this direction, then we can make our entire region an image of what we'd all like to be, a place where freedom and prosperity go hand in hand, a place where everyone feels that he or she has a chance, where every boy or girl believes that they can grow up in dignity to live out their dreams, a place where we work together to fight those terrible threats of crime and terrorism and drugs, a shield against whatever storms the future may bring, an alliance to seize whatever new chance the future may hold; a model, in short, for the 21st century world.

That is what I want for the Americas, that is what you are building every day here in Argentina, and that is what I hope together we can build for our children.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:58 a.m. at the Sheraton Buenos Aires. In his remarks, he referred to Carlos Fedrigotti, president, American Chamber of Commerce.

Interview With Argentine Reporters in Buenos Aires
October 17, 1997

MERCOSUR Trade and the World View

Q. I will begin with a question about one of the main aspects of your visit to Brazil and Argentina, which was the MERCOSUR question. During several months it appeared that there were controversial views in the U.S. concerning MERCOSUR. Since you strongly backed, both in Brazil and Argentina, MERCOSUR, the question is how you built up your conclusion or your position over the MERCOSUR, and did you consider, eventually, other approaches before taking a final decision, particularly in Brazil the other day?

The President. Well, I think that the impression developed—first of all, let's talk about how the impression developed.

Q. Yes.

The President. I think the impression developed because some people in the Government and in the press in America I think had the impression that MERCOSUR might be used as a vehicle to limit the growth of trade and investment with the United States in ways that would have adverse consequences for our long-term political as well as our economic cooperation. Now, let me say, at the end of the cold war there were Americans who felt that way about the European Union as well. When I became President, there was a group of people, good people, in our Government, permanent civil servants, who had the same feeling about the European Union.

But I have a very different view. I believe that the United States should do whatever it can to promote the political and economic cooperation of democracies, not simply to grow the economy but in a larger sense to lift the conditions of ordinary people and to strengthen democratic institutions so that they cannot be reversed, and finally, because the threats we face today at the end of the cold war are much more likely to be threats that cross national borders, like terrorism, drugs, organized crime, as opposed to threats from other nations. So we all have to adjust our thinking.

What I'm trying to do is to promote a process of reorganization of the world so that human beings are organized in a way that takes advantage of the new opportunities of this era and permits them to beat back the problems. If you start with that presumption, instead of a political organization in South America that doesn't include us is a threat to us, then you come to a very different conclusion. My conclusion is that MERCOSUR has been good for the countries that are members of it because they've torn down barriers among each other. That helps them all economically. At the same time, our trade with all the MERCOSUR nations has increased.

And it permits other things. For example, Brazil and Argentina worked with us to stop the interruption of the democratic process in Paraguay. We now have the problems of potential terrorist activities in the tri-border—the

countries are now better equipped to do that. So to me this is a positive thing.

Now, having said that, what I had hoped to do on this trip is to convince the leaders, not just the Presidents but the leadership generally, that it is also in our interest to follow through on the commitment we made at the Summit of the Americas in Miami to work toward a free trade area of the Americas, and to see MERCOSUR, NAFTA, Andean Pact, CARICOM as building blocks in this. This is very important, because if the rest of the world should happen not to agree with us philosophically, then having a big trade area will be a great insurance policy for all these countries. And if we can prove that you can merge integrated economies and integrated democracies, then we'll be more likely to build a global system of this kind.

So that's a long answer, but anyway it's important that you understand that this MERCOSUR issue for me is part of a very big world view. I just never felt as threatened by it as a lot of people who saw it in terms of this particular negotiation over this tariff or this custom or that sort of thing.

Social Inequity

Q. Mr. President, in this era of free market in the region, the problem of social inequity is a great deal for our countries and also for the strength of our democracy. I would like to have your views about that.

The President. First of all, I think it's important to point out that this problem of social inequity is a problem that every country in the world is facing, even countries with very robust growth. No country has solved the problem perfectly of how to grow the economy and preserve more equality and at the same time move more poor people into the middle class.

Let me just give you a couple of examples. Look at France, which has a very strong social contract but pays for it with very high unemployment. Great Britain has opted for a policy more like ours, where they're generating lots of jobs now—their unemployment rate is 6.5 percent, only about a point and a half higher——

Q. Five-point-nine yesterday.

The President. ——5.9 yesterday, so it's only a point higher than ours. And they're open to immigrants now, as the United States is. But as a result of that, because the modern economy favors technology and education, they've had increasing inequality there, just as we have.

I think it's important to point out that most of this is due to the structural changes in all advanced economies driven by technology. Trade is a part of it, but mostly it's the changing of the paradigm, if you will, away from the industrial society to the information age. And I believe the answer is to have the Government have less destructive involvement in the economy, but the Government should have more constructive involvement in the society.

Basically, you have to do, I think, three things. You have to, first of all, have a system of lifetime education and training so that everybody can participate. Secondly, you have to have a strategy to bring the benefits of free markets to the places that are untouched. Technology can help. Investment can help. I think that is very important. And thirdly, you have to have adequate protections for people who, through no fault of their own, are not participating. This is easy to say and difficult to do, because if it costs too much to do this you will weigh down the economy. But essentially that is what must be done.

So the challenge in Argentina, the challenge in Brazil, the challenge in Latin America is, in a different way, the challenge that we in America face—in the United States—and that the Europeans are trying to do—even the Japanese now are having to deal with it. So this is the new social challenge of the 21st century. The answer is not to withdraw from the trade or to pretend that the technology doesn't exist, the answer is to get all the benefits.

Argentina, for example—I will make you a prediction here. If you can maintain these levels of growth that you have now, your unemployment will go down, but it will not go as low as you want unless you have real systems to create more small businesses, to hook small business into technology and exports, and to create much more universally effective education systems. But that's no criticism of the last 7 years; you had to fix all the problems of the past before you can confront the challenges of the present.

Integrity in Government

Q. Mr. President, to follow up what you just said, corruption makes inequality even worse. You said that the applying of the term "endemic corruption" to Brazil has been a mistake. What's

the precise meaning of widespread corruption that had been implied in the same document to the Argentine situation?

The President. Well, first of all, I wasn't even familiar with this document. I didn't know it was issued. I don't know who wrote it.

But let me back up and say, when you are in a period where the Government has had heavy-handed involvement in the economy and then things start to change and arrangements are unsettled, that's a point where, in general, civil societies are vulnerable to corruption. Also, human nature being what it is, there will nearly always be someone somewhere who is doing something wrong.

So what you want, however, is a system where the incentives are to be honest; where there are disincentives, sanctions, for being dishonest; and where you're moving in the right direction. I told President Menem—we had a talk about this last night. I was complimenting President Caldera of Venezuela because he took the lead in making sure that our hemisphere—we have, basically, the only convention against corruption of any hemisphere in the world.

And I said to President Menem, and I said to the young people at the townhall meeting yesterday, what my experience is, just from my life in politics. And that is that if a civil society can maintain a vigorous free press, an economy that works, and you can just preserve democracy, time takes care of a lot of this. That is, I believe that 20 years from now, an American President will be sitting here and either you will be sitting here or your successors will be, and I will predict to you that if democracy survives in Argentina, which I believe it will, there will be less corruption, but you could still ask a question about corruption. Do you see what I mean? You could still ask.

So what my advice would be here, because this country has come so far so fast, moving away from some of its darkest moments not very long ago and also moving away from the heavy-handed control of the state over the economy, that the focus should be on maintaining a vigorous and safe free press, making sure that the economy operates according to internationally accepted norms, and preserving democracy.

I had a great talk not very long ago with Senator Dole, who was my opponent in the last election. We have quite an interesting and good relationship, I think, and he was in Congress for 35 years. So I said to him, "Bob"—the Washington press was full of something at the moment, I can't even remember what it was—I said, "Bob, is Washington more honest today, or less, than 30 years ago?" He said, "It's not close. They're much more honest."

Q. Much more honest?

The President. Much more. And the same thing is true everywhere. In other words, barring some unforeseeable development, it always gets better if you can keep the press free and vigilant and if you can keep the economy operating with some integrity. And just the passage of time strengthens the presumption of democracy and freedom and accountability. So it will get better here if that can happen—everywhere.

Education

Q. Mr. President, in your trip here and in Brazil and Venezuela, was there anything that was striking or that surprised you, that changed your idea of these countries or what American policy should be towards them? I mean, what did you learn on this trip?

The President. Well, first of all, I would say that I feel that the potential for both growth and greatness in these societies is even greater than I had imagined. I think that the potential for America to have a constructive partnership and actually help deal with some of these challenges that countries face—and they're different in all three countries—is even greater than I had imagined, as long as it's clear that we are dealing in an atmosphere of mutual respect and equality.

And I think that the potential for solving at least some of the worst social problems is greater than I had imagined. That is, when I was in Brazil I went to a school in a very poor neighborhood in Rio, where the children came out of circumstances that were very difficult, and they were doing quite well. And it seems to me that one of the obligations that the United States has through our business community here is to do more throughout Latin America to give that kind of educational experience to children. If I could do one thing in sort of a crash way, it would be to try to revolutionize the quality and reach of education for all the children of the region.

Free Press and Civil Society

Q. You spoke about the freedom of the press. You might be aware that in Argentina there's a coexistence between freedom of the press and

then serious threats and actions against the press.

The President. I'm very aware of that.

Q. For example, the assassination of Jose Luis Cabeza, a photojournalist. This morning the papers inform, quite, I hate to say, unprecisely about some initiative you probably told the government about supporting the press in an international, American, Pan American——

The President. Again, on this issue, I can't comment on the specifics of, because I don't know. I'm aware that the photographer was killed, and I know a lot of your reporters have been threatened and that the problem from your point of view must be the question of whether this can be stopped in specific cases.

But what I said to President Menem yesterday was that, again, this is something that—Argentina is building a civil society, and it has to be built brick by brick. And the fact that the press is free is a good thing. The fact that some people feel free to at least threaten and perhaps harm members of the press is a bad thing. So to get beyond that you have to build even more bricks in the house of civil society.

What I suggested was that the OSCE, the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, actually has a press ombudsman, which has become quite important because we have all these countries converting from communism to free societies—again, coming to grips with this from a different background, but it's the same sort of issue. And most of our people who deal with it think this has been quite a good thing. So I suggested that perhaps he and other leaders here might support an initiative to do the same thing within the OAS, so that we could help every country where this is an issue, through an ombudsman who could say, not only this particular case has to be dealt with, but here are institutional changes that could be made in this, that, or the other country, that would make it better. That was my precise suggestion.

Q. But that ombudsman, what kind of questions would it deal with?

The President. Well, it would deal with whatever questions the OAS was willing to refer to it. But I think the idea would be to be able to take specific cases and build a system where those kinds of cases didn't come forward. Of course, the individual case would still have to be handled through the justice system, but the point is maybe a press ombudsman would say, "Look, here's the sort of judicial system every country in OAS should have," or "Here's the kind of judicial training center we ought to have." That's another one of our proposals, battling around the OAS—to set up a common judicial training center so that every country could send their judges there, and we could have generally accepted systems which would help to build a civil society.

Attacks on Buenos Aires Jewish Community

Q. Mr. President, are you aware or were you requested any kind of classified information from the FBI or the CIA by the Jewish organization that interviewed you yesterday regarding the attack at the Embassy and the AMIA?

The President. Well, the press report on that was a little bit misleading today—I don't think on purpose. But let me explain what I said.

Q. That's why I was questioning.

The President. Yes, I'm glad you asked. What I said was that the judge with oversight on the case had already talked to both the FBI and the CIA. The families of the victims and their advocates believe that perhaps there are some people in our Government or some people who've been involved in this who have some information that has not been turned over. What I said was that I would go back to our sources, our people, and see if we could get any more information; I would do everything I could.

I think there was a little misunderstanding, perhaps in the translation, when I simply pointed out that when we operate in other countries we sometimes talk to people who deserve the right to be protected, and we have general rules that we follow—not in Argentina, everywhere in the world—to try to make sure that we never put anyone at risk who is helping us. But we're going to see if we have information we have not turned over that we can give to the appropriate authorities so we can go forward with this.

This would be a very good thing, not only for the families of the victims but for Argentina, if we could actually resolve the cases of the bombing of the Embassy and the community center.

Argentina-U.S. Relations

Q. Argentina and U.S. relations were not always like today. What really changed, according to you, and when you first perceived that such a change was underway?

The President. Well, I think in the nearest term what has changed is that Argentina moved away from military governments that oppress and kill its people, toward not only a democracy but a democracy under President Menem that has genuinely reached out to the rest of the world and tried to open not only the economy but the society. Even the debates you are having about the government here are evidence of that. So I think that's the first and most important thing.

Then I think the United States—I would hope that this is true; it's self-serving for me to say this, but I hope it's true—the United States, since I've been President, we have had a genuine interest in establishing a new kind of partnership with Latin America. President Roosevelt wanted to do it. He wanted to be a good neighbor, but the cold war intervened. He died. The cold war intervened. Things happened. President Kennedy wanted to do it. He wanted an Alliance for Progress. But there were difficulties which made it impossible to have a continuing effort. And then some of our Presidents just simply disagreed. They saw every development in Latin America as a manifestation of what was happening in the cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union.

I saw, as the first President who would govern completely at the end of the cold war, an opportunity essentially to go back to the vision of Bolivar. And we are becoming more alike, not only because of the globalization of our economy and the universality of our communications but because Spanish-speaking Americans are our fastest growing group and because we share now these values of democracy and peace and security.

So I think all these things have played a role. I hope that I have played a role. I was the first President, I believe, to appoint an envoy to all of the Americas, Mack McLarty, my former Chief of Staff. I don't think any President has ever done anything like that before. So I have a person that is very close to me actually in the region all the time, knowing the leaders, knowing the people working with this.

But I think none of it would have been possible if first you hadn't had the changes in Argentina. Because if we are totally at odds with a country over its human rights policy, over its political policy, over whether it's open to the United States in a genuine partnership, then even our ability to lay down the mistakes we've made in the past as a country would not have made it possible. So the two things happened together.

NOTE: The interview began at 11:05 a.m. at the Sheraton Hotel. In his remarks, the President referred to President Carlos Menem of Argentina and President Rafael Caldera of Venezuela. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Statement on the Japan-United States Trade Agreement on Access to Japanese Ports

October 17, 1997

I am pleased that our negotiators have reached an agreement in principle that will open trade in Japan's ports and level the playing field for American shippers. We have long pressed Japan for a firm commitment to liberalize trade in its ports, and today they have done just that. Japan has agreed to provide an expedited licensing process for American ships entering its ports and to support an alternative to the port services provided by the Japanese Harbor Transportation Authority. Those provisions, after the details are worked out, will allow America's shippers to compete and win in the global marketplace. I want to congratulate our negotiators for all of their hard work on behalf of America's businesses and workers.

Statement on Line Item Vetoes of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998

October 17, 1997

I have used my line item veto today to save taxpayers $19 million by canceling eight projects in the 1998 Energy and Water Appropriations Act that are unwarranted.

Today marks the sixth time I have used my line item veto authority to save the taxpayers money by canceling unjustified, special interest provisions. The savings are real—$2 billion to the taxpayers. Just as important, the threat of a line item veto serves as a deterrent to ill-conceived, special interest spending proposals.

For today's action, the cancellations include five water projects that I did not request in my budget; that are new rather than ongoing projects; that have greater costs than benefits; that are recreational for a limited number of people; or that should be funded at the local level. I also canceled three projects that are unwarranted corporate subsidies.

In taking this action, I tried to show deference to Congress' role in the appropriations process. I accepted the vast majority of the 423 projects in this bill that I did not request in my budget. Nevertheless, I feel strongly that my administration should look for opportunities to save taxpayer dollars by striking unwarranted provisions of bills that come before me.

In addition, I am also announcing today that I want to work with Congress to find a solution to the growing problem of future liabilities and extended delays in completing ongoing projects. Each year, Congress adds more and more projects without sufficient resources to complete existing projects in a timely way. Some of them include 50-year Federal commitments, involving hundreds of millions of dollars. The more projects are added, the longer the delays in finishing the existing ones.

Because of limited Federal resources, the gap between the number of projects that are approved and the number we can afford will keep growing. I believe that now is the time for the administration and Congress to address the problem. I have asked the administration's senior officials who work in this area to reach out to the key Member of Congress to work toward a solution.

NOTE: The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on October 20. H.R. 2203, approved October 13, was assigned Public Law No. 105–62.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting Line Item Vetoes of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998

October 17, 1997

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

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel the dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the "Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998" (H.R. 2203, approved October 13, 1997). I have determined that the cancellation of these amounts will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachments, constitutes a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on October 20. H.R. 2203, approved October 13, was assigned Public Law No. 105–62.

Statement on the Death of James A. Michener
October 17, 1997

Hillary and I are greatly saddened by the loss of one of our country's most gifted storytellers, James A. Michener. Through his rich narratives woven on the grandest scale, Michener made our imaginations soar and our history come alive. From the sandy shores of the South Pacific to the barren tundra of Alaska, we followed Michener on epic journeys through time and place, along the way celebrating such time-honored virtues as patriotism, courage, and common sense. And even after achieving great fame and wealth, Michener never forgot his humble roots. He was a major benefactor to colleges and writers' groups, eventually donating much of his fortune for the benefit of others. America has lost a rich voice and a generous spirit.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Narcotics Traffickers Centered in Colombia
October 17, 1997

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

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia is to continue in effect for 1 year beyond October 21, 1997.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on October 21, 1995, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to maintain economic pressure on significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia by blocking their property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and by depriving them of access to the U.S. market and financial system.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The notice is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

The President's Radio Address
October 18, 1997

Good morning. This week Hillary and I have been visiting our neighbors in South America. Along with the distinguished American delegation of Congressmen, several Cabinet members, and other members of the administration, we've savored the hospitality and the uniqueness of each country. But as we've traveled from Venezuela to Brazil to Argentina, we've also had the chance to see that much more unites the people of the Americas than separates us.

We cherish the same values: freedom and equality, family and community, peace and democracy. We aspire to prosperity through free enterprise, open markets, a commitment to give everyone who will work for it a chance to succeed, and a dedication to preserving the environment while growing the economy. And we all believe in providing all our children with a world-class education so that they can fulfill their God-given promise in the 21st century.

Last summer's balanced budget agreement, with the largest new investment in education since 1965, will take us a long way toward our sweeping but straightforward agenda. By the year 2000, we want to ensure that every 8-year-old can read, every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old can go on to college, and every adult can keep on learning.

On this trip, we worked to establish education partnerships with other countries, especially in bringing the benefits of technology and the Internet to even the very poorest neighborhoods and village schools.

Back home, as the new school year gets really underway, we're hooking up more of our own classrooms to the Internet, kicking off the America Reads program to mobilize a huge number of volunteers, especially college students and young AmeriCorps team leaders, to make sure that all of our children can read independently by the third grade. And we're finally opening the doors of college to anyone who is willing to work for it, with more Pell grants and work-study slots, the $1,500-a-year HOPE scholarship tax credit for the first 2 years of college, and tax cuts and education IRA's to help students pay for the cost of the junior and senior years, graduate school, and other training.

Still, we can't rest. A vital and vigorous debate over how best to improve public education will be waiting for me when I get back to Washington. Everyone knows we need to do more to boost the quality of public schools; the question is, how? Some people think we should give students vouchers to help pay for private schools if they don't think public schools are good enough. They say the competition will even make the public schools better. It may sound like a good argument, but I think it's wrong. Too many of our public schools are underfunded already, and besides, there are better ways to improve the public schools in a way that doesn't siphon off precious tax dollars to help a few students at the expense of the other 90 percent.

My strategy is to set high standards, measure student performance against them, inject more competition and choice into the public school system, and support local initiatives like school uniforms, after-school and summer-school programs that increase order, safety, and learning.

First, we must set national standards of academic achievement and then have voluntary tests, starting with fourth-grade reading and eighth-grade math, to measure them. Second, we must recruit more volunteers to America Reads so that we can have an army of volunteer reading tutors in our schools, helping every child read independently by the end of the third grade. Third, we must also bring more choice and competition into public education. The right way to do this is by empowering more parents and students to choose the public schools they attend and by bringing more charter schools to more communities.

Since I became President, the number of public charter schools in America has grown from one to 700. Parents, educators, and community leaders are creating and operating these new schools within the public school system that are freed from bureaucratic redtape but accountable to parents, students, and communities that support them. And they stay open only if they meet the high standards of performance.

I endorse bipartisan efforts in the House and Senate to help communities open 3,000 more charter schools in the coming years by giving States incentives to issue more charters, more flexibility to try new reforms and strengthen accountability, and funds to help them get started, funds guaranteed in our balanced budget agreement. Now, that's a good example of what I mean when I say politics should stop at the schoolhouse door.

We also have to strengthen existing schools. I support another bipartisan proposal that will help low-achieving, low-income schools transform themselves through proven reforms, everything from intensive reading instruction to school uniforms to after-school tutoring to mandatory summer school for students who fall behind.

Virtually every problem facing our schools today has been solved by a community somewhere in America. We have to bring these solutions to the schools that need them the most. The good news is we can do it, as the rising performance of our students compared to students in other nations shows.

Our schools are improving, and they can get better, much better. No single magic bullet will improve our schools, but high standards, the voluntary tests to measure them, good teaching, well-run schools with the latest technology, and old-fashioned, safe, orderly environments will make education better. Working together, we can do it. Our children deserve no less, and our Nation's future depends upon it.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 8:15 a.m. on October 17 in Room 2233 of the Sheraton Hotel in Buenos Aires, Argentina, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on October 18.

Remarks at Nahuel Huapi National Park in San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina

October 18, 1997

President Menem, distinguished members of the Argentine Government, Governor Verani, Mayor Miguel, Dr. Varotta, Director Suarez, and Colonel Cabana, thank you very much.

Mr. President, let me begin by thanking you for your wonderful hospitality to Hillary, to me, to all of our team from the Cabinet and the American administration. We're very grateful to you. We are also grateful for our broad and deep partnership with Argentina. From peacekeeping missions around the globe to our cooperation in the far reaches of outer space, from expanding trade to extending its benefits to all our people, from the peaceful use of nuclear power to the fight against terrorism, over the last 2 days we have worked hard to deepen our cooperation to benefit all of our people.

For the children in this audience, our partnership to protect the environment of our nations and the entire globe is perhaps the most important part of what we must do together.

Eighty-four years ago this month, two visionaries of the Americas arrived together in this place where nature and civilization meet. One was Theodore Roosevelt. No American President had spent more time thinking about the New World as a community of democracies; no American President had done more to preserve and protect our natural environment. His traveling companion was Perito Moreno, the man who founded this magnificent domain, Nahuel Huapi National Park, a remarkable gift to future generations.

Mr. President, it is up to us now to act with the foresight and in the spirit of Roosevelt and Moreno in dealing with today's great environmental challenges: how to bring the blessings of global growth to all nations and still protect not just our national environments but the planet itself.

One of our severest challenges clearly is climate change. The evidence is compelling that increasing emissions of greenhouse gases are leading to the warming of our planet and that global warming could lead to profound and destructive changes in the way we lead our lives. Among the consequences will be the more rapid spread of diseases, the rising of the oceans, flooding lowlands on various continents and islands in the oceans, and more frequent and severe weather events in all continents, including more severe droughts and floods.

Five years ago, the nations of the world began to address this challenge at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. This December, when more than 150 nations gather in Kyoto, Japan, we can make, and we must make, more progress toward a solution. Our goal must be to set realistic and binding limits on greenhouse gas emissions and then to create a blueprint to guide us for the future.

In meeting the challenge of climate change, clearly the United States and the rest of the developed world must lead. For today, industrialized nations produce most of the greenhouse gases that go into our atmosphere. But emissions from the developing world are expected to grow dramatically. Forty years from now, they will exceed those of developed countries. Since the issue is how to stabilize and reduce greenhouse gases in the entire atmosphere, this is clearly a global problem in which we must all do our share.

I applaud the leadership of President Menem in Argentina in affirming today that developing as well as developed nations should have emissions targets. And we have agreed to pursue joint implementation, an important tool that will allow the United States and Argentine businesses to adopt the most cost-effective emissions reductions. We have seen clearly in the United States over and over again that we solve our environmental problems more quickly when we work together with technology and markets through the private sector.

I want to make it clear that the strategy we embrace today does not ask developing nations to sacrifice the legitimate aspirations of their people for economic growth. Instead, it offers an important opening to chart a new energy course that is consistent with growth but makes sure that today's progress does not come at tomorrow's expense.

This endeavor will require sustained, committed partnership. The United States is committed to providing a billion dollars to help developing nations find alternative energy sources and use them more efficiently. Next year at the Summit of the Americas in Santiago, we hope to make sustainable development a cornerstone of a new era in inter-American cooperation.

As you have heard from the previous speakers, technology, science, and education are important allies in preserving the environment. Here in Bariloche, Argentina is building satellites that NASA will launch. And then from high above the Earth's atmosphere, they will help us to keep an eye on our planet's changing contours, including surveying the forest in Chaco and Mesopotamia, predicting agricultural patterns in La Pampa, monitoring the deserts in Patagonia, even tracking endangered whales in the south Atlantic.

And the GLOBE program is using the Internet to teach students here and in over 50 other countries that a solid grasp of science and ecology is indeed the first step toward a cleaner world. Today I am pleased to announce that working with Argentina, we're establishing a new GLOBE program at a school in a very special place, Antarctica, a treasure held in trust for every person on Earth. I'm also pleased that the United States National Park Service and the Argentine National Parks Administration has signed an agreement for a 5-year program of cooperation.

If you look at the national park around us here and its power to renew the soul, it certainly gives evidence to the truth of what the Argentine writer Victoria Ocampo wrote, when she said, "We possess only what we really love." Well, this land belongs to everyone. It is protected by the Government, but we must all love it.

Yesterday, Mr. President, Hillary and I had a chance to walk through the magical Arrayanes Forest. It was an experience we will never forget. And it gave us a renewed dedication to work with you to preserve our planet for these children and those whom they represent, the world over.

At the dawn of a new century, let us resolve not only to give our children remarkable new economic and educational opportunities but to preserve our hemisphere and our Earth and to give new meaning to the words *Nuevo Mundo*.

Thank you, Mr. President.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:05 a.m. at the Llao Llao Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to President Carlos Menem of Argentina; Gov. Pablo Verani, Rio Negro Province; Mayor Cesar Miguel of San Carlos de Bariloche; Conrado Franco Varotta, Executive Director, Argentine National Commission for Space; Carlos Suarez, executive director, Institute of Energy Economics, Bariloche Foundation; and Col. Robert D. Cabana, USMC, NASA astronaut.

Radio Remarks on Voluntary National Testing for Basic Education Skills

October 20, 1997

A new study released by the Department of Education today confirms what most of us knew instinctively already: Students, especially low income students, who challenge themselves with rigorous math and science courses in high school are much more likely to go on to college.

I've worked hard to make college affordable for all Americans. Our increased Pell grants and work-study positions, the new HOPE scholarship tax credits for the first 2 years of college, and other tax credits in education IRA's for the remaining years, graduate school, and other training, all these will truly open the doors of college to all who are willing to work for it.

We've addressed the economic barriers. Now we have to tackle the academic ones. While the studies show that taking algebra in middle school was essential to preparing for advanced math and science classes, just 25 percent of our eighth graders took algebra in 1996. We must do better. That's why I call upon all Americans to support our voluntary national tests for fourth-grade reading and eighth-grade math, to ensure that all our children meet the high standards of academic excellence they'll need to succeed in tomorrow's world. Our math test will make sure our children master algebra and prepare for math and science courses that lead to college.

I call upon Congress to end the delays. Our children are counting on us.

NOTE: These remarks were recorded at 9:43 a.m. on October 17 in Room 2233 at the Sheraton Hotel in Buenos Aires, Argentina, for later domestic broadcast, and released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 20.

Remarks on the America Reads Initiative

October 21, 1997

Thank you very much. Secretary Riley, Dr. Corrigan, Senator Kennedy, Senator Specter, Congressmen Etheridge and Miller and Hoyer. And I thank the Members of Congress not here in both parties who support this program.

Thank you, Eric Castillo, for what you do and for representing a new generation of American college students, I believe among the most idealistic and community service-oriented young people we have ever had in the colleges and universities of this country, and a rebuke to the superficial and downright wrong characterizations of generation X as not caring about the future of this country. And I thank you for that.

And thank you, Victoria, for reading the book with me and making me look good. [*Laughter*] You did an excellent job. Her mother is here. I'd like to ask her mother to stand. Thank you very much for coming. [*Applause*] And they did a great job. Thank you. I thank all the other young students and all the other college students who are here, and a special word of thanks to all the college and university presidents who have joined us today.

We have just seen a concrete and, I thought, very moving example of the difference reading can make in the lives of our children. We also ought to remember the difference that this can make in the future of our country as we move into a new century and a very different time.

In the last 5 years, together we have done a lot to prepare our country for the 21st century: a new economic policy that works, a new crime policy that works, a new welfare reform policy that works, expanding health care coverage to our children, improving the environment, now opening the doors of college to all who are willing to work for it. But to fundamentally succeed in having an America where opportunity is open to everyone who will work for it and where everyone can be a part of a thriving American community, we must give all our children the world's best education.

By the year 2000, we should succeed in seeing that every 8-year-old can read independently, that every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, that every 18-year-old can go on to college, and that every adult in our country can continue to learn for a lifetime.

We have made historic progress toward these goals. Last summer's balanced budget contained the biggest increased investment in education since 1965, the biggest increase in access to higher education since the GI bill 50 years ago. It will go a long way toward funding our mission to connect every classroom and library to the Internet by the year 2000. But all of this progress will be limited if our children do not first master the basics. The next major step is

to make sure every 8-year-old can do what Secretary Riley's grandchild and Victoria can do—they can say, "I can read this book all by myself."

We know that children who don't read well by the end of the third grade are more likely to drop out of school and far less likely to realize their full potential. We know that children who receive the help they need are much more likely to succeed in school and in life.

Today, 40 percent of our Nation's 8-year-olds are not reading as well as they should. There are many reasons for this. We come from many different places, and we have more and more young children whose first language is not even English. But none of these reasons is an excuse for our inaction, particularly when we see that action can produce the kind of results that Victoria showed us today.

That is one of the reasons that I have supported high national standards for reading and national examinations to make sure our children are reaching those standards. And that is the main reason we have launched America Reads. Over a year ago, it began with a simple idea, that a well-trained, coordinated army of a million volunteers could be rallied to teach our children. I called on every sector of society to help us mobilize this citizen army, specifically challenging colleges and universities to use their new work-study slots to train tutors. There are 300,000 of those new slots that have been approved by our Congress in the last 2 years. And to help them do it, we waived the requirement that colleges pay 25 percent of work-study wages.

Our college and university presidents and our college students have more than risen to meet this challenge. Last December, 21 college presidents, led by President Corrigan, pledged to start these programs for their students and urge others to do the same. You heard President Corrigan say that now almost 800 colleges and universities have joined America Reads. These voluntary commitments will reach hundreds of thousands of children and help them to reach their dreams. And I might say that a lot of the colleges and universities are finding that they have more people who want to participate than they have work-study slots. They even have people who want to participate who aren't eligible for work-study and just want to do it because they think it's the right thing to do.

At Yale, 300 students applied for 60 work-study slots. At the University of Michigan, 400 applied for 84 slots. At Miami Dade Community College, our Nation's largest community college, more than 150 tutors have been trained and already are helping students throughout your hometown. In Boston, an energetic group appropriately called Jump Start teamed up with several local colleges to connect work-study students to children who need help. These are just a few examples.

I want to join Secretary Riley and thank my longtime friend Carol Rasco for the outstanding leadership she has given this program. I thank the Department of Education. But most of all, I thank the young people of this country who are responding to the challenge.

And I might say also, as we all know, the challenge is not wholly confined to our colleges and universities. I just received the quarterly report of the church that Hillary and I attend here in Washington. They have 45 members of the church involved in America Reads. This idea is catching fire in America. The interest is there, the concern is there, the commitment is there to meet our goal.

That's why it is so important for Congress to fund America Reads, as President Corrigan said. It was agreed as part of our balanced budget agreement. The proposal will pay for 25,000 reading specialists and coordinators to coordinate the tutor training and support we need to enlist, train, and put into action the entire army of America Reads volunteers to serve every child in America, like Victoria and the others who are here, who are out there waiting to meet a volunteer.

Also, because parents are our children's first and most important teachers, the proposal includes challenge grants to help parents do more to teach their children to read. I think that is critically important, and that is a part of the program that is in the budget. These approaches are the best things we know to do to teach our kids to read. They're already working in places like Simpson County, Kentucky, where AmeriCorps members help students jump an average of 3 grade levels in 8 months; working in Reading, Ohio, where trained parent volunteers are helping their kindergarten-aged children make 3 times the progress of children who don't get the extra help; working in my home State of Arkansas, where the Home Institution Program for Preschool Youngsters, HIPPYS,

brings parents into their children's learning process with stunning results; working here in the District of Columbia, where this February we launched DC Reads to bring together literacy programs and local volunteer reading tutors. With America Reads, it can work all over the country for every child who needs it.

This reflects the commitment, I might add, that thousands of Americans made at the Presidents' Summit on Service in Philadelphia a few months ago, to marshal the resources of every part of our society to help our children get a good education, get basic health care, do it in a safe environment with adult mentors, and with a chance for all children themselves to serve.

We've made a lot of progress since the summit on all fronts. Especially, I want to note that we've increased the number of AmeriCorps scholarships, recognized high school service, encouraged private businesses to help parents move from welfare to work. But we have to give all children the chance to learn and all Americans the chance to serve. The great thing about America Reads is it serves two of the goals of the summit: It gives children a good education, and it gives young people the chance to serve.

It would be a shame, with all the children out there who still need help learning to read and who want to get it, with all the parents who are yearning to do the best job they can as parents raising their children, with all the idealistic students and other American citizens who want to be a part of this program—it would be a shame if we did not reach the full goal of America Reads. We have to have a bipartisan commitment to education that transcends politics. We have to have a follow-through on the bipartisan commitment to fund America Reads to its full potential.

The renowned African-American educator Mary McLeod Bethune once said, "The whole world opened up to me when I learned to read." We read "The Carrot Seed" today. Instead of the carrot, think about Victoria. Think about a million Victorias. Think about millions and millions more. We are the planters of the seed. We have to first plant the seed, and then we have to tell the doubters it will grow.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:43 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Robert A. Corrigan, president, San Francisco State University; Eric Castillo, tutor, America Reads Foundation; Victoria Adeniji, second-grade student tutored in the America Reads program, and her mother, Felicia; and Carol H. Rasco, Director, America Reads Foundation.

Remarks to the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues

October 21, 1997

Thank you, Eleanor, for that introduction. We've been friends a long time and, frankly, I had forgotten that I had done some of those things. [*Laughter*] Thank you, Nancy Johnson, Madam Secretary. Thank you, First Lady, for now spending more than half your life at least acquainted with me in some form or fashion—[*laughter*]—almost half of it married.

I congratulate the members of the caucus on 20 years of leadership. I thank Women's Policy Inc. for hosting this event, and I am delighted to be here, not only with the Secretary of State but also with Audrey Haynes, the Director of the White House Office for Women's Initiatives and Outreach, and several other outstanding senior officials of the White House.

I, too, want to pay tribute to Margaret Heckler and Elizabeth Holtzman for their vision in creating this office, for the leadership that—[*applause*]—thank you—for the past leadership of Olympia Snowe and Pat Schroeder, Connie Morella and Nita Lowey. And of course, to Nancy Johnson and Eleanor Holmes Norton, who show no lack of energy in pressing your cause with the President.

When Nancy mentioned there are now 52 members of this caucus in the House of Representatives, I was sitting next to Hillary, and I knew what she was thinking: That's about 52 too few. [*Laughter*] And I was thinking it, too, based on your record.

I think the thing that has been overlooked in this whole endeavor of trying to give more sensitivity to issues of special concern to women and trying to give women more opportunities to serve is that we live in an age where every public figure says, as if it were just a cliche, that the most important resource in any human endeavor in the private sector or the public sector is our people. And yet we cavalierly go on, in example after example after example, not giving all our people the chance to live up to the fullest of their God-given capacities and make the greatest service they can to the rest of us to promote the general welfare. I've done what I could to correct that, partly based on the example of my wife, my mother, and my grandmother, and partly because I have known so many of you personally, and partly because it is manifest that we have to find a way to reach across all the lines in our society and lift up everyone to the position of his or her highest and best use and potential.

In that connection, I would like to thank the newly confirmed Ambassador to the Vatican, Lindy Boggs, for her willingness to serve.

I've been proud to work with you on a lot of issues. Most of them have been mentioned tonight—the family and medical leave law, which has changed more lives than almost any bill that we've passed around here in a long time. Everywhere I go around the country now, people still come up to me and tell me personal stories of how that law changed their lives. The Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, the minimum wage, the child care, the adoption tax credit, increased child support enforcement, the family violence initiatives—all these things have made a difference. The hand of this caucus was felt heavily in the recent balanced budget, with the single biggest aid to education increase since '65, the biggest increase in aid to children's health since Medicaid in '65, and the children's tax credit. So, the country is in your debt.

And I do believe that the bipartisan nature of this caucus has made a profound difference. I know that we're joined tonight by the Democratic leader, Dick Gephardt, and I believe Speaker Gingrich wanted to be here and had to be in Georgia tonight. I know Mr. Gephardt would agree with me that all of us have been impressed by how you are able to stay together, work together, and, in Eleanor's terms, get down to business no matter how crazy things get in this occasionally loony town. And for that, too, we are all in your debt, for you set an example that everyone else should follow.

I'd like to talk just a moment about health issues. Hillary mentioned them and has worked on them so hard, and others have mentioned them. The budget not only provided for $24 billion to extend health coverage to 5 million children who don't have it, thus giving greater peace of mind to the parents who are raising them, both as parents and also when they're away at work, it did a lot more for the health of women. It expanded Medicare to cover bone mass measurement for women at risk of osteoporosis. Funding for osteoporosis research has now reached more than $100 million at NIH. It expanded Medicare to cover annual mammograms for all women over the age of 49 and eliminated the copayments to make these examinations more affordable. These were important things, and we have more to do.

We have to continue our focus on women's health. Since I took office, funding for breast cancer research, prevention, and treatment has almost doubled, and we've discovered two breast cancer genes, holding great promise for the development of new prevention strategies, something that's profoundly important to all of us who have ever dealt with this in our families.

We're unlocking the mysteries of the genetic code and continuing to discover new ways to diagnose and treat genetic disorders. But we know that these breakthroughs also bring with them the need for new protections. Studies show the leading reason women do not take advantage of new genetic breast cancer tests is because they fear they will be discriminated in health plans if the tests come out the wrong way. This is wrong, and it ought to be illegal.

So I want to work with you to get Congress to pass bipartisan legislation that will ban all health plans, group and individual, from denying coverage or raising premiums on the basis of genetic tests. After all, if we can get everybody to take the tests, if they know what they're up against, in the end we will prevent more severe illness, we will reduce cost to the health care system. And we shouldn't punish individuals for doing something that we know is not only in their own interest but is in the interest of society.

Also, legislation should prohibit all health plans from disclosing genetic information that could be misused by other insurers. It ought to protect researchers' ability to make the best

use of this important tool. So, again, let me applaud those, especially Representative Slaughter and Senator Snowe, for their leadership. Genetic discrimination legislation deserves action now.

Let me also say that many of you in this room have contributed to our efforts to support legislation to protect women who have had mastectomies. They shouldn't be forced out of the hospital before they're ready because of pressure from a health plan. It's unacceptable that Congress has not yet held a hearing on the DeLauro-Dingell-Roukema 48-hour mastectomy patient protection bill, and we need to keep pushing for that.

And finally, we need to keep breaking down the doors and breaking through the glass ceilings and acting to bring women the full measure of economic and legal equity to which they're entitled. This caucus and our administration, under the leadership of Aida Alvarez, continues to work to counter the effects of discrimination and long-developed networks which hinder the success of women- and minority-owned businesses. I'm proud of the fact that the SBA in the last 5 years has tripled the number of loans to women businesses, and I thank you for your support of the disadvantaged business enterprise program, which has successfully increased the percentage of women- and minority-owned construction firms. I'm pleased to say that this has now passed both Houses, and I hope you'll keep up the fight so that it actually reaches my desk.

Twenty years after its creation, the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues commands the respect that you've always deserved. You now have a record you can be proud of. You work in a way that you can be proud of. You can feel the respect here in this audience this evening of all the people who have come to pay tribute.

Tonight is a night for celebration. We celebrate an initiative taken in 1977, a celebration of 20 years of hard work, of the many initiatives that you have accomplished. But most importantly, I'm here to celebrate the energy, the intelligence, the character, and the old-fashioned patriotic devotion to the task at hand that will bring you even more brilliant achievements in the years ahead.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:27 p.m. in the Mellon Auditorium at the Department of Commerce. In his remarks, he referred to Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton and Representative Nancy L. Johnson, cochairs, former Representatives Margaret M. Heckler and Elizabeth Holtzman, founders and original cochairs, and former Representative Patricia Schroeder, former cochair, Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues; and former Representative Corinne Claiborne (Lindy) Boggs.

Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Dinner
October 21, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you for being here. Thank you for your exuberant welcome. Thank you for what it means. You know that our country is better off than it was 5 years ago. You know it's because we worked together to change the direction of this country. And you know that's what really counts in the lives of the American people. We could use more of you in Washington, DC, reminding people here about what really counts in the lives of the American people. And we thank you for your support.

I want to thank, first of all, Tom Daschle. There is no way that I can convey to you the extraordinary leadership that he has given to the United States Senate and the Democratic caucus. Senator Kerrey talked about it a little bit. It's really an easy job; there are no egos in the Senate. [*Laughter*] Everybody comes from the same kind of place; there are no genuinely conflicting interests. [*Laughter*] It's always fun to be in the minority when you're getting your brains beat out; there's no difficulty there. [*Laughter*] It's an extraordinarily difficult job. He's done it with grace and good humor, with brilliance and insight and genuine courage on occasion after occasion. And this country is very

fortunate that Tom Daschle is in the leadership of the Congress.

I want to thank my longtime friend Senator Bob Kerrey for his willingness to do this job in the toughest of all times and to do it superbly well and to continue to fight to push our party and our country toward change. Whether it's reforming the IRS, facing the difficult issue of entitlements, Bob Kerrey is always willing to be on the cutting edge of change. And my belief is that every single election, if given the chance, will be an election where the voters vote for the future. And we have tried to give them a chance to have a Democratic Party that was about the future, in no small measure because of you, Senator Kerrey, and we thank you for it very much.

Lastly, let me thank Senator Torricelli. I had the privilege of campaigning side by side with Bob Torricelli in New Jersey last year. And they said the polls were really close, and then something happened at the end and they miraculously opened up. They opened up for him, and they opened up for me. And the people of New Jersey have been very good to me now twice. But in 1996, it was an extraordinary election. And also, it was amazing how that nip-and-tuck Senate race just ballooned at the end, and Senator Torricelli opened his substantial lead. I think it's because people saw that if they voted for him, they would have somebody who (a) was on their side, and (b) wasn't afraid to fight for them.

And when I see Bob Torricelli trying to cut through the smokescreens and the rhetoric and the hot air and the disingenuous arguments that he has been willing to take on almost single-handedly, day-in and day-out, to stand up and fight for his party, his President, and his principles, it makes me thank goodness that he is a United States Senator. And I will never forget him.

And I want to thank the Senators that are the cochairs of this event tonight, Senator Bingaman, Senator Bryan, Senator Rockefeller, Senator Mikulski, Senator Ford. I want to join in what has already been said by Bob Kerrey about Wendell Ford and John Glenn and my longtime dear friend Dale Bumpers. I didn't want any of them to quit, and I was mad about it for 2 or 3 days. And then I realized it was not my choice and not my life. And they have more than served their country and more than paid their dues. But this is a much, much better America because of the service that has been given to us by Wendell Ford and John Glenn and Dale Bumpers. It's a better country, and we should all be grateful.

I come here tonight to say that we should go into the contest in 1998 united, and we should go into the contest based on the issues. Let the other side continue to follow the politics of personal destruction. Let us tell the American people what we have done and what we intend to do. Let us give them a chance to vote for their future and their children, for a vision of America in the 21st century that will give us opportunity for everyone responsible enough to work for it, a country that is coming together instead of being driven apart, and a Nation still strong and visionary enough to lead the world toward peace and freedom, prosperity and security. That is our job.

And when you come here and make your contributions and support our endeavors, I want you to know that that's what the leaders of this organization believe and that's what I believe.

We had success in 1996 for some very simple reasons. One, we promised to get rid of trickle-down economics and replace it with invest-and-grow economics. The American people had an economic policy that worked, and it affected their lives.

Second, we promised to get rid of hot air and tough talk on crime and replace it with tough and smart action on crime. We had a crime policy that worked, and it made a difference in people's lives.

We promised to get away from tough talk and anecdotes about welfare and try to give people a new approach to welfare that would reward work and childhood, that would be tough in work requirements but good for children. And it's working.

We promised that we would fight for a clean environment, even as we tried to grow the economy. And we fought off a ferocious attack on our environmental protections.

We promised to fight for a safe and secure workplace, even as we tried to grow the economy. And we fought off a ferocious attack on the rules which protect workplace safety.

We promised to modernize the Government. We downsized it by 300,000 without putting people in the street, got rid of thousands of pages of regulation and hundreds of programs, and put more money into education and technology. And it's worked. We promised we could

reduce the deficit and grow the economy and invest more in our people, and it has worked.

That is what accounted for the success in 1996. Ideas have consequences. And people who are willing and disciplined enough to implement their ideas can change the course of a country. That is what this is all about. Don't ever forget that what you do here has consequences.

And we had a balanced budget that passed by overwhelming bipartisan margins in both the Senate and the House. And I was glad of that, glad to celebrate it. But I think you know which party was passionately fighting for the biggest increase in aid to education since 1965, for the biggest increase in aid in access to college since the GI bill in 1945, for our ability now to say that we have truly opened the doors of college to every American responsible enough to work for it. I think you know which party was fighting for the $24 billion to provide health insurance to 5 million children in working families who don't have it today. I think you know which party was fighting for that.

But what I don't want you to ever forget is, before we ever passed that budget, the deficit had already been reduced by more than 80 percent from its 1992 high, because of the votes taken only by members of your party in 1993 to drive the deficit down and get the economy going again. And nobody should ever be permitted to forget it.

We've got a lot to do in the future. We have to raise the standards of our schools and give people more choices in the public schools they attend and make things that work more prevalent in all of our school districts.

We have a big challenge to face in fulfilling our solemn responsibilities on global climate change. We have 4 percent of the world's people; we contribute 26 percent of the world's greenhouse gases; we enjoy 22 percent of the world's economic growth. The climate is warming more rapidly than any time in the last 10,000 years. No one knows when something bad will happen or exactly what it will be, but the overwhelming consensus of scientists is that we must reduce our greenhouse gases. I am prepared to see the United States take the lead. But I am not a pessimist. Every single action the United States has taken since 1970 to clean up our own environment has led to more jobs, a diversifying economy, a stronger American economy, a brighter American future. And so will this. And that's what we're going to do. But I refuse to hide our heads in the sand. We have to face that.

The Democratic Party will have to prove in the next couple of years that we can preserve Social Security and we can preserve Medicare for the next generation without bankrupting our children and our grandchildren to pay for it. That is the responsible position, and we can do it in a progressive way. But we are the party that will have to do the work if you want it to be done in that way. We have to keep pushing forward into the future.

The Democratic Party should pass, working with our friends in the Republican Congress who will agree with us, a genuinely progressive settlement to protect our children from the dangers of tobacco. And we can do it in the right way, and we need to do it immediately—next year—as quickly as we can.

Tomorrow the First Lady and I are hosting the first-ever conference at the White House on child care. We know that there are millions of people who have to go to work every day worried about whether their kids have adequate child care or worried about how in the world they're going to pay for it. We know that child care takes almost 20 percent of the average lower income person's paycheck. We've got to make sure that if we're really going to balance work and family in the 21st century, people can have adequate and affordable child care.

There are lots of things to do out there. But we have to be bound together by our vision. We stand for opportunity and responsibility. We stand for work and family. We stand for individual liberty and the community. And we know America cannot be strong at home unless it is strong abroad.

I pray that the Democrats never turn away from our responsibilities to lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity and security. Whether it's in the Middle East or Northern Ireland or Latin America or South Asia or the Far East or in Africa, we have got to work to see that the people of the world keep growing together. We must never return to war, and we must try to stop the wars that exist now, and we must expand our opportunities to relate to each other in more peaceful, productive ways.

I want to thank the Democratic caucus for one other thing. Unanimously, our caucus—unanimously—voted to support campaign finance reform this year, and I thank them—

every last, single one. I don't know how long we will have to labor under the illusion that somehow there is no responsibility for this issue or somehow everyone is responsible. The White House is for campaign finance reform. The Democratic caucus is unanimously for campaign finance reform. The vast majority of the Members of the House in our caucus are for it. We will get it—when we can get enough help from our friends in the Republican Party, we will have campaign finance reform. And I hope that it will become clear that that is what has to be done.

Lastly, let me say, be of good cheer when you go into this campaign. If you read American history books, you will see that, typically, in the second term of an incumbent President, the party of the President normally doesn't do all that well at midterm elections. There is a reason for that. People think the sun is setting and the energy is running out and the steam is getting weak. Well, the sun is not setting, the energy is not running out, and I will be working full tilt until the last minute of the last hour of the last day. And I want you to give me a Democratic Senate to work with.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:35 p.m. in the Ballroom at the Hyatt Regency Hotel.

Remarks at the National Geographic Society

October 22, 1997

Thank you very much, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Vice President, all of you who are here. I thank especially the Members of Congress who are here, the leaders of labor and business who are here, all the members of the administration, and especially the White House staff members that the Vice President mentioned and the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of EPA, and the others who have helped us to come to this moment.

On the way in here, we were met by the leaders of the National Geographic, and I complimented them on their recent two-part series on the Roman Empire. It's a fascinating story of how the Empire rose, how it sustained itself for hundreds of years, why it fell, and speculations on what, if any, relevance it might have to the United States and, indeed, the West. And one of the gentlemen said, "Well, you know, we got a lot of interesting comments on that, including a letter referencing a statue we had of the bust of Emperor Vespasian. And one of our readers said, 'Why in the world did you put a statue of Gene Hackman in a piece on the Roman Empire?'" [*Laughter*]

And I say that basically to say, in some senses, the more things change, the more they remain the same. [*Laughter*] For what sustains any civilization, and now what will sustain all of our civilizations, is the constant effort at renewal, the ability to avoid denial, and to proceed into the future in a way that is realistic and humane but resolute.

Six years ago tomorrow, not long after I started running for President, I went back to my alma mater at Georgetown and began a series of three speeches outlining my vision for America in the 21st century: How we could keep the American dream alive for all of our people; how we could maintain America's leadership for peace and freedom and prosperity; and how we could come together, across the lines that divide us, as one America.

And together, we've made a lot of progress in the last nearly 5 years now that the Vice President and I have been privileged to work at this task. At the threshold of a new century, our economy is thriving, our social fabric is mending, we've helped to lead the world toward greater peace and cooperation.

I think this has happened, in no small measure, in part, because we had a different philosophy about the role of Government. Today, it is smaller and more focused and more oriented toward giving people the tools and the conditions they need to solve their own problems and toward working in partnership with our citizens. More important, I believe it's happened because we made tough choices but not false choices.

On the economy, we made the choice to balance the budget and to invest in our people

and our future. On crime, we made the choice to be tough and smart about prevention and changing the conditions in which crime occurs. On welfare, we made the choice to require work but also to support the children of people who have been on welfare. On families, we made the choice to help parents find more and better jobs and to have the necessary time and resources for their children. And on the environment, we made the choice to clean our air, water, and land, to improve our food supply and to grow the economy.

This kind of commonsense approach, rooted in our most basic values and our enduring optimism about the capacity of free people to meet the challenges of every age, must be brought to bear on the work that remains to pave the way for our people and for the world toward a new century and a new millennium.

Today, we have a clear responsibility and a golden opportunity to conquer one of the most important challenges of the 21st century, the challenge of climate change, with an environmentally sound and economically strong strategy to achieve meaningful reductions in greenhouse gases in the United States and throughout the industrialized and the developing world. It is a strategy that, if properly implemented, will create a wealth of new opportunities for entrepreneurs at home, uphold our leadership abroad, and harness the power of free markets to free our planet from an unacceptable risk. This strategy is consistent with our commitment to reject false choices. America can stand up for our national interest and stand up for the common interests of the international community. America can build on prosperity today and ensure a healthy planet for our children tomorrow.

In so many ways the problem of climate change reflects the new realities of the new century. Many previous threats could be met within our own borders, but global warming requires an international solution. Many previous threats came from single enemies, but global warming derives from millions of sources. Many previous threats posed clear and present danger; global warming is far more subtle, warning us not with roaring tanks or burning rivers but with invisible gases, slow changes in our surroundings, increasingly severe climatic disruptions that, thank God, have not yet hit home for most Americans. But make no mistake, the problem is real. And if we do not change our course now, the consequences sooner or later will be destructive for America and for the world.

The vast majority of the world's climate scientists have concluded that if the countries of the world do not work together to cut the emission of greenhouse gases, then temperatures will rise and will disrupt the climate. In fact, most scientists say the process has already begun. Disruptive weather events are increasing. Disease-bearing insects are moving to areas that used to be too cold for them. Average temperatures are rising. Glacial formations are receding.

Scientists don't yet know what the precise consequences will be. But we do know enough now to know that the industrial age has dramatically increased greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, where they take a century or more to dissipate, and that the process must be slowed, then stopped, then reduced if we want to continue our economic progress and preserve the quality of life in the United States and throughout our planet. We know what we have to do.

Greenhouse gas emissions are caused mostly by the inefficient burning of coal or oil for energy. Roughly a third of these emissions come from industry, a third from transportation, a third from residential and commercial buildings. In each case, the conversion of fuel to energy use is extremely inefficient and could be made much cleaner with existing technologies or those already on the horizon, in ways that will not weaken the economy but in fact will add to our strength in new businesses and new jobs. If we do this properly, we will not jeopardize our prosperity, we will increase it.

With that principle in mind, I'm announcing the instruction I'm giving to our negotiators as they pursue a realistic and effective international climate change treaty. And I'm announcing a far-reaching proposal that provides flexible market-based and cost-effective ways to achieve meaningful reductions here in America. I want to emphasize that we cannot wait until the treaty is negotiated and ratified to act. The United States has less than 5 percent of the world's people, enjoys 22 percent of the world's wealth, but emits more than 25 percent of the world's greenhouse gases. We must begin now to take out our insurance policy on the future.

In the international climate negotiations, the United States will pursue a comprehensive framework that includes three elements, which, taken together, will enable us to build a strong and robust global agreement. First, the United

States proposes at Kyoto that we commit to the binding and realistic target of returning to emissions of 1990 levels between 2008 and 2012. And we should not stop there. We should commit to reduce emissions below 1990 levels in the 5-year period thereafter, and we must work toward further reductions in the years ahead.

The industrialized nations tried to reduce emissions to 1990 levels once before with a voluntary approach, but regrettably, most of us, including especially the United States, fell short. We must find new resolve to achieve these reductions, and to do that we simply must commit to binding limits.

Second, we will embrace flexible mechanisms for meeting these limits. We propose an innovative joint implementation system that allows a firm in one country to invest in a project that reduces emissions in another country and receive credit for those reductions at home. And we propose an international system of emissions trading. These innovations will cut worldwide pollution, keep costs low, and help developing countries protect their environment, too, without sacrificing their economic growth.

Third, both industrialized and developing countries must participate in meeting the challenge of climate change. The industrialized world must lead, but developing countries also must be engaged. The United States will not assume binding obligations unless key developing nations meaningfully participate in this effort.

As President Carlos Menem stated forcefully last week when I visited him in Argentina, a global problem such as climate change requires a global answer. If the entire industrialized world reduces emissions over the next several decades but emissions from the developing world continue to grow at their current pace, concentrations of greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere will continue to climb. Developing countries have an opportunity to chart a different energy future consistent with their growth potential and their legitimate economic aspirations. What Argentina, with dramatic projected economic growth, recognizes is true for other countries as well: We can and we must work together on this problem in a way that benefits us all.

Here at home, we must move forward by unleashing the full power of free markets and technological innovations to meet the challenge of climate change. I propose a sweeping plan to provide incentives and lift roadblocks to help our companies and our citizens find new and creative ways of reducing greenhouse gas emissions:

First, we must enact tax cuts and make research and development investments worth up to $5 billion over the next 5 years, targeted incentives to encourage energy efficiency and the use of cleaner energy sources.

Second, we must urge companies to take early actions to reduce emissions by ensuring that they receive appropriate credit for showing the way.

Third, we must create a market system for reducing emissions wherever they can be achieved most inexpensively, here or abroad, a system that will draw on our successful experience with acid rain permit trading.

Fourth, we must reinvent how the Federal Government, the Nation's largest energy consumer, buys and uses energy. Through new technology, renewable energy resources, innovative partnerships with private firms, and assessments of greenhouse gas emissions from major Federal projects, the Federal Government will play an important role in helping our Nation to meet its goal. Today, as a downpayment on our million solar roof initiative, I commit the Federal Government to have 20,000 systems on Federal buildings by 2010.

Fifth, we must unleash competition in the electricity industry, to remove outdated regulations and save Americans billions of dollars. We must do it in a way that leads to even greater progress in cleaning our air and delivers a significant downpayment in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Today, two-thirds of the energy used to provide electricity is squandered in waste heat. We can do much, much better.

Sixth, we must continue to encourage key industry sectors to prepare their own greenhouse gas reduction plans. And we must, along with State and local government, remove the barriers to the most energy efficient usage possible. There are ways the Federal Government can help industry to achieve meaningful reductions voluntarily, and we will redouble our efforts to do so.

This plan is sensible and sound. Since it's a long-term problem requiring a long-term solution, it will be phased in over time. But we want to get moving now. We will start with our package of strong market incentives, tax cuts, and cooperative efforts with industry. We

want to stimulate early action and encourage leadership. And as we reduce our emissions over the next decade with these efforts, we will perform regular reviews to see what works best for the environment, the economy, and our national security. After we have accumulated a decade of experience, a decade of data, a decade of technological innovation, we will launch a broad emissions trading initiative to ensure that we hit our binding targets. At that time, if there are dislocations caused by the changing patterns of energy use in America, we have a moral obligation to respond to those to help the workers and the enterprises affected, no less than we do today by any change in our economy which affects people through no fault of their own.

This plan plays to our strengths: innovation, creativity, entrepreneurship. Our companies already are showing the way by developing tremendous environmental technologies and implementing commonsense conservation solutions.

Just yesterday Secretary Peña announced a dramatic breakthrough in fuel cell technology, funded by the Department of Energy research, a breakthrough that will clear the way toward developing cars that are twice as efficient as today's models and reduce pollution by 90 percent. The breakthrough was made possible by our pathbreaking partnership with the auto industry to create a new generation of vehicles. A different design, producing similar results, has been developed by a project funded by the Defense Advanced Research Products Agency and the Commerce Department's National Institute of Science and Technology.

The Energy Department discovery is amazing in what it does. Today, gasoline is used very inefficiently in internal combustion engines; about 80 percent of its energy capacity is lost. The DOE project announced yesterday by A.D. Little and Company uses 84 percent of the gasoline directly going into the fuel cell. That's increased efficiency of more than 4 times traditional engine usage.

And I might add, from the point of view of all the people that are involved in the present system, continuing to use gasoline means that you don't have to change any of the distribution systems that are out there. It's a very important but by no means the only discovery that's been made that points the way toward the future we have to embrace.

I also want to emphasize, however, that most of the technologies available for meeting this goal through market mechanisms are already out there; we simply have to take advantage of them. For example, in the town of West Branch, Iowa, a science teacher named Hector Ibarra challenged his sixth graders to apply their classroom experiments to making their school more energy efficient. The class got a $14,000 loan from a local bank and put in place easily available solutions. The students cut the energy use in their school by 70 percent. Their savings were so impressive that the bank decided to upgrade its own energy efficiency. [*Laughter*] Following the lead of these sixth graders—[*laughter*]—other major companies in America have shown similar results. You have only to look at the proven results achieved by companies like Southwire, Dow Chemical, DuPont, Kraft, Interface Carpetmakers, and any number of others in every sector of our economy to see what can be done.

Our industries have produced a large group of efficient new refrigerators, computers, washer/dryers, and other appliances that use far less energy, save money, and cut pollution. The revolution in lighting alone is truly amazing. One compact fluorescent lamp, used by one person over its lifetime, can save nearly a ton of carbon dioxide emissions from the atmosphere and save the consumer money.

If over the next 15 years everyone were to buy only those energy-efficient products marked in stores with EPA's distinctive "Energy Star" label, we could shrink our energy bills by a total of about $100 billion over the next 15 years and dramatically cut greenhouse gas emissions.

Despite these win-win innovations and commitments that are emerging literally every day, I know full well that some will criticize our targets and timetables as too ambitious. And of course, others will say we haven't gone far enough. But before the debate begins in earnest, let's remember that over the past generation we've produced tremendous environmental progress, including in the area of energy efficiency, at far less expense than anyone could have imagined. And in the process, whole new industries have been built.

In the past three decades, while our economy has grown, we have raised, not lowered, the standards for the water our children drink. While our factories have been expanding, we

have required them to clean up their toxic waste. While we've had record numbers of new homes, our refrigerators save more energy and more money for our consumers.

In 1970, when smog was choking our cities, the Federal Government proposed new standards for tailpipe emissions. Many environmental leaders claimed the standards would do little to head off catastrophe. Industry experts predicted the cost of compliance would devastate the industry. It turned out both sides were wrong. Both underestimated the ingenuity of the American people. Auto makers comply with today's much stricter emissions standards for far less than half the cost predicted, and new cars emit on average only 5 percent of the pollutants of the cars built in 1970.

We've seen this pattern over and over and over again. We saw it when we joined together in the seventies to restrict the use of the carcinogen vinyl chloride. Some in the plastics industry predicted massive bankruptcies, but chemists discovered more cost-effective substitutes and the industry thrived. We saw this when we phased out lead in gasoline. And we see it in our acid rain trading program, now 40 percent ahead of schedule, at costs less than 50 percent of even the most optimistic cost projections. We see it as the chlorofluorocarbons are being taken out of the atmosphere at virtually no cost in ways that apparently are beginning finally to show some thickening of the ozone layer again.

The lesson here is simple: Environmental initiatives, if sensibly designed, flexibly implemented, cost less than expected and provide unforeseen economic opportunities. So while we recognize that the challenge we take on today is larger than any environmental mission we have accepted in the past, climate change can bring us together around what America does best: We innovate; we compete; we find solutions to problems; and we do it in a way that promotes entrepreneurship and strengthens the American economy.

If we do it right, protecting the climate will yield not costs but profits, not burdens but benefits, not sacrifice but a higher standard of living. There is a huge body of business evidence now showing that energy savings gives better service at lower cost with higher profits. We have to tear down barriers to successful markets, and we have to create incentives to enter them. I call on American business to lead the way, but I call upon government at every level, Federal, State, and local, to give business the tools they need to get the job done and also to set an example in all our operations.

And let us remember that the challenge we face today is not simply about targets and timetables. It's about our most fundamental values and our deepest obligations.

Later today, I'm going to have the honor of meeting with Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I, the spiritual leader of 300 million Orthodox Christians, a man who has always stressed the deep obligations inherent in God's gift to the natural world. He reminds us that the first part of the word "ecology" derives from the Greek word for house. In his words, in order to change the behavior toward the house we all share, we must rediscover spiritual linkages that may have been lost and reassert human values. Of course, he is right. It is our solemn obligation to move forward with courage and foresight to pass our home on to our children and future generations.

I hope you believe with me that this is just another challenge in America's long history, one that we can meet in the way we have met all past challenges. I hope that you believe with me that the evidence is clear that we can do it in a way that grows the economy, not with denial but with a firm and glad embrace of yet another challenge of renewal. We should be glad that we are alive today to embrace this challenge, and we should do it secure in the knowledge that our children and grandchildren will thank us for the endeavor.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:57 p.m. in the Gilbert Grosvenor Auditorium. In his remarks, he referred to Reg Murphy, president and chief executive officer, National Geographic Society.

Remarks During the Morning Session of the White House Conference on Child Care

October 23, 1997

[*The First Lady welcomed the conference participants, and a videotape was shown.*]

The President. Thank you very much. Welcome to the White House. Thank you very much, Kathy Carliner, for your remarkable statement. And I thought you were very good in the film. Rob Reiner wants to give you a screen test. [*Laughter*]

I am so happy to see all of you here. There are many people here who might well be introduced, but I think I must start with the people who are terribly important to whether we will be able to fully achieve our part of the great agenda we are going to lay out today, the Members of Congress who are here. And I'd like to call their names and then, when I finish, ask them all to stand.

Senator Herb Kohl, who sponsored legislation on child care; Senator Jack Reed; Congressman Bill Clay; Congressman Sandy Levin; Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro; Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey; Congresswoman Sue Kelly; Congresswoman Maxine Waters; Congressman Xavier Becerra; and Congressman Nick Lampson. Would the Members of Congress who are here please stand? Thank you for coming.

I'd also like to thank my longtime friend—Hillary and I have been friends of Governor Jim Hunt and his wife, Carolyn, who are here, for almost 20 years now. And I think Governor Romer is here or on his way. Mayor Cleaver, we're glad to see you. And John Sweeney, the head of the AFL–CIO, and others who have come to be with us today, I thank you very much.

This is a happy day at the White House, first, for all the people in the administration and all those who have worked with them for months and months and months to help this day come to pass. And second, and even more important from my point of view, this is a happy day because I have been listening to the First Lady talk about this for more than 25 years now—[*laughter*]—and it may be that I will finally be able to participate in at least a small fraction of what I have been told for a long time I should be doing. And I say that in good humor but also with great seriousness.

This is an anniversary of sorts for me. It was 6 years ago today, as a newly announced candidate for President, that I went back to my alma mater at Georgetown and began a series of three speeches outlining what I thought America ought to look like in the 21st century and what I thought we would have to do to create a country in which everyone had an opportunity, everyone was expected to be a responsible citizen, and where we came together, across all the lines that divide us, into one community.

There are many things that are necessary for that to be done, but clearly two of them are, first, people in this country have to be able to succeed at work and at home in raising their children. And if we put people in the position of essentially having to choose one over the other, our country is going to be profoundly weakened. Obviously, if people are worried sick about their children and they fail at work, it's not just individual firms, it's the economic fabric and strength of the country that is weakened. Far more important, if people fail at home, they have failed in our most important job and our most solemn responsibility.

Second, we'll never be the kind of country we ought to be unless we believe that every child counts and that every child ought to have a chance to make the most of his or her God-given abilities.

That's why we're here today, to examine where we are and what we still have to do. And what we still have to do is quite a lot, to make sure we live by what we believe when we say that all parents should be able to succeed at home and at work and that every child counts. No parent should ever have to choose between work and family, between earning a decent wage and caring for a child. Especially in this day and age when most parents work, nothing is more important, as you have just heard Kathy Carliner say, than finding child care that is affordable, accessible, and safe. It is America's next great frontier in strengthening our families and our future.

As the Catholic Conference has noted, no government can love a child and no policy can

substitute for a family's care. But there is much that we can do to help parents do their duty to their children. From my days as Governor of Arkansas to my service as President, strengthening families has been a central goal of what I have worked on. I'm very proud that the first bill I had the opportunity to sign into law as President was the Family and Medical Leave Act, so that no parent has to choose between caring for a child or keeping a job when a family member is ill.

The expanded earned-income tax credit helps to ensure that parents who work don't have to raise their children in poverty. No one who is out there working full-time with children should have to worry about that. Expanded Head Start programs are serving more families than ever before. We've collected record sums of child support enforcement. The historic balanced budget I signed this summer provides a $500-per-child tax credit and helps parents to pay for their children's college education through IRA's, expanded loans and Pell grants, the HOPE scholarship, and other tax credits.

The Congress has before it now a program of Secretary Riley's called 21st Century Community Schools, in which we ask for funds to help our States keep our schools open after classroom hours for children who have no place else to go and need that environment.

We've also made some progress on child care. Since 1993, child care assistance has increased by 70 percent to help families pay for nearly a million children. Last year in the welfare reform debate, we fought and won the battle to expand child care assistance by $4 billion over the next 6 years, giving States an unprecedented opportunity to lead, to innovate in efforts to make child care more affordable.

But we have to do more. With more families required to rely on two incomes to make ends meet, with more single-parent families then ever, more young children are left in the care of others even in their earliest years. And as the First Lady said, we learned at our Conference on Early Childhood and the Brain, that's when children develop or fail to develop capacities that will shape the entire rest of their lives. It's also true that more and more schoolchildren are returning to empty homes after school.

The first thing we have to do is to make it possible for parents to spend time with their children whenever possible. That's why I hope the Congress will vote to expand the family and medical leave law so that parents at least can take some time off for their children's medical appointments, teacher conferences, and other basic duties. And I support flextime laws that will allow workers to choose between receiving overtime in pay or in time off with their families.

But during those times when children can't be with their parents, they must get care that keeps them safe and that helps them to learn and grow. As we all know, too often that isn't the case. Too often child care is unaffordable, inaccessible, and sometimes even unsafe. The cost, as Hillary said, strains millions of family budgets. And government assistance meets just about a quarter of the need. Even for those who can afford it, sometimes good care is hard to find, as Kathy said in her remarks. Waiting lists sometimes takes months or years to move, forcing many parents to cobble together unstable arrangements.

The shortage of care puts older children at risk, as well. Five million of them between the ages of 5 and 14 are left to fend for themselves after school. And as they get older, that increases the chances that they'll be exposed to drugs, tobacco, and crime.

Finally, studies have shown that too many child care facilities are literally unsafe. The tragedies that have befallen families who depended on child care continue to make headlines all across our nation. This conference is an important step forward in addressing all these issues. What we learn today should spur us on to find ways to help parents, all parents, afford safe, affordable, high quality child care, whether it's at home, a child care center, or a neighbor's house.

In the coming months, our administration will develop a plan, to be unveiled at the next State of the Union, to improve access and affordability and to help to assure the safety of child care in America. In the meantime, I want to announce four specific things we can do right now.

First, I'm asking Congress to establish a new scholarship fund for child care providers. Too many caregivers don't have the training they need to provide the best possible care. Those who do have training are rarely compensated with higher wages. The scholarship program I propose will help students earn their degrees as long as they remain in the child care field

for at least a year, and it will ensure that caregivers who complete their training will receive a bonus or a raise.

Second, we have to weed out the people who have no business taking care of our children in the first place. I am transmitting to Congress the "National Crime Prevention and Privacy Compact," which will make background checks on child care providers easier and more effective by eliminating State barriers to sharing criminal histories for this specific purpose. I urge Congress to pass and States to ratify this legislation.

Third, I've asked Secretary Rubin to oversee a working group on child care, composed primarily of business leaders working with labor and community representatives, to find ways more businesses can provide child care or help their employees afford high quality child care. And again, I thank John Sweeney for his important support of this initiative. In some ways, the most gripping part of that film we saw was the father talking about how he was just consumed with worry at work. No parent should ever have to go through that.

Finally, we must use community service to strengthen and expand access to after-school programs. Today, the Corporation for National Service through its To Learn and Grow Initiative will pledge to help after-school programs all across our country to use volunteers to provide better care to children. It is releasing a how-to manual for groups who want to incorporate community service into after-school programs. And I think that, Secretary Riley, if we can win in our little budget battle here on the 21st Century Community Schools, then together, we can do some real good out there on this issue.

My friends, for centuries—over two now—the American dream has represented a compact that those who work hard and play by the rules should be able to build better lives for themselves and for their children. In this time and even more into the future, child care that is too expensive, unsafe, or unavailable will be a very stubborn obstacle to realizing that dream. So let us commit ourselves to clearing the obstacle, to helping parents fulfill their most sacred duty, to keeping the American dream alive for them and, most important, for their children.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the First Lady opened the panel discussion. Ellen Galinsky, president and co-founder, Families and Work Institute, discussed the need to provide better quality child care as a choice for parents.*]

The President. I'd like to ask one question. First of all, I can't help saying this—when I heard you say that warm and responsive child care actually triggered a biochemical reaction that reduced stress—I wish we could have a center like that for the White House staff and the Congress staff. [*Laughter*] We may actually come up with a revolutionary new proposal here today. [*Laughter*]

Let me ask you a serious question. One of the things that I constantly try to deal with here, that I'm supersensitive to because I was a Governor for 12 years before I came here, is trying to determine who should do what—what we can do and make a difference, what we have to basically either exhort or incentivize or require some other people to do.

I was quite taken by the comment you made that only 36 hours of training of a child care worker can make a huge difference. I can't help thinking there probably are a lot of young, often single parents that might benefit from the same 36 hours of training. And I'm wondering how you think that issue ought to be dealt with. Should States basically upgrade their training standards and put funds into it? Should there be training centers established, more than are there now—even if everybody were required to do it, are there enough places that do the training in all States?

Talk a little bit about how we might set up an infrastructure and pattern of training to give—let's suppose we said within 2 years we wanted every child care provider, even people who do it out of their homes, wherever, to get the 36 hours of training, and we'd like it to be open, let's say, to low-income parents who are having their first child—how would we do such a thing?

[*Ms. Galinsky discussed available resources and the level of interest in training.*]

The President. But what percentage of the people who are now providing child care get that kind of training? That's the question I'm trying to get.

[*Ms. Galinsky responded that in a recent study, few caregivers actually completed required training. The First Lady agreed that the child care licensing system compared poorly to that for*

other professions. The discussion then continued concerning care before and after school hours.]

The President. Thank you. I would just like to make a couple of observations. I thought what you said was terrific. First of all, until—the crime rate in America has been going down for 5 years now, rather steeply, but it's been going up among people under 18. It may have leveled off, may be dropping a little bit now; we're hopeful. But if it is, it's because more and more communities are doing what you suggested. We need another—at least another year to see whether it's changed.

You are very familiar with what's been done in Boston, and one of the things that's been done is the whole sort of juvenile justice system has been geared to be warm and responsive. Juvenile probation officers make house calls with police officers, and community groups walk the streets in the afternoon to, basically, almost pick the kids up and give them things to do and get them involved with things. And as far as I know, it's the only major city in America where nobody under 18 has been killed by a gun in 2 years now. But it's not rocket science. It's a systematic attempt to take personal responsibility for all these children after school. And I can tell you, if you see the flip side of it in these juvenile crime rates, it's really touching and quite moving.

The other thing I wanted to say is, I wondered if you had any sense, just as a practical matter, of whether these programs tend to work better if they are school-based. And the reason I ask that is, I think that we fight these battles around here all the time of how to spend the school money—and most money for schools comes from the State and local level anyway. But I think one of the biggest problems that these schools have on the issue you've talked about is that in school after school after school after school, financial problems have caused them to cut back on their art programs, cut back on their music programs, cut back on their nonvarsity athletic programs. The things that children used to typically do after school or could stay after school and do, these school districts, as they're now budgeting and as they're now staffed and under the rules under which they now labor, they cannot—more and more schools are dropping these programs. And I think it's disastrous, because a lot of it is just exactly how children relate in a kind of a nonlinear, just purely intellectual way that both of you have said is so important. And I was wondering if you've seen that and if you think that's contributing to the problem.

I mean, a lot of people, without any programs, used to just stay after school because there was an art project, there was a music project, you were getting ready for a concert, the intramural teams were playing. And this is—you know, there are huge school districts in this country where all of these things are a thing of the past. People look at you like you've lost your mind when you talk about this now; they haven't had these things in years.

And it may be that one of the things we ought to be exploring is whether we can reinstitute some of these things in the lives of our schools that would naturally lead to an out-of-school atmosphere so they wouldn't think about adopting a new program approach. Anyway, I just kind of wanted to ask you that: Are the schools the best place if they work, or does it not matter, if you do it right?

[*Michelle Seligson, founder and director, National Institute on Out-of-School Time, responded that it was a community-by-community decision and then described the components of good after-school programs. The discussion then continued.*]

The President. I have to excuse Secretary Rubin in a moment to return to his duties, but I wanted to make one point and ask one question. The point I want to make is, he tries real hard to put on that sort of cold shtick, you know, that this is just economics, but——

Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin. "Shtick" is an Arkansas term. [*Laughter*]

The President. I learned that from him, that word, you know. [*Laughter*] But I'm sure you could see there was more there.

It occurred to me, listening to you talk about this, that this child care issue is an example of what makes our work both wonderful and maddening. How many times have Secretary Riley and I said that every problem in American education has been solved by somebody in some school somewhere, so why don't we get uniform excellence?

I just had the most difficult policy development process I have been through, I think, since I've been President, that Secretary Rubin and I did together. It was on trying to develop America's position on climate change. But it had

very little to do with the science. There is literally enough technology out there today to enable us, without lowering our standing of living, indeed while raising our standard of living, to substantially cut our emissions of greenhouse gases. And I can cite you industry after industry after industry that's made a ton of money doing it on their own, so why doesn't everybody do it? Why don't we even have a critical mass of companies doing it? And I ask you that question.

So we've got another example here with child care. If you can cite these examples where all of these companies are making money and having happy, more productive employees, what are the barriers? Why is the market dysfunctional in cases like this, and what can we do to make it work? Because if we were trying to get hookups to the Internet, we'd have 100 percent penetration in one-tenth of the time it takes us to get 10 percent penetration for educational excellence, environmental conservation, or the spread of child care. What's the difference? [*Laughter*]

Secretary Rubin. Are you asking me? [*Laughter*]

The President. I think it's the single, most important question about social policy today. You and I think about this all the time, but I don't know what you think about this.

This is not in the notes, you know, he's not prepared to say this.

[*Secretary Rubin suggested a peer group approach to identify and promote best practices to deal with such problems.*]

The President. Thank you.

[*The First Lady then continued the panel discussion on ensuring access to safe, affordable child care.*]

The President. I was glad to hear what you said about not being able to sit still after 3 o'clock. I'm glad to know you've been sitting still before 3 o'clock. [*Laughter*] I didn't know—I have never seen you still for 2 minutes in all of our acquaintance. This is amazing. [*Laughter*]

I don't think you can answer this now, but I think it's quite important that we be explicit about a dilemma that we will face as we move toward next year—the State of the Union, what our position ought to be. We all know that there will be, in the context of the budget agreement we just adopted, fierce competition for limited money. We're going to have some more money to put into this; we'll do the very best we can. It will be a priority, but still, it seems to me that there will be competition for what the best way the Federal Government can spend more money in child care is.

We could increase the tax credit to either make it more generous to people who get it now or move it up in the income limits. We could expand Head Start, particularly the Zero To Three program, where we've only got just a few thousand kids now—25,000 or something—and I think the early results are pretty promising. It's a terribly important initiative.

Or we could devise some way to help get these salaries up, which—you know, abysmal. When you were talking about the salaries, Hillary gave me a chart which showed that child care workers on the whole are better educated than the American work force and lower paid. So we keep saying we want all these people to come in and get more education and more training, and yet—and there are some cases where people don't have any education or training, but there are a lot of them that are quite well-educated that are working for ridiculously limited wages.

So what's your sense about how we ought to go about making that decision? And I'll just give a blanket invitation to the audience, too, that if you were in my position and you knew you couldn't do 100 percent of all these things, would you do a little bit of all of them, would you focus on one, would you focus on the other? And I invite you to make your views known to us, either today during the conference or in writing, because this will be a difficult thing. Congressman Lampson is still here; he's going to have to make a decision about how to vote on this stuff. And we will have to decide.

[*Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala said that resources should be invested in quality, focusing on caregivers. The discussion then continued.*]

The President. Well, thank you very much. I agree with the last thing you said for sure. [*Laughter*]

Let me say, the reason I wanted Governor Hunt to come here today, apart from our 20 years of friendship and my immense admiration for him, is that—if I could go back to the question I asked Secretary Rubin—the great trick

we have with all great social questions in America is—that we know that Government can't solve alone, either because we don't have the resources or the capacity—is how to have grassroots, community-based partnerships that still, when the day is over, add up to a system that serves everybody instead of just makes nice, touching stories we can all tell each other at seminars till kingdom come.

And that is what they have done in North Carolina. They have kept the entrepreneurial spirit. They have the partnership. They've cobbled money together, from first one place, then another, and he's put a lot of new money in it, and because he has taken this initiative and set up a framework within which creativity and partnership can flourish, they have a system. And I still believe—I'll say it again—I think that is the great sort of challenge that America faces that goes across so many of our problems and plainly relates to this.

The only question I wanted to ask you about it that I would like you to specifically address is, do you have enough money to deal with the dilemma that raising quality standards must increase your cost to some extent, and does that price anybody out of it? And if not, why not?

[*Gov. James B. Hunt of North Carolina stressed the need for additional State and Federal funding, as well as help from the business and nonprofit sectors.*]

The President. You know, just one other thing I'd like to say that I think we ought to consider—this is a little thing, but you talked about the bully pulpit—I think a lot of people are just plain old-fashioned ignorant about what's involved in being an effective, successful child care worker—would be surprised at the average educational level of child care workers in America and the average pay. And I think that we ought—one of the things that we ought to do with this bully pulpit idea of yours is start trying to find ways that every community and every State can honor outstanding child care workers the same way we honor teachers today, or scientists or others, because I think that's terribly important. I just don't think society—I don't think they mean to devalue people in this work, I just think they don't know—most people.

[*Governor Hunt agreed, noting that he held an awards banquet for child care workers in North Carolina last year.*]

President Clinton. I don't think you can underestimate how important it is for people to say to other people that they matter. And if it matters in your personal life, it's got to matter in all these other areas, too. I think it's a big issue.

[*The First Lady thanked Governor Hunt for his example, and the discussion continued.*]

The President. Well, that is, I think, an extraordinary way to wrap up our morning session. I can't think of anything that could be added to what you said. But if you think about what all of our last speakers said, it amounts to a plea to us to do what we can to both increase the coherence and completeness of community-based action within a framework that creates a system that involves all our children.

And again, let me say to all of you involved in this work, I am profoundly grateful to you. I thank you for being here today. This has been an immensely enlightening day to me. I have been struggling to understand this issue, especially since one day several years ago—we all have our little epiphanies in life about these matters, but Hillary had been talking to me about child care for years, and one day when I was running for Governor, well over a decade ago—I used to make a habit in every election season of going to the earliest plant gate in my State, because the workers came to work between 4:30 and 5:30, and even the vote-hungriest politicians wouldn't get up that early, so I always had them all to myself. [*Laughter*]

And I never will forget, one day I came home and I told Hillary, I said, "You won't believe what happened to me at a quarter to 5 this morning." It was a Campbell soup plant in North Arkansas, and this pickup truck rolled up. And as often happened, the husbands and wives—and one was taking the other to work, and they would come up in the dark and kiss each other good-bye. And so this pickup truck came up, and this lady leaned over and kissed her husband good-bye and opened the door. And the light came on, and inside were three children under the age of 5.

And so I went over and talked to the young man when his wife went into work at a quarter to 5. I said, "What are you doing with these kids? I mean, how do you do this?" He said, "Well, we've got to get them up every morning at a quarter to 4, and we dress them up." And he said, "I keep them as long as I can, but

I have to be at work at 7. So I had to find somebody who would take care of them at 6:30"—three kids under 5. But he said, "We've got three kids under 5. We both have to work."

Now, there are millions of stories like that. And they are no less gripping for the parents than those who don't have quite such strange circumstances. But it is inconceivable to me that we have had all of you wonderful people working at this and we've put all this money in it, and we still never developed a systematic approach or, in the words of Patty, a quilt that everybody can be a part of. And that, I think, we should all leave as our mission.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 10:15 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to working mother Kathy Carliner, who introduced the President; Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado; Mayor Emanuel Cleaver II of Kansas City, MO; John J. Sweeney, president, AFL–CIO; and Patty Siegel, executive director, California Child Care Resource and Referral Network.

Statement on the Death of Ann Devroy

October 23, 1997

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn that Ann Devroy, longtime White House correspondent for the Washington Post, passed away earlier today.

For more than a decade, no journalist dominated and defined the White House beat with the kind of skill, shrewd analysis, and gruff grace that Ann brought to her reporting. As the saying goes, she always knew how to afflict the comfortable—and she made more than one President squirm—but she did comfort the afflicted. When White Houses did not get a fair shake in the press, Ann would often be the first to set the record straight. And she always wrote and reported with the interests of her readers first in her heart, trying always to make the White House story easier for a citizen to grasp.

Her friends in the press, her friends here at the White House, and all those who admired her tough but fair reporting will join me and Hillary in extending to Mark, Sarah, and Ann's family our deepest condolences.

Statement on Signing the Second Continuing Resolution for Fiscal Year 1998

October 23, 1997

I am pleased to have signed into law today House Joint Resolution 97, the second short-term continuing resolution for fiscal year 1998.

The resolution provides 1998 appropriations for continuing projects and activities of the Federal Government through November 7, 1997, except those funded by the five bills that I have already signed into law.

I urge the Congress to approve the remaining 1998 spending bills that include the items contained in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement and to provide funding for other priority programs. To give the Congress time to adopt such bills, I have approved this second continuing resolution.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

October 23, 1997.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 97, approved October 23, was assigned Public Law No. 105–64.

Remarks to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Honoring Board-Certified Master Teachers

October 24, 1997

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. I have to say the Vice President always says when—we have this arrangement, he always says, thank you for the standing ovation. [*Laughter*] I'd also like to thank the United States Marine Band for being here for us today. I know you enjoyed them very much. You know, when I have to leave this job, in 3 years and a couple of months, I'll miss a lot of things about Washington and the White House—a few things I won't. [*Laughter*] But I'll really miss the Marine Band. It's a great honor to be around them every day. They're terrific.

I want to thank Rebecca Palacios for her introduction and for her lifetime of dedication. We wanted her up here because she stands for all of you. And she first came to my attention when she spoke at Al Shanker's memorial service, and I know that a lot of you feel as I do. I wish he were here today. He'd be tickled to see this crowd and the progress of this endeavor.

I'd like to thank Congressman Bob Etheridge and our good friend Senator Jim Jeffords from Vermont for being here and for the support we have received in the Congress with the leadership that they have given, and others, to this endeavor.

I thank Secretary Riley. You know, I got a little nostalgic when Dick Riley was up here talking—Governor Hunt and Governor Riley and Governor Clinton—we've been at this since the 1970's. And none of us are very young anymore, and we're a little beat up, but it's been, I must say, one of the great treasures of my life to be friends with these two great leaders, to get to know their wives and their families, and to feel like we were giving a lifetime to this endeavor of advancing education. And I agree with Jim Hunt, Dick Riley is the best Secretary of Education we've ever had, and I thank him for that.

Governor Hunt, I thank you for your leadership yesterday at the first-ever White House Conference on Child Care that Hillary and I sponsored, and I thank you for what you're doing in North Carolina to get a systematic approach to giving all of our children in their preschool years the best preparation and support they can have. I thank you for 10 years at the helm of this extraordinary organization. Because of the work that you and the national board, with support from the business community and from States all across America, have done, more teachers are now being challenged to fulfill their greatest potential, and just as important, they're finally being rewarded for doing so. And I thank you for that.

And thank you, Barbara Kelley, for stepping in to fill Governor Hunt's shoes. You've worked tirelessly to improve education in Maine, and you've served the board well as vice chair. And I must say, you've got quite a crowd up for your first day on the job here. Congratulations. I'd also like to thank James Kelly and Sarah Mernissi for their leadership on the board.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to take just a couple of minutes and try to put what you're doing here in this truly historic endeavor into the larger context of the journey that your Nation is on. Six years ago this month, when I began to seek the Presidency, I did it because I thought we had to change course, become more focused, more united, and more energetic if we were going to succeed in preparing America for the 21st century. And I had a simple but, I think, quite profound vision of what I wanted our country to be like when we crossed that next divide.

With all of our challenges, all of our difficulties, and all of our diversity, I want this to be a country where the American dream is alive for everybody who is responsible enough to work for it. I want America to still be the world's leading force for peace and freedom and prosperity. And I want us to be able to reach across all the lines that divide us, to make one America.

Together, we've made a lot of progress: The economy is growing; crime is down; the social fabric is mending. That happened in no small part, I think, because we underwent as a nation our own educational process. We had to think anew and learn anew about what the role of Government is and what we ought to be doing in all of these areas that are important to us.

I had listened for years as a Governor to a debate here about whether the Government should do nothing or try to do everything, neither of which made any sense to me in my own life. So we've given America a smaller and more focused Government that focuses on giving people the tools and creating the conditions to make the most of their own lives.

I also believed that we had to go beyond a lot of other kind of false choices. In the economy, the argument used to be, are we going to do something about the deficit, in which case we won't do anything else, or are we going to just keep spending and betray the future of all the children in the audience? We have shown that you can reduce the deficit and balance the budget and still invest in America's children and its future, and that is the right approach. [*Applause*] Thank you.

On the environment, the debate was, well, if we clean up the environment, we'll wreck the economy—in spite of the fact that that contradicted all our experiences. So we have energetically embraced the proposition that we have to dramatically improve the environment, dramatically reduce our greenhouse gases, and we're going to do it and grow the economy. When you start new things in an innovative way, you create more jobs and more opportunities. Doing the right thing is normally something that benefits you economically, and it will here as well.

On crime, I thought there was a totally false debate about people who talked tough on the one hand, and people who were genuinely compassionate about the circumstances that bred crime on the other. I thought we ought to be both tough and compassionate in trying to prevent people from getting into trouble in the first place. And that approach is working, and the crime rate is dropping.

On welfare, there was a debate which basically treated everybody on welfare on the one hand as if they never wanted to go to work and say we ought to impose a lot of requirements on them, and other people who were genuinely concerned about the welfare of children of people on welfare but never wanted to hold them to higher standards. So we took an approach to welfare reform that required everybody to work who can, but take care of the children. That's our most important job. And in the process our country has learned and grown and gained self-confidence, just the way your students do in the class.

And we are still engaged in this debate here in Washington about education. You know, there are those who say that the Federal Government should do next to nothing in education and that basically it should be left alone. Or some people think it should be abandoned altogether. I believe that we have to go beyond either giving up on the one hand or giving more money to the status quo on the other. None of you represent the status quo. You represent standards, reform, and investment. That is the proper path for education in the future and every area.

I know we've been saying this all our lives, but it is really true that the greatest challenge America faces to realizing our entire vision is the challenge of giving every child in this country a world-class education. If we don't do it, how can we preserve the American dream for people who are responsible enough to work for it? There are a lot of people today in America—every day I think about all the people out there who are willing to work, are willing to work harder, who are trapped in circumstances that they find totally unsatisfactory, that are difficult for their children, simply because they never got a good education to develop their abilities.

How can we lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity if we are weak at home because we don't have strength in the minds and hearts and spirits and the self-confidence of all of our people? How can we have enough sense to overcome all of our diversity and be one America, at a time when racial and ethnic and religious tensions are causing people to kill each other all over the world, if we don't have the education that makes us understand that deep down inside what we have in common will always be more important than the things that divide us? You are carrying us into the future.

Now, therefore, in a very fundamental sense, you are at the center of America's mission to the 21st century. And you know some things that sometimes it seems like we forget here in Washington when you hear these debates: Meeting the challenge will not be easy. There is no quick fix. There is no single proposal that will magically give all our children the education that they need and deserve.

I might say that I do not believe that a proposal that takes resources away from public schools, most of which are already underfunded,

will do anything for the 90 percent of the children who are going to remain there. But I would also say, we make a great mistake when we stop at the denial. We cannot afford to be in denial. What's that story all the children say? "Denial is not just a river in Egypt." [*Laughter*] We know, and you have proved by what you have done, that we all have to be impatient. If you believe in the education of all children, if you believe in the potential of the public schools, we have to be impatient and focused and determined and willing not just to settle for isolated successes but to do systematic things.

That is the genius of the national board. I think, of all the many contributions Jim Hunt has made to our public life, when his whole career is over, two will stand out: the work he's done on this board, and the work he's done in North Carolina to take a systematic approach to all children between birth and age 5 to get them ready to go to school.

We must be impatient. We have to change the system for everyone. It's got to work for everyone. Isolated examples of success are not enough. Therefore, we have to fight to raise standards for students and teachers. We ought to give more choice and competition among public schools. We ought to equip all of our schools with the latest technology and people who know how to use it. [*Laughter*]

We ought to empower our parents to take a more active role in their children's education. We ought to recognize that people can't succeed in school unless our schools, all of them, are safe and disciplined and drug-free. We have to do more to bring high-quality teachers to difficult, underserved, poor areas, where the children need them the most. We ought to make it easier for all schools to reform, to be less bureaucratic. If people aren't performing, it ought to be easier for them to be moved out. But the most important thing we can do is to train and reward the finest teachers in America, to get them and keep them in the classroom.

So that debate is going on here now, and we face a choice. There are those of us, like Governor Hunt and our master teachers, who are doing all they can to sustain and improve and strengthen public education in America. And there are those whose answer is to do nothing or, worse, to walk away. It's a choice between those who look at the challenge of public education and throw up their hands and those who, like you, roll up their sleeves.

I have called upon all of our people to create an America in which every 8-year-old can read, every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old can go to college, and every American can keep on learning for lifetime.

Let us say one thing here for the record. You and people like you all over the country have been working on this for more than a decade, and our schools—against all odds and great challenges, our schools are getting better. Everybody should know that. They are getting better. We are taking in ever more diverse student populations. We are learning more about how to deal with each other, and we are getting better results. Secretary Riley mentioned North Carolina's results. We are getting better results, but only when we are impatient, focused, determined, relentless, and systematic in our approach.

The balanced budget I signed last summer will help us to do this. It will throw open the doors of college to everybody who is willing to work for it through more Pell grants, 300,000 more work-study slots, education IRA's, the historic HOPE scholarship for the first 2 years of college, and other tax credits for all higher education. The budget goes a long way toward completing our mission to connect every classroom and library to the Internet by the year 2000, which I think we're going to meet. And I thank you.

We're fighting to fully fund America Reads, which has already involved AmeriCorps volunteers, tens of thousands of college students from 800 campuses now, many other people in churches and other volunteer groups going into our schools to help tutor individually young children. And Congress has taken the first step toward funding that, and I appreciate that.

But all these things will mean little unless the classroom works. Ultimately, the magic of education is what goes on in the class, between the teachers and the students, hopefully supported at home by the parents. That's why we have to set high national standards of academic excellence. That's why I'm fighting for these fourth grade reading and eighth grade math tests. And I thank Governor Hunt and the other States and cities who have supported it.

Through voluntary national standards, parents and teachers can make sure that all their children in all of our schools get the skills they

need. I thank Governor Hunt again for his leadership here, and I hope he can have even more members of the National Governors' Association following the lead of the heads of the biggest school districts in the country and many city governments all across the country who are doing this.

Again I will say that if there is any attempt in Congress to kill this effort at national standards and voluntary testing, I will have to veto it.

So this is the context in which your efforts are working, and we have to see it against that. It is the great frontier of our national effort to come to grips with all the challenges we face to get this country into the 21st century in the shape that we all know it must be in. Raising the quality of teaching has to come at the top of the list.

We all know a single extraordinary teacher can change the lives of many students. We all know we should reward excellence in teaching. Now we know that national board certification defines excellence in teaching. That's why I've asked the Congress for $105 million over the next 5 years to help us get 100,000 board-certified master teachers.

Now, just think of the difference a master teacher could make if we had a master teacher in every single school in America. All of you know that one of the things teachers do a good job of is talking. [*Laughter*] In the classroom, in the teachers' lounge, in the halls, before and after school, you talk for a living, and you're good at it. If we could get at least one master teacher in every single school building in America, then all the process through which you go, you will be, without even thinking about it and sometimes consciously, imparting to the other teachers, to the principals, changing the culture of our schools in ways that no one could write out a form book and predict. But we know if we can get enough of these master teachers, we will have a critical mass that will then impact on all the other teachers, on the teaching environment, and therefore, on the learning of all of our children.

That is why I asked for the $100 million. That's why I want 100,000 board teachers. I do not want to stop until we've got a master teacher in every single school building in the United States of America—eventually, I hope, in every classroom—but every school building. We should not stop until we do that.

That's the sort of thing that Jim Hunt has visualized all this time, a system—not isolated successes, a system—where we give our teachers, our schools, our children a chance to be the best they can be. That is what we have to do, and that is our mission. And that's why we've got to get this through the Congress and why I'm so glad to see Senator Jeffords here. And I know that he stands for a lot of other people who will do it.

I must say, when Congressman Etheridge gave up being head of the North Carolina education effort to come to Congress, he didn't really do that—he's basically got two jobs in one—and I think he's going to ask Governor Hunt for a second salary to support it. [*Laughter*]

Now, let me also say to you that you're getting a lot more support around the country now in local school districts and in businesses who are stepping up to the challenge. Last month, the Los Angeles Unified School District and the United Teachers of Los Angeles agreed to reward board-certified teachers with a 15 percent raise. You know, one of Clinton's laws of politics is when someone—people always say in Washington, "That's not a money problem." When they say that, they're talking about someone else's problem. [*Laughter*] It does matter. We must pay people more if they're doing well, if they're better prepared, and if they're willing to stand out and stake out a new frontier, and it's important.

Just a few days ago the McGraw-Hill company joined forces with the New York City Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers there, along with New York universities to prepare more teachers for board certification. These things are crucial to our success. We can appropriate the money here. We can help you implement it. But we've got to have friends out there who believe in it and then people who will reward the teachers once they get the certification. So I want every State, every school board, every business to help more of our teachers become master teachers.

As the national board continues to define what teachers should know and be able to do, I also hope you will make even more use of effective technology. Every teacher should be as comfortable with a computer as a chalkboard. You should not be as technologically challenged as I am. [*Laughter*]

And finally, let me say I think we have to do more to attract more young people into teaching as a career, particularly where the kids need it the most. I have called upon Congress to support a $350-million scholarship program modeled on the National Medical Service Corps. Those of us who come from rural States can all remember how blessed our rural communities have been over the last several years, the last couple of decades, by the doctors who were educated in medical school with the National Medical Service Corps and then went out to some place where people had never seen a doctor for years or where the town doctor had died and no other young people would go and how many people were helped by that. We need to do that for our inner-city schools, for our rural schools, for our poorest children.

This proposal would basically give a talented young person an education in exchange for a promise to teach children growing up in our most underprivileged communities. It will strengthen teacher training in colleges that work directly with inner cities and with poor rural schools. It is a good idea, and I hope you will help me pass it, because the kids out there who have the toughest neighborhoods to live in and the toughest obstacles to overcome and the parents in the most difficult circumstances, they need the best teachers. They need them, and we ought to try to help them get them.

And finally let me say just a simple thank you for making a decision to spend your lives on the future. If you really think about it, most of us do things every day where, at the end of the day, we can know that the major impact of what we've done comes more or less right after we do it. The major impact of what you do will come perhaps after we're not even around anymore. You literally live your lives based on a faith in the innate dignity and potential of every child that you may never see realized. They may go off to some far-distant place and do something, and the connection will be broken. But you know what you're doing is renewing this country in a constant and profound way. And I think you for that.

Henry Adams once said that "Our teachers affect eternity. They can never tell where their influence stops." You will never know where your influence stops, but I can tell you, you will know that it always begins here in Washington as long as Dick Riley and Jim Hunt and Bill Clinton and the people that agree with us have a job to do—[*laughter*]—have a job to do and the energy to do it.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m. in a pavilion on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to board-certified master teacher Rebecca Palacios, who introduced the President; Gov. James B. Hunt, Jr., of North Carolina; and Barbara Kelley, chair, James A. Kelly, president and chief executive officer, and Sarah "Sally" Mernissi, vice president for government relations, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Remarks to the Asia Society and the United States-China Education Foundation Board

October 24, 1997

Thank you very much, Ambassador Platt. I thank the Asia Society and the U.S.-China Education Foundation for bringing us together today. I thank Senator Baucus and Congressmen Dreier, Matsui, and Roemer for being here; Secretary Albright, Ambassador Barshefsky, National Security Adviser Berger, the other distinguished officials from the State Department. And I thank especially the members of the diplomatic corps who are here and the students. And especially let me thank two of my favorite people, Joe Duffey and Evelyn Lieberman, for the work of the Voice of America and the USIA, all that they do to promote the free flow of ideas around the world.

Next week, when President Jiang Zemin comes to Washington, it will be the first state visit by a Chinese leader to the United States for more than a decade. The visit gives us the opportunity and the responsibility to chart a course for the future that is more positive and

more stable and hopefully more productive than our relations have been for the last few years.

China is a great country with a rich and proud history and a strong future. It will, for good or ill, play a very large role in shaping the 21st century in which the children in this audience today, children all across our country, all across China, and indeed all across the world, will live.

At the dawn of the new century, China stands at a crossroads. The direction China takes toward cooperation or conflict will profoundly affect Asia, America, and the world for decades. The emergence of a China as a power that is stable, open, and nonaggressive, that embraces free markets, political pluralism, and the rule of law, that works with us to build a secure international order, that kind of China, rather than a China turned inward and confrontational, is deeply in the interests of the American people.

Of course, China will choose its own destiny. Yet by working with China and expanding areas of cooperation, dealing forthrightly with our differences, we can advance fundamental American interests and values.

First, the United States has a profound interest in promoting a peaceful, prosperous, and stable world. Our task will be much easier if China is a part of that process, not only playing by the rules of international behavior but helping to write and enforce them.

China is a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council. Its support was crucial for peacekeeping efforts in Cambodia and building international mandates to reverse Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and restore democracy to Haiti. As a neighbor of India and Pakistan, China will influence whether these great democracies move toward responsible cooperation both with each other and with China.

From the Persian Gulf to the Caspian Sea, China's need for a reliable and efficient supply of energy to fuel its growth can make it a force for stability in these strategically critical regions. Next week, President Jiang and I will discuss our visions of the future and the kind of strategic relationship we must have to promote cooperation, not conflict.

Second, the United States has a profound interest in peace and stability in Asia. Three times this century, Americans have fought and died in Asian wars; 37,000 Americans still patrol the cold war's last frontier, on the Korean DMZ. Territorial disputes that could flare into crises affecting America require us to maintain a strong American security presence in Asia. We want China to be a powerful force for security and cooperation there.

China has helped us convince North Korea to freeze and ultimately end its dangerous nuclear program. Just imagine how much more dangerous that volatile peninsula would be today if North Korea, reeling from food shortages, with a million soldiers encamped 27 miles from Seoul, had continued this nuclear program.

China also agreed to take part in the four-party peace talks that President Kim and I proposed with North Korea, the only realistic avenue to a lasting peace. And China is playing an increasingly constructive role in Southeast Asia by working with us and the members of ASEAN to advance our shared interests in economic and political security.

Next week I'll discuss with President Jiang the steps we can take together to advance the peace process in Korea. We'll look at ways to strengthen our military-to-military contacts, decreasing the chances of miscalculation and broadening America's contacts with the next generation of China's military leaders. And I will reiterate to President Jiang America's continuing support for our "one China" policy, which has allowed democracy to flourish in Taiwan and Taiwan's relationship with the PRC to grow more stable and prosperous. The Taiwan question can only be settled by the Chinese themselves peacefully.

Third, the United States has a profound interest in keeping weapons of mass destruction and other sophisticated weaponry out of unstable regions and away from rogue states and terrorists. In the 21st century, many of the threats to our security will come not from great power conflict but from states that defy the international community and violent groups seeking to undermine peace, stability, and democracy. China is already a nuclear power with increasingly sophisticated industrial and technological capabilities. We need its help to prevent dangerous weapons from falling into the wrong hands.

For years, China stood outside the major international arms control regimes. Over the past decade, it has made important and welcome decisions to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Biological Weapons Convention, and to respect key provisions of the Missile Technology Control Regime. Last year at the United Nations, I was

proud to be the first world leader to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. China's Foreign Minister was the second leader to do so.

China has lived up to its pledge not to assist unsafeguarded nuclear facilities in third countries, and it is developing a system of export controls to prevent the transfer or sale of technology for weapons of mass destruction.

But China still maintains some troubling weapons supply relationships. At the summit, I will discuss with President Jiang further steps we hope China will take to end or limit some of these supply relationships and to strengthen and broaden its export control system. And I will make the case to him that these steps are, first and foremost, in China's interest because the spread of dangerous weapons and technology would increase instability near China's own borders.

Fourth, the United States has a profound interest in fighting drug trafficking and international organized crime. Increasingly, smugglers and criminals are taking advantage of China's vast territory and its borders with 15 nations to move drugs and weapons, aliens, and the proceeds of illegal activities from one point in Asia to another or from Asia to Europe.

China and the United States already are cooperating closely on alien smuggling, and China has taken a tough line against narcotrafficking, a threat to its children as well as our own. Next week I will propose to President Jiang that our law enforcement communities intensify their efforts together.

Fifth, the United States has a profound interest in making global trade and investment as free, fair, and open as possible. Over the past 5 years, trade has produced more than one-third of America's economic growth. If we are to continue generating good jobs and higher incomes in our country when we are just 4 percent of the world's population, we must continue to sell more to the other 96 percent. One of the best ways to do that is to bring China more fully into the world's trading system. With a quarter of the world's population and its fastest growing economy, China could and should be a magnet for our goods and services.

Even though American exports to China now are at an all-time high, so, too, is our trade deficit. In part, this is due to the strength of the American economy and to the fact that many products we used to buy in other Asian countries now are manufactured in China. But clearly, an important part of the problem remains lack of access to China's markets. We strongly support China's admission into the World Trade Organization. But in turn, China must dramatically improve access for foreign goods and services. We should be able to compete fully and fairly in China's marketplace, just as China competes in our own.

Tearing down trade barriers also is good for China and for the growth of China's neighbors and, therefore, for the stability and future of Asia. Next week, President Jiang and I will discuss steps China must take to join the WTO and assume its rightful place in the world economy.

Finally, the United States has a profound interest in ensuring that today's progress does not come at tomorrow's expense. Greenhouse gas emissions are leading to climate change. China is the fastest growing contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and we are the biggest greenhouse gas emitter. Soon, however, China will overtake the United States and become the largest contributor. Already, pollution has made respiratory disease the number one health problem for China's people. Last March, when he visited China, Vice President Gore launched a joint forum with the Chinese on the environment and development so that we can work with China to pursue growth and protect the environment at the same time.

China has taken some important steps to deal with its need for more energy and cleaner air. Next week, President Jiang and I will talk about the next steps China can take to combat climate change. It is a global problem that must have a global solution that cannot come without China's participation as well. We also will talk about what American companies and technology can do to support China in its efforts to reduce air pollution and increase clean energy production.

Progress in each of these areas will draw China into the institutions and arrangements that are setting the ground rules for the 21st century: the security partnerships, the open trade arrangements, the arms control regime, the multinational coalitions against terrorism, crime, and drugs, the commitments to preserve the environment and to uphold human rights. This is our best hope to secure our own interests and values and to advance China's in the historic transformation that began 25 years ago when China reopened to the world.

As we all know, the transformation already has produced truly impressive results. Twenty-five years ago, China stood apart from and closed to the international community. Now, China is a member of more than 1,000 international organizations, from the International Civil Aviation Organization to the International Fund for Agricultural Development. It has moved from the 22d largest trading nation to the 11th. It is projected to become the second largest trader, after the United States, by 2020. And today, 40,000 young Chinese are studying here in the United States, with hundreds of thousands more living and learning in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

China's economic transformation has been even more radical. Market reforms have spurred more than two decades of unprecedented growth, and the decision at the recently ended 15th Party Congress to sell off most all of China's big, state-owned industries promises to keep China moving toward a market economy. The number of people living in poverty has dropped from 250 million to 58 million, even as China's population has increased by nearly 350 million. Per capital income in the cities has jumped 550 percent in just the past decade.

As China has opened its economy, its people have enjoyed greater freedom of movement and choice of employment, better schools and housing. Today, most Chinese enjoy a higher standard of living than at any time in China's modern history. But as China has opened economically, political reform has lagged behind.

Frustration in the West turned into condemnation after the terrible events in Tiananmen Square. Now, nearly a decade later, one of the great questions before the community of democracies is how to pursue the broad and complex range of our interests with China while urging and supporting China to move politically as well as economically into the 21st century. The great question for China is how to preserve stability, promote growth, and increase its influence in the world, while making room for the debate and the dissent that are a part of the fabric of all truly free and vibrant societies. The answer to those questions must begin with an understanding of the crossroads China has reached.

As China discards its old economic order, the scope and sweep of change has rekindled historic fears of chaos and disintegration. In return, Chinese leaders have worked hard to mobilize support, legitimize power, and hold the country together, which they see is essential to restoring the greatness of their nation and its rightful influence in the world. In the process, however, they have stifled political dissent to a degree and in ways that we believe are fundamentally wrong, even as freedom from want, freedom of movement, and local elections have increased.

This approach has caused problems within China and in its relationship to the United States. Chinese leaders believe it is necessary to hold the nation together, to keep it growing, to keep moving toward its destiny. But it will become increasingly difficult to maintain the closed political system in an ever more open economy and society.

China's economic growth has made it more and more dependent on the outside world for investment, markets, and energy. Last year it was the second largest recipient of foreign direct investment in the world. These linkages bring with them powerful forces for change. Computers and the Internet, fax machines and photocopiers, modems and satellites all increase the exposure to people, ideas, and the world beyond China's borders. The effect is only just beginning to be felt.

Today more than a billion Chinese have access to television, up from just 10 million two decades ago. Satellite dishes dot the landscape. They receive dozens of outside channels, including Chinese language services of CNN, Star TV, and Worldnet. Talk radio is increasingly popular and relatively unregulated in China's 1,000 radio stations. And 70 percent of China's students regularly listen to the Voice of America.

China's 2,200 newspapers, up from just 42 three decades ago, and more than 7,000 magazines and journals are more open in content. A decade ago, there were 50,000 mobile phones in China; now there are more than 7 million. The Internet already has 150,000 accounts in China, with more than a million expected to be on-line by the year 2000. The more ideas and information spread, the more people will expect to think for themselves, express their own opinions, and participate. And the more that happens, the harder it will be for their government to stand in their way.

Indeed, greater openness is profoundly in China's own interest. If welcomed, it will speed economic growth, enhance the world influence of China, and stabilize society. Without the full freedom to think, question, to create, China will

be at a distinct disadvantage, competing with fully open societies in the information age where the greatest source of national wealth is what resides in the human mind.

China's creative potential is truly staggering. The largest population in the world is not yet among its top 15 patent powers. In an era where these human resources are what really matters, a country that holds its people back cannot achieve its full potential.

Our belief that, over time, growing interdependence would have a liberalizing effect in China does not mean in the meantime we should or we can ignore abuses in China of human rights or religious freedom. Nor does it mean that there is nothing we can do to speed the process of liberalization.

Americans share a fundamental conviction that people everywhere have the right to be treated with dignity, to give voice to their opinion, to choose their own leaders, to worship as they please. From Poland to South Africa, from Haiti to the Philippines, the democratic saga of the last decade proves that these are not American rights or Western rights or developed world rights, they are the birthrights of every human being, enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Those who fight for human rights and against religious persecution, at the risk of their jobs, their freedom, even their lives, find strength through knowledge that they are not alone, that the community of democracies stands with them. The United States, therefore, must and will continue to stand up for human rights, to speak out against their abuse in China or anywhere else in the world. To do otherwise would run counter to everything we stand for as Americans.

Over the past year, our State Department's annual human rights report again pulled no punches on China. We cosponsored a resolution critical of China's human rights record in Geneva, even though many of our allies had abandoned the effort. We continue to speak against the arrest of dissidents and for a resumed dialog with the Dalai Lama, on behalf of the people and the distinct culture and unique identity of the people of Tibet, not their political independence but their uniqueness.

We established Radio Free Asia. We are working with Congress to expand its broadcast and to support civil society and the rule of law programs in China. We continue to pursue the problem of prison labor, and we regularly raise human rights in all our high-level meetings with the Chinese.

We do this in the hope of a dialog. And in dialog, we must also admit that we in America are not blameless in our social fabric: Our crime rate is too high; too many of our children are still killed with guns; too many of our streets are still riddled with drugs. We have things to learn from other societies as well and problems we have to solve. And if we expect other people to listen to us about the problems they have, we must be prepared to listen to them about the problems we have.

This pragmatic policy of engagement, of expanding our areas of cooperation with China while confronting our differences openly and respectfully, this is the best way to advance our fundamental interests and our values and to promote a more open and free China.

I know there are those who disagree. They insist that China's interests and America's are inexorably in conflict. They do not believe the Chinese system will continue to evolve in a way that elevates not only the human material condition but the human spirit. They, therefore, believe we should be working harder to contain or even to confront China before it becomes even stronger.

I believe this view is wrong. Isolation of China is unworkable, counterproductive, and potentially dangerous. Military, political, and economic measures to do such a thing would find little support among our allies around the world and, more importantly, even among Chinese themselves working for greater liberty. Isolation would encourage the Chinese to become hostile and to adopt policies of conflict with our own interests and values. It will eliminate, not facilitate, cooperation on weapons proliferation. It would hinder, not help, our efforts to foster stability in Asia. It would exacerbate, not ameliorate, the plight of dissidents. It would close off, not open up, one of the world's most important markets. It would make China less, not more, likely to play by the rules of international conduct and to be a part of an emerging international consensus.

As always, America must be prepared to live and flourish in a world in which we are at odds with China. But that is not the world we want. Our objective is not containment and conflict, it is cooperation. We will far better serve our

interests and our principles if we work with a China that shares that objective with us.

Thirty years ago, President Richard Nixon, then a citizen campaigning for the job I now hold, called for a strategic change in our policy toward China. Taking the long view, he said, we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations. There is no place on this small planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolation.

Almost two decades ago, President Carter normalized relations with China, recognizing the wisdom of that statement. And over the past two and a half decades, as China has emerged from isolation, tensions with the West have decreased; cooperation has increased; prosperity has spread to more of China's people. The progress was a result of China's decision to play a more constructive role in the world and to open its economy. It was supported by a far-sighted American policy that made clear to China we welcome its emergence as a great nation.

Now, America must stay on that course of engagement. By working with China and making our differences clear where necessary, we can advance our interests and our values and China's historic transformation into a nation whose greatness is defined as much by its future as its past.

Change may not come as quickly as we would like, but as our interests are long-term, so must our policies be. We have an opportunity to build a new century in which China takes its rightful place as a full and strong partner in the community of nations, working with the United States to advance peace and prosperity, freedom and security for both our people and for all the world. We have to take that chance.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:50 p.m. in the auditorium at the Voice of America. In his remarks, he referred to Nicholas Platt, president, The Asia Society; and President Kim Yong-sam of South Korea.

The President's Radio Address
October 25, 1997

The President. Good morning. I want to talk to you today about the vital importance of mammography in our fight against breast cancer. The tragedy of breast cancer has touched the lives of nearly every American family, including my own. This year alone, 180,000 women will be newly diagnosed with breast cancer and more than 40,000 women will die from the devastating disease.

Since I took office, fighting breast cancer has been one of my top priorities. We've nearly doubled funding for breast cancer research, prevention, and treatment. The recent discovery of two breast cancer genes by NIH scientists holds out great promise for new prevention strategies, and we continue to work to find a cure.

Until that day, we know that early detection is the most potent weapon we possess in our battle against breast cancer, and we know that mammography is the best way to detect breast cancer so that it can be treated before it's too late.

The First Lady and I have worked hard to make mammograms available to more women and to encourage more women to get mammograms. The historic balanced budget I signed into law last summer makes annual mammograms far more affordable for women on Medicare and extends this potentially life-saving benefit to all Medicare beneficiaries over the age of 40.

Hillary has led our national campaign to educate women about the vital importance of mammography, and I'd like to ask her to say a few words about it.

The First Lady. Mammography can mean the difference between life and death for millions of women. Yet I know from my conversations with women around the country, particularly older women, that far too many think they don't need mammograms because they are past their childbearing years. Others are afraid of mammograms. Still others don't know that their health insurance covers the test.

The National Mammography Campaign was launched to dispel myths and fears about mammography and to increase public awareness about Medicare coverage of mammograms. In the last 3 years, through community outreach, public service announcements, and partnerships with an energized business community, we have made a lot of progress. Now we must work even harder to reach women who, because of income, language, or cultural barriers, are the least likely to get mammograms.

The administration's Horizons project is doing exactly that, in six of our largest cities. This week we received the project's first report, and it is teaching us a great deal about how to reach older women who have not been getting mammograms. We are looking forward to taking what we have learned and bringing this knowledge to communities all over the country.

The President. The success of our campaign depends upon our ability to reach as many women as possible. This week, the National Cancer Institute is launching a wide-reaching education program to provide health professionals and women and their families with simple, straightforward information about the newest research and recommendations for early detection. These publications will reach thousands of women with a simple message. Mammograms are available, effective, and safe, and they can save your life.

When women do go for a mammogram, we must make sure they receive the highest quality care. High-quality mammograms can detect the vast majority of breast tumors and, when followed by prompt treatment, can reduce the risk of death by as much as 30 percent. Women need and deserve that security.

That is why today I'm pleased to announce new FDA regulations that will ensure medical facilities, health providers, and detection equipment are all held to the highest possible standards so that every woman gets the quality care she needs when she needs it most. With these steps, we're giving women and their families a powerful tool to fight breast cancer and new hope that the fight can be won.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 4:47 p.m. on October 24 in the Oval Office at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on October 25.

Remarks to the National Italian-American Foundation
October 25, 1997

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the warm welcome. Thank you for singing "Happy Birthday" to Hillary. I think the reason she—[*applause*]—I think the reason she wanted to come here is she wanted to make sure she got an Italian birthday cake, and she did. [*Laughter*]

Thank you, Frank Guarini, for your warm words and your friendship and for your service on behalf of our country at the United Nations. Thank you, Frank Stella, and I'm glad to see all the Members of Congress here. We have some members of the administration here. We have Jack Valenti here, who lets me watch movies at the White House. [*Laughter*] The best perk of being President is the movie theater, plus knowing Jack Valenti. [*Laughter*]

I'm also very glad that the Deputy Prime Minister of Italy, Walter Veltroni, is here, and I thank him for his leadership. You know, I've been spoiled coming to these dinners. A couple of years ago I came and Danny DeVito was here, and he jumped in my lap. [*Laughter*] I was afraid Al Pacino would jump in my lap tonight—[*laughter*]—but I had other choices.

I want to thank you for the people you're honoring tonight for their service and for their representation of the values of the National American-Italian Foundation. Especially, I want to thank you for honoring my friend Leon Panetta. You heard Frank Guarini mention some, but I must say not all, of the Italian-Americans who have prominent positions in our administration. I'm sad to tell you that the complaint has been filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission claiming that I have overrepresented Italians in my administration—[*laughter*]—and I plead guilty.

I can't say enough about Leon Panetta. We went to Rome together, and I spoke, and Leon translated my speech. Most people thought he

was giving the speech. [*Laughter*] I felt like that old joke about the Pope, you know, everybody said, "Who is that guy up there with Leon Panetta?" [*Laughter*] I miss him and Sylvia terribly, but I know they're having a good time in California. And I can tell you that if this country had a few more citizens like him, we would have a lot fewer problems, and I'm glad you're honoring him tonight. I would also like to congratulate and thank Congressman Tom Foglietta for his service, about-to-be service as our new Ambassador to Italy.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a night of joy and a night for the honorees, and I don't want to take a lot of your time. But I would like to say that, in a very real sense, what I have tried to do as President is to pursue a course that would reflect the values that are held so deeply by Italian-American families who have come to our shores and who have enjoyed such great success.

When I came here, I thought that Washington was, frankly, too divided, not just politically between Democrats and Republicans but almost intellectually divided. Everything was either/or. Should the Government do everything, or should it do nothing? The answer is, it should do neither. It should focus on giving people the tools to succeed and helping other people to climb the ladder that so many of you have climbed.

With so many people having to work and having children, should they have to choose? Of course not. Sometimes I still believe that our greatest challenge is to enable Americans to succeed at work and at home at their most important job, raising their children. Should we be able to grow our economy and preserve our natural heritage? I think we should. I think that is a false choice.

So I ask you all, whether you're Republicans or Democrats or wherever you are on the political spectrum, to always, always say that the United States should pursue a course that is consistent with our values and not be fooled into thinking that we have to sacrifice things that are fundamental to move ahead. The truth is, when we find a way to move ahead consistent with our values, we do better more quickly.

I'm very grateful for the success that the United States is enjoying today, and I'm grateful for the role that Italian-Americans have played in it, and I hope we can continue to do more.

Finally, let me say I'm very grateful to this organization for the support you've given to our administration in this great national conversation we're having about our racial and ethnic diversity. It's going to be quite a challenge, you know: sometime in the next century the United States will have no single majority ethnic group, even Americans of European origin. I know you hate being lumped with we Irish and the Germans and all the rest of us—[*laughter*]—but even the Europeans won't be a majority in America anymore.

And somehow, we have to find a way to celebrate our differences, just as you come here to celebrate your heritage, and still be bound together by fundamental values that are more important, into one America. If we do that—and I believe we will—it will be in no small measure because of the accomplishments, the achievements, the attitudes of people like you, people who are proud to have succeeded and want other people to have the same chance.

Sometimes, I think late at night about if I could say in one sentence what it is that I want, I'd like for every single child in this country to have that chance at the brass ring. And so many of you have enjoyed it; so many of you have been helped by your parents to do so. I hope that when we're done here—it won't be much longer, just a little over 3 years—virtually every child will be able to feel that he or she has that chance. If so, we will have fulfilled the mission that so many of you have been on.

So, once again, my congratulations to all the honorees. I thank you for giving Leon a chance to come back to Washington. He tries to stay away from here as much as he can now. [*Laughter*] I thank you for bringing all these wonderful Italian-American artists here so that I can see people I usually only watch on the screen or listen to with my CD's. But most of all, I thank you for all you've done to make America a much, much greater country than it would have been without you.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:35 p.m. in the International Ballroom at the Washington Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Frank J. Guarini, vice chairman, and Frank D. Stella, chairman, National Italian-American Foundation;

Jack Valenti, president, Motion Picture Association of America; actors Danny DeVito and Al Pacino; and former Chief of Staff to the President Leon Panetta and his wife, Sylvia.

Remarks to the 1997 NCAA Men's and Women's Basketball Champions
October 27, 1997

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. You see my voice is a little weak. You'll be happy it will be a shorter speech.

But we're celebrating two other athletic events here today. I think I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the Florida Marlins and the Cleveland Indians on a magnificent World Series, and the Vice President on finishing his first marathon yesterday. [*Laughter*]

I'd also like to welcome the Lady Vols back. It's tough to win those back-to-back championships. Al Gore and I know something about that. [*Laughter*] And there are many benefits about having Pat Summitt come back here year-in and year-out. I'm getting to watch her son grow up—[*laughter*]—and I enjoy it very much.

I want to say a special word of appreciation, since the Vice President got to talk about his native team—you know, a lot of you know that I am a fanatic basketball fan, and I got hurt last year right before the tournament. The only good thing about my agonizing injury incurred under humiliating circumstances—I fell 6 inches and tore my leg off—[*laughter*]—was that I got to see every game in the tournament that was on any channel on television. And I must say I was astonished by the performance of the Arizona Wildcats. They were young; they were energetic; they never quit. And I think that it will be a long time before we see another team so young, so full of energy, so full of depth, beat three number one seeds, which had never happened before, and produce the kind of record they did in that tournament.

I want to congratulate Miles Simon, who was named the MVP of the tournament; Michael Dickerson, a First Team All Pac-10; Michael Bibby, who was the All Tournament Team and the Pac-10 Freshman of the Year. He didn't look like a freshman on the court, I must say. And Coach Olson, I want to congratulate you on taking a team to the tournament I think every year since 1985, which is a truly astonishing record.

I think that I would be remiss if I did not also say that there are many of us in the United States who love basketball, who also want basketball to be a good experience for the basketball players, and who want them to become fine citizens, fine young men and fine young women. We talked about Pat Summitt's students all getting their degrees. I think everybody who knows anything about Lute Olson admires him as a person, as well as a basketball coach, and admires the qualities that he represents and tries to impart to his players. So, in spite of all the championships, I think that's the most important thing of all, and we thank you for that, as well.

Now I'd like to get on with having the two coaches, in clear and strong voice, and their players presented to all of you. So I'd like to invite Coach Summitt and Coach Olson to come up and share a few words.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Pat Summitt, coach, University of Tennessee Lady Volunteers; and Miles Simon, Michael Dickerson, and Michael Bibby, team members, and Lute Olson, coach, University of Arizona Wildcats.

Remarks to the Democratic Leadership Council
October 27, 1997

Thank you very much. If you listen closely, you will hear that I am in my annual voice-loss mode. [*Laughter*] I think I can get through this talk. We celebrated Hillary's 50th birthday over the weekend. A lot of our friends came in, and the weather changed. And about once a year when this happens, this happens. [*Laughter*] I'll do my best.

Let me thank Al From and Senator Lieberman. My good friend Sandy Robertson, thank you for what you said. To all the Members of the Senate and House who are here and who have been so good to the DLC over the years; to all my predecessors as chairman of the DLC, including several Members of the Congress and former Congressman McCurdy.

It's hard for me to believe that it's been 7 years since Al From, in his sort of gentle, demure way—[*laughter*]—persuaded me to become chairman of the DLC. It's hard to believe it's been 6 years since I announced my candidacy for President, nearly 5 years since we began to work together to prepare America for the 21st century. But it has been.

And for nearly 5 years, we have worked together on a simple but profound vision to say that the American dream should be alive for everybody who is responsible enough to work for it; that our country must continue to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity; that we have to find a way to bring our people together, across all the lines that divide us, into one America.

The success of the last 5 years owes much to the ideas and the work of the DLC and its grassroots leaders, going back to the mid-1980's, when a small handful of us organized it. Even then, the DLC was working to go beyond the stale debate and the false choices of Washington, DC, with modern policies, good ideas, mainstream values. Today, from time to time, I still lament the fact that we have not rid the rhetoric of our Nation's Capital of a lot of the old debate and a lot of the old false choices. But believe you me, out there in the real world where Americans live, we're a long way from where we were just 5 years ago, and you should be very proud of it.

First, we had to define what the role of Government should be in preparing our country for the future. We had to reject the idea of those who say we should do nothing with Government and reject those who say we should try to do everything. Instead, we gave the American people a Government that is very much smaller, more focused, but more committed to giving people the tools and the conditions they need to make the most of their own lives.

Then we had to go area by area to abandon those old false choices, the sterile debate about whether you would take the liberal or the conservative position, that only succeeded in dividing America and holding us back.

On the economy, we replaced trickle-down economics and its huge deficits with invest-and-grow economics, a strategy aimed at both reducing the deficit and investing in our people. On crime, we replaced all the tough talk with tough action, with a strategy that had both punishment and prevention, along with more police officers on the street. On welfare, we went beyond those who were complacent on the one side and those who condemned all people on welfare on the other, with a strategy that is tough on work but good for children and welfare families. On education, we went beyond the old debate of abandoning public education altogether or simply throwing more money at the status quo with a strategy of standards, reform, and investment. On the environment, we rejected the idea that protecting the health of our families has to hurt the economy. Instead, we embraced a strategy designed to preserve and enhance the environment and our public health while growing the economy. We also restored the primacy of family and community to our work with initiatives like family and medical leave, the dramatic expansion of the earned-income tax credit, the empowerment zones for distressed areas in our inner cities, AmeriCorps, the national service proposal, which the DLC did so much to begin. And along the way, we soundly defeated the Republican Party's 1995 Contract With America.

Our philosophy of opportunity, responsibility, and community, guideposts embraced by the DLC before 1993, are now America's guideposts to the 21st century. Our vision has, in large

measure, become America's vision. And because of that, America is stronger than it has been in a long time: our economy the healthiest in the world, our social fabric mending, our international leadership unchallenged. With 13 million new jobs, low inflation, low unemployment, homeownership at an all-time high, crime down for 5 years in a row, record millions of people moving from welfare to work, we are preparing America for the 21st century.

Once again, we face the future with confidence, confidence that must give us strength for the work ahead. For today I want to talk to you about that, what we still have to do to prepare our people for this new era. Today, it seems to me the central challenge for the DLC, for all Democrats, indeed, for all Americans, is how to seize the benefits of a new economy in a way that benefits all our people, that keeps us all moving forward together.

The cutting-edge industries of the future, computers, biotech, aerospace—in those, America leads the world. We also lead the world again for the first time since the seventies in automobile production and sales. In sectors old and new, information and technology and global commerce are leading the transformation. The new wealth of nations is to be found in skills, knowledge, and imagination. But this must also be backed up by strong trade policies, strong economic policies, a commitment to the environment and to giving all our people the chance to succeed.

Here again, this must not be an either/or choice. We must embrace both the global economy and the idea that there should be a social compact of mutual interdependence and responsibility.

Now, in the industrial age, the progressive movement and the New Deal forged the social compact in which the success of the economy was premised on the security of working people. The 20th century social compact served us very well. It built our middle class. It embodied the American dream. But it is not adequate to deal with the rapid change and energy of the information economy.

Therefore, it is up to us—to all of us—the generation of the computer revolution, to craft a new social compact for a new economy, a new understanding of the responsibilities of Government and business and every one of us, of what we owe to each other. It is up to us to make sure that our people have the strength, the skills, the security, the flexibility we need to reap the rewards of the 21st century.

Now, when I took office in 1993, the new economy was within reach, but our policies were keeping it from us, building up big deficits, high unemployment, stagnant wages. We took a new and different approach—first, to reduce the deficit, to free our people of the dead weight that had been on us since the 1980's. In 1993, with your strong support, we did just that. Normally, I don't dwell on the past, but I think it's worth pointing out one more time: the deficit reduction plan of 1993 was supported only by Democrats, enacted in the face of the most withering partisan criticism and real political risk that cost some Members their positions in Congress. Well, it's time for the naysayers to admit they were wrong. It worked, and America is better for it.

On the day I took office, the deficit was $290 billion. I am pleased to tell you that today, the budget deficit this past year was $22.6 billion. That is a reduction of $267 billion, more than 90 percent, even before the balanced budget law saves one red cent. The Democratic Party gave that to America, and I am proud of them for doing it.

Our deficit today is the smallest share of our economy since 1970, the first time in 50 years the deficit has gone down 5 years in a row, the first time in decades our economy has grown while the deficit went down, not up. Now the balanced budget law will complete the process, give us the first balanced budget in a generation. And I hope the DLC will always be proud of its role in replacing trickle-down economics with invest-and-grow economics.

The second strategy of—the second element of our strategy has been to expand exports. You all know the arithmetic: We are 4 percent of the world's population, 20 percent of its income; 96 percent of the world's consumers live somewhere else; the developing countries are growing 3 times as fast as the developed countries. We are the world's number one exporter. If we want to keep our income, with our population base, we have to sell even more to the other 96 percent, especially those who are growing the most rapidly.

Export-related jobs pay more. Fully a third of our economic growth in the past 5 years came from trade. This has happened in no small measure because we have negotiated tough trade agreements—over 200 of them—to open

new markets to American products. Our markets in general have been open to the world for decades. The core of our international economic strategy has been to open the world's markets to us. Our workers, when given a fair chance, can outcompete anyone. When I've had the authority to make broad agreements, I have used it in America's interest.

That's why it's critically important that the President be given this fast-track authority again, to negotiate trade agreements and submit them to Congress, the same authority every President of either party has had since Gerald Ford, the ability to create open and fair trade for business and working people and to advance our prosperity.

Let me just give you one example. The information technology agreement we reached with 37 other nations just a year ago will eliminate tariffs and unshackle trade of $500 billion in computers, semiconductors, and telecommunications. This $5 billion cut in tariffs on American products can lead to hundreds of thousands of high-wage jobs for our people. And we can do more of this if I have the power to do it.

I want to open trade in areas where American firms are leading: computer software, medical equipment, environmental technology. I want to open foreign markets to our agricultural products that aren't open to them now. I want to open the markets of Chile and other Latin nations to our goods and services, and other nations that are growing 3 times the rate of the American, the European, and the Japanese economies. If we don't seize these opportunities, our competitors will.

Last year, for the first time in recent history, Latin American nations had more trade with Europe than the United States. Now that Canada has negotiated a trade agreement with Chile, every major economy in the hemisphere has duty-free access to Chile's markets but one—ours. Now, that's a bad deal for our businesses and our workers. It's an "America last" strategy. For the life of me, I can't figure out why anybody in the wide world believes it will create jobs for us to stay out of markets that other people are in, when we can win the competitive wars.

The fast-track legislation I support is responsible. It recognizes that America is not alone in needing to see that the new economy is accompanied with a new social contract. It will give us leverage to make progress with our trading partners on child labor, labor standards generally, the environment. The most detailed and concrete authority for these issues ever to be included in this kind of legislation is in bills reported out by the committees.

Now, there are some who want more, who would prescribe what has to be in a trade agreement even before I negotiate it. They want to delay fast-track authority because they don't think, apparently, I have enough of it. But walking away from this opportunity will not create a single job. It will not save jobs. It will not keep a single child in another country out of a sweatshop. It will not clean up a single toxic site in another nation. Turning away will not expand our economy, enhance our competitiveness, empower our workers. It will simply give away markets and jobs and global leadership that Americans should have.

Now, again I say, like so many other things, this is not an either/or proposition. I want to thank you for fighting for fast track. I want to ask you to keep fighting for it. I still believe we're going to win it. But we have to fight every day till the last vote is taken. But I also want to challenge all of you here to recognize that those of us who support open trade and want to reap its benefits have a responsibility to figure out what no advanced society has yet fully done, which is how can you embrace all the changes of the technological information age, all the changes of the global economy, and still preserve some measure of social contract so that everybody who's responsible has a chance to get a good education, to find a decent job, to build a strong family, to be part of a thriving community.

What is the new social compact? Well, we know at a minimum it's investing in the skills of all our people. We know that the core of any agreement in society in this economy must say that we have to equip everyone to reap the rewards of change. The risk and rewards of this economy don't fall evenly. Those who are better educated, who are flexible, who have skills and confidence to move on from one job to another and seize new opportunities, they are rewarded.

Therefore, we must make education our most important tool in erecting this new social compact. We cannot rest until we know that every one of our 8-year-olds can read, every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old can go to college, every adult can learn

for a lifetime. And as I said at the beginning, we have to say in education we must be—to succeed—for standards, reform, and investment.

We've worked hard to open the doors of college to all who want to go—the biggest increased investment in higher education in 50 years. We're moving forward to renew our public schools with school choice and thousands of charter schools which the DLC has been so strongly advocating, to connect every classroom to the Internet by 2000, to raise standards so that every child can master the basics.

And again, I say, if Congress walks away from this standards fight, I can't for the life of me see how we're going to help one single, solitary poor child by saying, "It's okay with us if you stay in a school, and you get out, and we don't know whether you know math or whether you can master the language or not." That is a terrible mistake, and you ought to hang in there with me on the standards fight and make sure we win it.

Today, good news—I expect to sign into law full funding for the America Reads challenge, which will significantly increase support, Senator Wofford, for AmeriCorps, a legacy of the DLC, so that our young citizen service can harness the energy of a whole army of volunteer tutors, now including over 800 colleges and universities in America who are going out into schools to teach young children to read.

We are trying to create opportunity and security for working people in other ways: giving them more pension portability and security, making it easier for people to carry their health insurance around, investing more in the health insurance of children of working families who don't have it now, the big increase in the earned-income tax credit. All these things will help people to build coherent work, family, and community life in the midst of change.

Our new balanced budget provides for more investment in empowerment zones, new community development financial institutions to help those areas that haven't been hurt by trade but haven't been helped by it either—all in the name of trying to make it possible for us to have a coherent life for responsible citizens in America, to empower people so that they can make their way.

Now, I think we have a special obligation to people who have not felt any benefits from this economic program. And I think we have a special obligation for those who are going to be displaced. I have never denied that with every economic change there would be displacement. But there has always been displacement. When we had electricity, the people who made candles didn't have so many jobs. Does that mean they weren't good people, that their lives had less meaning, that they had no dignity? Of course not. But it also meant we didn't abandon electricity.

So what is the proper answer? The proper answer is to recognize fully and frankly that we have not done as well as we should to deal with people who are displaced by the modern economy. We need to be humble about this. Nobody has solved this problem. You look at every advanced economy, they're trying to struggle with this. Nobody has a magic bullet, but we know we have to do better. And the DLC ought to be on the front line of saying, "You bet we're for fast track, but no, we don't want to leave those people who lose their jobs behind. And yes, we understand there are neighborhoods in this country where there still hasn't been any economic prosperity, and you bet we're concerned about them, too." That ought to be our contribution to this debate—more trade and more opportunity to make it in the new economy for everybody.

We're working with some Members of Congress to develop new initiatives to bring more Americans into the winner's circle, which we will announce next week. We also have to increase our investment in workers who do lose their jobs, whether it's because of a trade agreement, technology, or for any reason. We have to increase our investment in communities that suffer from dislocation.

We have learned a lot from our experience with military base closures. And based on that, we're going to step up our involvement when a factory closes because of trade or technology. And we have to do more to tap the potential of our inner cities and our poor rural communities. They are the great, nearest untapped market for American enterprise, the most important source of new economic growth. And we have to lift people up there so they can become a part of the growing middle class.

All of these things we have to do—balance the budget, expand exports, invest in our people—this will create a vital new economy. It is a strategy that has been developed and hammered into place out of the ideas that the DLC was advocating a long time ago. Now, we can't

turn back, and our party can't turn back. We need an economy for the 21st century, a Democratic Party for the 21st century to lead the way.

Every generation of Americans, at every critical juncture of our history, has fulfilled its responsibility to the progress of our great American experiment. And each step along the way has required us not only to advocate our independence but to acknowledge our interdependence.

The first American social compact was forged by the Pilgrims braving stormy seas to flee religious persecution and begin anew. As he came to join this colony, John Winthrop told his shipmates gathered in the hold of their ship that in America we must be knit together in this work as one man—rejoice together, mourn together, labor and suffer together, always having before our eyes our community in the work, our community as members of one body.

At the dawn of the new century, we ought to remember Mr. Winthrop as we write a new social compact. We must be the authors of our time. We can master this new economy, but we have to do it as one America.

Thank you. God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:40 p.m. in the Regency Ballroom at the Omni Shoreham Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Al From, president, Democratic Leadership Council; Sanford R. (Sandy) Robertson, event chairman; former Representative Dave McCurdy of Oklahoma; and former Senator Harris Wofford of Pennsylvania, Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service.

Statement on Signing the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

October 27, 1997

I have signed into law today H.R. 2158, the "Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998."

This Act will fund vital environmental, veterans, housing, community development, space, and science programs. Specifically, it provides funding for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and several other agencies.

The Act funds a number of my Administration's high priorities, including the Corporation for National and Community Service and the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) fund. National Service gives young people the opportunity to obtain funded for a college education while serving the country in areas of great need, such as the environment, public safety, and human services. While the Congress did not fully meet my request for America Reads within National Service, there are funds to give additional tutors the opportunity to help young students in their community. Funding for CDFI will increase the flow of capital to distressed neighborhoods and their currently underserved low-income residents, and provide financing for neighborhood redevelopment and revitalization efforts.

The Act provides $7.4 billion for the EPA, which will enable the agency to adequately enforce our environmental laws. I am pleased that H.R. 2158 fully funds my request for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, adequately funds the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, and provides an advance appropriation for Superfund, the EPA's major program that ensures the continued cleanup of hazardous waste sites. I am, however, concerned about reductions to the 1998 requested levels for Superfund, the U.S. Climate Change Action Plan, the Montreal Protocol efforts to prevent ozone layer depletion, and EPA's right-to-know programs. These reductions impede our ability to clean up 900 Superfund sites by the year 2000, hamper our ability to meet our international commitments on climate change and ozone depletion,

and deprive our citizens of needed environmental information.

The Act provides $24 billion in funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), including full funding for my request to renew expiring Section 8 contracts, thus assuring continuation of HUD rental subsidies for low-income tenants in privately owned housing. Funding is also provided for programs such as the HOME Investment Partnership program, Community Development Block Grants, and HOPE VI for severely distressed public housing. I am pleased that the bill continues to support States and cities through these vital economic development programs. The Act also funds my request for Brownfields redevelopment, an initiative to redevelop abandoned sites and return them to productive uses and thereby help communities revitalize these areas. The Act also fully funds my requests for Homeless Assistance Grants and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, and provides funding, although not my full request, for antidiscrimination efforts, including the Fair Housing Initiatives program.

The Act contains a major initiative to reduce the costs of Section 8 contract renewals for FHA-insured properties. The Act recognizes the gravity of the situation and provides HUD with many new tools. At the same time, I am concerned that provisions within the Act could limit FHA's ability to design efficient partnerships, increasing costs to the FHA insurance fund, and could restrict opportunities for assisted tenants to use portable vouchers to seek out the housing that best meets their particular needs. I am also concerned that there is no direct and explicit solution for the tax consequences that threaten the restructuring process.

The Act fully funds my request of $17.6 billion for the medical care of this Nation's veterans and contains my requested user fee proposal, funded at $0.6 billion. This new revenue source gives the Department of Veterans Affairs the incentive to improve its collections while ensuring more control over its future viability as a health-care provider.

Unfortunately, the Act also eliminates funding for the U.S. Office of Consumer Affairs, which has served Presidents of both parties over three decades. I will work to ensure that a consumer voice is maintained from existing agency resources.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
October 27, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2158, approved October 27, was assigned Public Law No. 105–65.

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

October 27, 1997

I am pleased to sign into law today H.R. 2169, the "Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998."

This legislation provides funds to improve safety on our highways, airways, and waterways. It would also permit the highest level of Federal infrastructure investment in history—investment to improve our Nation's highways, transit systems, Amtrak, and airports and, as a result, improve personal mobility and make America a better global competitor.

Unfortunately the Congress has done only half the job in passing this legislation. Authorization of the Federal grant programs for highways, transit, and highway safety expired on September 30, 1997. Until the Congress reauthorizes those programs within the constraints of the Balanced Budget Act, we have only the promise of record-high investment levels, not the reality.

I submitted my proposal to reauthorize those programs, called "The National Economic Crossroads Transportation Efficiency Act" (NEXTEA), last March. The Congress has held hearings and begun work on this legislation. But, as we near the end of the first month of fiscal 1998, the Congress has not presented me with legislation that would reauthorize these programs.

I call on the Congress to act—before it adjourns for the year—on a multi-year reauthorization bill that will give transportation planners and decision-makers the assurance of multi-year funding levels that they can use to continue to improve America's vital transportation network. My Administration stands ready to assist the Congress to resolve the issues and agree on a multi-year bill.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
October 27, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2169, approved October 27, was assigned Public Law No. 105–66.

Remarks at a Birthday Party for the First Lady in Chicago, Illinois
October 27, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. You can hear I'm a little hoarse tonight, but I'll do my best to be heard over the din. Let me say to all of you, first of all, thank you, Mr. Mayor; thank you, Mrs. Daley; thank you, Lois Weisberg. I thank all the committee, everybody who had anything to do with this day today. You have made Hillary and, I might say, her mother and her brothers who came with her today—you've made their whole family very happy. This has been an unforgettable day in her life, and I am profoundly grateful to all of you, and I thank you very much.

You know, before I met Hillary, you could put what I knew about Chicago in a thimble and have space left over. [*Laughter*] About a week after I met Hillary, I thought there was no other city on the face of the Earth. [*Laughter*] I'll never forget the first time I came here to visit Hillary. I remember only two things: her father would not come outside to say hello to me—[*laughter*]—which I thought showed good judgment on his part—[*laughter*]—and she took me to Chicago and showed me the city. And I fell in love with it then—that was a long time ago now—and I have been ever since.

This is a magnificent place. You have done unbelievable things. You're in the process of doing other unbelievable things. They may well make a larger chapter in the history of this city, but you will never have a kinder, better, warmer gesture than the one you've given Hillary today, and I will never forget it as long as I live. Thank you very, very much.

Audience member. Four more years!

The President. It's not constitutional. [*Laughter*]

I want to ask Hillary to come up now. You have to remember—this birthday—she wore it lightly for a long time, but her staff started celebrating it 50 days before the event. They wanted her to recognize precisely how old she was by giving her one present a day for 50 days up to the blessed event—[*laughter*]—which occurred yesterday. Now she's still celebrating it as if she's going to hold on for dear life. [*Laughter*] Whatever she wants to do, I'm for.

Ladies and gentlemen, our First Lady.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:25 p.m. in Gar Hall at the Chicago Cultural Center. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago and his wife, Margaret; Chicago Commissioner of Culture Affairs Lois Weisberg; and the First Lady's mother, Dorothy Rodham, and brothers Tony Rodham and Hugh Rodham, Jr.

Remarks at Oscar Mayer Elementary School in Chicago
October 28, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Evaline, and thank you, Mary. Thank you, Maggie Sullivan. Mr. Blitstein, thank you for welcoming me here.

I have been officially welcomed. [*Laughter*] I have my Oscar Mayer wiener here. When Hillary was teaching me about Chicago so long ago, we learned to sing the Oscar Mayer song. [*Laughter*]

Congressman, Mayor, Mr. Chico, Mr. Vallas, Ms. Buckney, Alderman Bernardina, Alderman O'Connor, Recorder White. I don't know if my friend John Stroger is here or not, but if he is, hello. I am delighted to be here today.

As all of you know, I'm sure, my wife had a wonderful day in Chicago yesterday, and her whole family was here. And I was regaled with it last night, everything that happened. Chicago is a really special place, and the people who are tied to it have this almost psychic energy, I think, about what's going on.

For example, on the way into Chicago, my brother-in-law told me, he said, "I've got good feelings about this." He said, "I even think the Bears are going to win." [*Laughter*] I swear he did. So there is something quite mystical about all this but also something very wonderful. I thank you for letting me come here.

I wanted to be here today because this school is the embodiment of the effort that I have asked Americans to make to prepare our country for the 21st century, to make sure we have an America where every person who is responsible enough to work for it can live the American dream, where we're still strong enough to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity, and where we look across all of our diversity and come together as one America.

I know today a lot of Americans are focused on the stock market. It may be disappointing, but I think it is neither prudent nor appropriate for any President to comment on the hour-by-hour or the day-by-day movements of the market. I'd like to ask all of us to remember that our economy is as strong and vibrant today as it has been in a generation. We saw yesterday that our deficit has come down to $22 billion from $290 billion. That's the lowest since 1970.

With unemployment and inflation at their lowest levels in two decades, businesses and banks healthy and sound, new jobs being created every day, our economy is continuing to grow steady and strong. That's why we have to feel confident and continue our economic strategy. We've got to balance the budget, expand trade, and invest in the education of all our people.

Now, on that last score—in spite of all the economic progress we're making, in spite of the fact that crime is down 5 years in a row, that we have the lowest percentage of people on welfare we've had since 1970—millions of people have left the rolls—on education, we know we've got a lot more to do to make sure all children receive the world-class education they deserve to thrive in the information economy of the 21st century. That's why I've put educational excellence and opportunity at the top of America's agenda, and that's why I've come to Oscar Mayer school, to thank the mayor, the principals, the teachers, the students, the parents, and the people of Chicago for leading this crusade.

Because of what you are doing, the city that works now has a school system on the move. Chicago has shown us that having high expectations for our children, setting high standards and holding students accountable for them, and above all, making sure we stay at it systematically, school-by-school, child-by-child—Chicago has shown us that this works.

By abolishing the destructive practice of social promotion and giving all children the chance to learn what they need to know, Chicago is leading the way to an educated America in which every 8-year-old can read independently, every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old can go on to college, every adult can keep on learning for a lifetime. That is the vision I want for every American community, and Chicago is leading the way.

Last summer, I signed into law the historic Balanced Budget Act, which will help to bring us closer to these goals. It will open the doors to college for everyone who is willing to work for it, through more Pell grants and work-study positions, better student loans, tax-free education IRA's, the HOPE scholarship, and other tax credits for all forms of education after high school. We're also well on our way to putting computers in all our classrooms by the year 2000 and hooking them up to the Internet.

But none of it will matter if our children don't master the basics. That's why I'm fighting to bring our America Reads program to every community in the country, gathering an army of volunteers led by our AmeriCorps young people to go in and offer to tutor one-on-one all children who are having trouble reading. Today, we already have 800 colleges, tens of thousands of students who are moving into our schools and supporting our children in this way.

I'm also fighting to introduce more choice and competition into our public schools and to establish thousands of charter schools within the public school network so people, where they need it, can actually fashion schools designed to meet the special needs of special populations.

I want to support communities in making our schools places of learning and values, not violence and disorder. And I applaud what your principal said about the character education program here. We ought to have that in every school in the United States. And I think we have to do more to empower parents to take an active role in their children's education. I always love to come to a school where a parent and a student talk, and I was glad to see them both doing such a good job today. Yes, give them a hand. That's good. [*Applause*]

But you can do all this and you still have to have high expectations, high standards, and some accountability, because people have to be working toward a goal and they have to know what the goal is. That's why I've worked so hard for the concept of academic standards in the basics that we say should apply to every child in America, and to establish voluntary tests to measure the students' performance, beginning with fourth-grade reading and eighth-grade math. This will give our parents and our teachers the assurance that their children have mastered the basics. This will let every employer know that a diploma means something, a job applicant can read a manual, tally a check, analyze and solve a problem, and become a dependable employee.

I want to thank the mayor for his early support of national standards, and I thank the city of Chicago for joining with 14 other major American cities for pledging to make sure their students meet them. This is a truly groundbreaking development. If anyone had told any of us who had been working for 20 years in the area of school improvement 10 years ago that 15 of the biggest cities in America would be leading, not bringing up the rear but leading the fight for higher standards for our children, recognizing that our poorest children and the kids that grow up in the toughest neighborhoods are the ones who need the standards the most, no one would have believed it. This is an astonishing, positive development, and you should all be very proud of it.

I can remember a few years ago when the only news those of us who didn't live in Illinois got about the Chicago school system was the annual strike. [*Laughter*] I can remember we used to see a picture of the Governor's daughter in his office, waiting for the strike to be over, hanging around with her dad. And I now see what has happened: A whole people, led by a strong mayor and dedicated educators, have rejected low test scores, high drop-out rates, students earning diplomas they couldn't read, and instead have demanded results from their principals, their teachers, their schools, and most importantly, the students, letting them know they can't move on to the next grade unless they know what they're supposed to know from the grade they're finishing. You've strengthened curricula, renovated buildings, retrained teachers, expanded preschool education, kept schools open longer in the summertime to give children who need it extra help.

I'd like to say here, for the rest of America that might be watching this today, something that you have taught us: Ending social promotion does not put children down; it gives us a chance to lift all children up. We are not punishing children by making sure they know what they need to know and that when they move from grade to grade, it means something. And we don't do anyone, especially our poorest children in our toughest neighborhoods, a favor by giving them a pass on high standards. All of our children can succeed, and they deserve a chance to do it, even, if all else fails, repeating a grade.

You know, people used to say that asking a child to repeat a grade was too high a price to pay for learning because of the damage to self-esteem. But we know that children develop in different ways at different times. And we know that while a year seems like an eternity to an 8-year-old child or a 16-year-old child, when you're 50 it seems like nothing. [*Laughter*]

I care a lot about the self-esteem of the American people. But I would ask you to think about the thousands of Americans who are sitting in GED classes today, struggling in literacy programs, standing in unemployment lines, who can tell you there is nothing more damaging to self-esteem than wanting a job and not being able to get one; wanting to get an improvement, a promotion, a raise, and not having the skills necessary to get it. And if we adults send our children the right messages now, their self-esteem will not be harmed by an expression of

love and hope for their future that prevents that sort of problem for them later on.

I want what is happening in Chicago to happen all over America. I challenge every school district to adopt high standards, to abolish social promotion, to move aggressively to help all students make the grade through tutoring and summer school, and to hold schools accountable for results, giving them the tools and the leadership and the parental involvement to do the job.

Today I am directing the Department of Education to share promising approaches to improving low-performing schools, such as those that Chicago has developed, with people all across America. And I'm directing the Department of Education to strengthen its own efforts to help districts use the Federal money that we have now to transform schools that aren't performing into world-class learning centers.

There is nothing wrong with America that can't be fixed by what's right with America. I said that in my first Inaugural; I see it again today. If you did it here, it can be done everywhere. If it's happened to one child, it can happen to every child. What is working in Chicago must blow like a wind of change into every city and every school in America. We owe it to our kids, and because you have done it, you've given us the courage and the conviction to believe we can do it for all of our children.

Thank you. Stay with it. God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:34 a.m., in the gymnasium. In his remarks, he referred to Evaline Medina, fourth-grade student who introduced the President, and her mother, Mary Medina; Maggie Sullivan, sixth-grade teacher, and Robert Blitstein, principal, Oscar Mayer Elementary School; Representative Rod Blagojevich of Illinois; Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago; Gery J. Chico, president, reform board of trustees, Paul Vallas, chief executive officer, and Cozette Buckney, chief education officer, Chicago Public Schools; Charles R. Bernardina, alderman, 43d ward; Patrick J. O'Connor, alderman, 40th ward; Jesse C. White, Jr., Cook County recorder of deeds; and John Stroger, president, Cook County board of commissioners.

Memorandum on Low-Performing Public Schools

October 28, 1997

Memorandum for the Secretary of Education

Subject: Turning Around Low-Performing Public Schools

Since taking office in 1993, and with your strong leadership, my Administration has pursued a comprehensive effort to strengthen public schools. We have worked to raise academic standards, promote accountability, and provide greater competition and choice within the public schools, including support for a dramatic increase in charter schools. Moreover, we have worked to make the investments necessary to improve teaching and learning in classrooms across America, through efforts to keep our schools safe and free of drugs; to provide students who need it extra help to master the basics; to increase parental and community involvement; to recruit, prepare, and provide continuing training to teachers and reward excellence in teaching; and to make sure every school has access to and can effectively use 21st century technology.

This strategy is starting to produce results. We know that all students can learn to high standards, and that every school can succeed if it has clear instructional goals and high expectations for all of its students; if it creates a safe, disciplined and orderly environment for learning; helps parents be involved in their children's education; and uses proven instructional practices. All schools must be given the resources, tools, and flexibility to help every student reach high standards.

Yet, no school improvement strategy can succeed without real accountability for results, as measured by student achievement. Excellent schools and schools that show significant improvement must be recognized and rewarded. At the same time, schools that demonstrate persistently poor academic performance—schools that fail to make adequate progress in educating all students to high standards—must be held

accountable. No American child deserves to get a second-class education. Instead, State and local education officials must step in and redesign failing schools, or close them down and reopen them with new, more effective leadership and staff.

A growing number of cities and States have begun to take these steps. Cities such as Chicago, San Francisco, Philadelphia, and New York, and States such as Maryland and Kentucky identify low-performing schools and take steps to intervene if these schools fail to make progress. These steps often include the implementation of school improvement plans—providing afterschool academic help to students, strengthening training and assistance for school staff, creating smaller and more personal settings, such as schools-within-schools—and, where necessary, reconstitution of the school and replacement of the school principal and other staff.

We must encourage and help more cities and States to take up the challenge of turning around low-performing schools and helping the students they serve get back on the path to achievement. We can do this by making widely available information on what works and what doesn't, and by ensuring that Department of Education resources are most productively used for these purposes.

In order to accomplish this, I am directing the Department of Education to take the following actions within 90 days:

1. *Produce and Widely Disseminate Guidelines on Effective Approaches to Turning Around Low-Performing Schools.* There is much of value to be shared from the experiences of cities and States that already have successfully intervened in low-performing schools; from research and development on effective school improvement practices; and from business experience in managing high-performance organizations and in turning around low-performing companies. We know of several promising models of reform, ranging from the New American Schools designs to the Success for All program. These lessons must be summarized in clear and usable forms, and made widely available to educators, parents, State and local policymakers, business leaders, and others working to improve public education.
2. *Help Cities and States Use Existing Department of Education Resources to Turn Around Low-Performing Schools.* First, Department of Education programs should help and encourage more cities and States to develop and implement sound, comprehensive approaches to turn around low-performing schools and help students in them get a better education. The Department should develop a plan to provide technical assistance to cities and States seeking to turn around failing schools. In addition, the Department should inform cities and States of how they can use funds from existing Department programs to support their objectives. Many programs, such as Title I, Goals 2000, the Public Charter Schools Program, and the 21st Century Schools Program, are well suited for intervening in failing schools, because they can be used to provide extra help to students during and after the school day; to support high quality professional development for teachers; and to plan and implement effective school reforms. The Department should ensure that local school districts can easily and effectively access Federal funds from such programs and use them in an integrated fashion to support comprehensive efforts to improve low-performing schools. Where there are statutory barriers to accomplishing this purpose, such barriers should be identified so we can work with the Congress to change them.

Together, these initiatives can help local school districts turn failing schools into successful schools by improving teacher training, strengthening instructional practices, overhauling school management, and implementing schoolwide reforms. They can provide students who need it with extra help, during and after school hours. And they can provide students with additional choices within the public schools.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Statement on the Death of Representative Walter H. Capps
October 28, 1997

Hillary and I were shocked and deeply saddened to learn of the death of Representative Walter Capps. He was a rare soul, someone able to fuse intense spirituality with a devotion to his community and country. He brought constant values, a rare perspective, and a sense of moral grounding that public life too often lacks, and will sorely miss. I will always be grateful for his friendship and support. Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Lois, his children Lisa, Todd, and Laura, who has worked with us at the White House, and their entire family.

Remarks at the Welcoming Ceremony for President Jiang Zemin of China
October 29, 1997

President Jiang, Mrs. Wang, members of the Chinese delegation, welcome to the White House, and welcome to America. Mr. President, your visit gives us both an opportunity and a responsibility. At the dawn of a new century and a new millennium, let us strengthen the bonds between us; let us pursue common causes; let us address our differences openly and with respect; let us build a better world for our children.

We admire the progress China has made in such a short time. Your reforms have lifted millions from poverty, offering better housing and better schools. The Chinese people enjoy today a better standard of living than at any time in China's history. China is playing a stronger role in the community of nations, from promoting peace in Korea and Cambodia to fighting international crime and drug trafficking. Hundreds of international organizations now benefit from Chinese participation, and we welcome tens of thousands of Chinese students to the United States every year. They come to learn, but they also teach us a lot and they teach a lot, especially, to our young people with whom they will shape the future.

Mr. President, our challenge is to build on this progress for the benefit of China, the United States, and the world. For even as we admire the Great Wall of China, we must work to ensure that fewer and fewer barriers separate us.

Both our countries can best advance our interests and our values by working together rather than standing apart. For together we can lay the groundwork for a safer, better world, where peace prevails and prosperity grows; where we join to fight the threats that none of us can conquer alone; where all our children enjoy clean air, clean water, and a healthy future; and where people are treated with dignity, free to express their beliefs and observe their faiths.

Mr. President, Chinese immigrants who came here in the 19th century called America the "Golden Mountain." They made their dream a reality when they helped to build San Francisco into a thriving cosmopolitan city on a hill. Since then our people have climbed many mountains together. When you laid a wreath at Pearl Harbor, you paid tribute to the alliance between our people that brought victory in World War II. Now, on the verge of a new century, our two great nations must join our strength again.

As we cast our eyes over the horizon and toward the future, one thing is absolutely clear: China, with its ancient civilization and renewed economic and political vigor, will have a profound influence on the new world of the 21st century. How China defines its greatness will shape the future for all the world's children.

Mr. President, together, we can make this new era the brightest chapter in China's long and rich history, the best days America has ever known, and a new age of unprecedented peace and prosperity for all the world. That, Mr. President, is the future we hope for as we welcome you to the United States.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:18 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, where President Jiang was accorded a formal welcome with full

military honors. In his remarks, he referred to President Jiang's wife, Madame Wang Yeping. The transcript made available by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of President Jiang.

The President's News Conference with President Jiang Zemin of China
October 29, 1997

President Clinton. Mr. President, let me again say how pleased we are to welcome the leader of a great people with a remarkable civilization, history, and culture, a people now with its focus on the future. Your visit gives us the opportunity and the responsibility to build a future that is more secure, more peaceful, more prosperous for both our people.

To that end, I am pleased that we have agreed to regular summit meetings. I look forward to visiting China next year. We also have agreed to high-level dialogs between our Cabinet officials on the full range of security matters, and we will connect a Presidential hotline to make it easier for us to confer at a moment's notice.

China and the United States share a profound interest in a stable, prosperous, open Asia. We've worked well together in convincing North Korea to end its dangerous nuclear program. Today President Jiang and I agreed we will urge Pyongyang to take part in four-party peace talks with South Korea.

We also agreed to strengthen contacts between our militaries, including through a maritime agreement, to decrease the chances of miscalculation and increase America's ties to a new generation of China's military leaders.

A key to Asia's stability is a peaceful and prosperous relationship between the People's Republic of China and Taiwan. I reiterated America's longstanding commitment to a "one China" policy. It has allowed democracy to flourish in Taiwan and provides a framework in which all three relationships can prosper—between the United States and the PRC, the United States and Taiwan, and Taiwan and the People's Republic of China.

I told President Jiang that we hope the People's Republic of China and Taiwan would resume a constructive cross-strait dialog and expand cross-strait exchanges. Ultimately, the relationship between the PRC and Taiwan is for the Chinese themselves to determine—peacefully.

President Jiang and I agreed that the United States and China share a strong interest in stopping the spread of weapons of mass destruction and other sophisticated weaponry in unstable regions and rogue states, notably Iran. I welcome the steps China has taken and the clear assurances it has given today to help prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and related technology.

On the basis of these steps and assurances, I agreed to move ahead with the U.S.-China agreement for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. It will allow our companies to apply for licenses to sell equipment to Chinese nuclear powerplants, subject to U.S. monitoring. This agreement is a win-win-win. It serves America's national security, environmental, and economic interests.

President Jiang and I agreed to increase the cooperation between our countries in fighting international organized crime, drug trafficking, and alien smuggling. Our law enforcement officials will share information and consult regularly. And starting next year, we will station Drug Enforcement Administration officers in Beijing.

I'm also pleased that we will expand our cooperation on rule-of-law programs. Through them, we'll help China to train judges and lawyers, increase our exchanges of legal experts and materials, strengthen commercial law and arbitration in China, and share ideas on issues such as legal aid and administrative reform.

In both China and the United States, trade has been a critical catalyst for growth. China's the fastest growing market in the world for our goods and services. Tomorrow, Boeing will sign a contract for the largest sale of airplanes to China in history, 50 jets valued at $3 billion. This contract will support tens of thousands of American jobs and provide China with a modern fleet of passenger planes.

Still, access to China's market remains restricted for many America goods and services. Just as China can compete freely and fairly in America, so our goods and services should be able to compete freely and fairly in China. The United States will do everything possible to bring China into the World Trade Organization as soon as possible, provided China improves access to its market. China's decision today to join the information technology agreement, which cuts to zero tariffs on computers, semiconductors, and telecommunications equipment, is a strong step in the right direction.

As we pursue growth, we must also protect our shared environment. Already, pollution has made respiratory illness the leading health problem in China. Today our countries agreed to a joint initiative that will help China reduce air pollution and increase clean energy production, including through the use of American technology. The initiative builds upon the work begun by the Vice President in Beijing this spring.

I also discussed with President Jiang the special responsibility our nations bear, as the top two emitters of greenhouse gases, to lead in finding a global solution to the global problem of climate change. This is a broad agenda in which China and the United States share important interests that we can best advance by working together.

But we also have fundamental differences, especially concerning human rights and religious freedom. I'm convinced the best way to address them is directly and personally, as we did yesterday and today, and as we will continue to do until this issue is no longer before us, when there is full room for debate, dissent, and freedom to worship as part of the fabric of a truly free Chinese society.

Mr. President, I am very pleased that tomorrow you will visit Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, for it was there that our Founders set forth the beliefs that define and inspire our Nation to this very day. We believe all individuals, as a condition of their humanity, have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We believe liberty includes freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of association. We believe governments must protect those rights. These ideas grew out of the European Enlightenment, but today they are enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, not as the birthright of Americans or Westerners but of people everywhere.

I welcome China's decision to invite a delegation of distinguished American religious leaders to China to pursue a dialog on religious freedom. I'm pleased we have recommitted to discuss our differences over human rights at both governmental and nongovernmental levels.

Mr. President, China has known more millennia than America has known centuries. But for more than 220 years, we have been conducting our great experiment in democracy. We still struggle to make it work every day, and we know it requires struggle every day. The American people greatly admire China's extraordinary economic transformation, and we understand the importance that your own experiences and your present challenges lead you to place upon maintaining stability. We also appreciate the fact that human rights have been advanced in China by greater freedom from want, freedom of movement in career choice, and widely held local elections. But we also believe that China will enjoy more growth and more stability as it embraces more fully the political as well as the economic aspirations of all your people.

In the information age, the true wealth of nations lies in people's ability to create, to communicate, to innovate. Fully developing these resources requires people who feel free to speak, to publish, to associate, to worship without fear of reprisal. It is China's extraordinary human resources that will lift it to its rightful destiny of leadership and widely held prosperity in the 21st century.

As we look ahead, the United States welcomes China's emergence as a full and constructive partner in the community of nations, a great nation that joins its strength and influence to our own to advance peace and prosperity, freedom and security.

Mr. President, thank you for coming to the United States. We look forward to building on the good work of this day so that the best days for all our people are yet to come.

President Jiang. Ladies and gentlemen, a while ago I had an in-depth exchange of views with President Clinton on China-U.S. relations and on international and regional issues of mutual interest. The meeting was constructive and fruitful.

President Clinton and I have agreed on identifying the goal for the development of a China-

U.S. relationship oriented toward the 21st century. The two sides believe that efforts to realize this goal will promote the fundamental interests of the two peoples and the noble cause of world peace and development.

We both agree that our two countries share extensive common interests in important matters bearing on the survival and development of mankind, such as peace and development, economic cooperation and trade, the prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and environment protection.

Both sides are of the view that it is imperative to handle China-U.S. relations and properly address our differences in accordance with the principles of mutual respect, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, equality, and mutual benefit, and seeking common ground while putting aside differences.

President Clinton and I have also reached broad agreement on the establishment of a mechanism of regular summit meetings, the opening of a hotline between the two heads of state, the establishment of a mechanism of meetings and consultations between the two foreign ministers and other officials, an increase in exchanges between the armed forces of the two countries, and exchanges and cooperation between our two countries in economic, scientific, and technological, cultural, educational, and law enforcement fields.

My visit will achieve the purpose of enhancing mutual understanding, broadening common ground, developing cooperation, and building a future together, and bring China-U.S. relations into a new stage of development.

President Clinton and I share the view that China and the United States enjoy a high degree of complementarity and a huge potential for cooperation in the economic and trade fields. To step up our economic cooperation and trade not only benefits our two peoples but also contributes to economic development and prosperity of the world.

And I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you, Mr. President, for the kind reception accorded to me.

Now, questions are welcome.

President Clinton. Let a Chinese go first. We'll wait.

President Jiang's Visit

Q. I have a question which I would like to ask of President Jiang. President Jiang, for the past few years, you have reiterated once and again that we need to take a long-term perspective and we should view China-U.S. relations from the perspective of the 21st century. Therefore, Mr. President, what measures will the Chinese Government make, and how can a sound and stable relationship between China and the United States be brought into the 21st century?

President Jiang. And your question recalled of me of the first meeting that President Clinton and I had in Seattle when we agreed that we need to work to bring a world of prosperity, stability, and peace into the 21st century. The meeting that I had with President Clinton during my current trip to the United States was the fifth one that we had with one another. However, my visit is the first by a Chinese head of state to the United States in 12 years.

And this shows that both sides are working together and taking many specific measures to achieve this goal, and to put it more specifically, I believe it is very important for the two peoples of China and the United States to enhance mutual understanding. And I'm also coming here to the United States for the purpose of deepening mutual understanding between our two peoples.

There are a lot of works from ancient Chinese literature and culture describing the view that one should scale a great height in order to have a grander sight. And the development of modern science and technology also told us that if you have a greater height you can see farther into the long distance.

I do not want to take much of the time, so I would like to leave more time to President Clinton. [*Laughter*]

Human Rights

The President. Go ahead, Laurie [Laurie Santos, United Press International].

Q. Sir, we're told that you have asked, even last night, for the release of some political dissidents, and the Chinese have not done so. Is it acceptable for China to refuse even such a modest gesture?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, we had a long discussion about human rights; we discussed a lot of issues related to human rights, every conceivable aspect of it. And we have profound disagreements there. But that does not mean that this visit should not have occurred or that we don't have a big interest in continuing to work together. After all, this interest that

we have in working with China relates to the fact that we have common values and common interests related to preserving peace, to growing the economy, to stopping the spread of dangerous weapons. We have an agreement to fight narcotrafficking. We have an agreement to work together on the terrific environmental challenges we face—right across the board. So I think that you have to see this meeting in the context of that. But you shouldn't in any way minimize the steep differences that still remain between us over that issue.

Taiwan

Q. I have a question for Your Excellency, President Jiang Zemin. Why is the Taiwan issue the core issue in China-U.S. relations?

President Jiang. The three Sino-U.S. joint communiques all covered the question of Taiwan, because this question is involving the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China. The late Mr. Deng Ziaoping proposed the system of one country-two systems for the settlement of the Taiwan question and for the accomplishment of peaceful reunification of China, and this is the only correct policy.

However, we also say that we do not commit to renounce the use of force, that this is not directed at the compatriots in Taiwan but rather at the external forces attempting to interfere in China's internal affairs and at those who are attempting to achieve separation of the country or the independence of Taiwan.

I'm very happy that I discussed this issue in clear-cut terms with President Clinton during my current trip, as we have done in our previous meetings, and I believe the joint statement that the two sides are going to release will also carry explicit explanations on the Taiwan issue.

Thank you.

The President. Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Tiananmen Square and Human Rights

Q. Mr. President—a question, actually, for both Presidents—the shootings in Tiananmen Square were a turning point in U.S.-Chinese relations and caused many Americans to view China as an oppressive country that crushes human rights. President Jiang, do you have any regrets about Tiananmen? And President Clinton, are you prepared to lift any of the Tiananmen sanctions, and if not, why not?

President Jiang. The political disturbance that occurred at the turn of spring and summer in 1989 seriously disrupted social stability and jeopardized state security. Therefore, the Chinese Government had to take necessary measures, according to law, to quickly resolve the matter to ensure that our country enjoys stability and that our reform and opening up proceeds smoothly.

The Communist Party of China and the Chinese Government have long drawn the correct conclusion on this political disturbance, and facts have also proved that if a country with an over 1.2 billion population does not enjoy social and political stability, it cannot possibly have the situation of reform and opening up that we are having today.

Thank you.

President Clinton. To answer your question, first, on the general point, I think it should be obvious to everyone that we have a very different view of the meaning of events at Tiananmen Square. I believe that what happened and the aftermath and the continuing reluctance to tolerate political dissent has kept China from politically developing the level of support in the rest of the world that otherwise would have been developed. I also believe, as I said in my opening statement, that over the long run, the societies of the 21st century that will do best will be those that are drawing their stability from their differences, that out of this whole harmony of different views, there is a coherence of loyalty to the nation because everyone has their say. It enables people to accept, for example, the results of the elections that they don't agree with. So we have a different view.

The depth of the view in the United States, I think, is nowhere better exemplified than in the so-called Tiananmen sanctions. We are the only nation in the world, as far as I know, that still has sanctions on the books as a result of the events of 8 years ago.

Now, you asked a specific question. Our agreement on the nuclear proliferation issues allows me to lift the sanction on peaceful nuclear cooperation. It is the right thing to do for America. This is a good agreement. It furthers our national security interests. China is to be complimented for participating in it, and the decision is the right one.

The other sanctions, which cover a range of issues from OPIC loans to crime control equipment and many things in-between, under our law have to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. So as a result of our meeting today, the only Tiananmen Square sanction which is being lifted is the one on peaceful nuclear cooperation, and it is a good thing for America and China. And I applaud the Chinese side for the work they have done with us on this specific nuclear issue. It is a substantial step forward for us.

President Jiang. I would like to speak a few words in addition to this question. Our two countries have different geographical locations, and we are also thousands of miles apart geographically. We also have different historic and cultural tradition, different level of economic development, and different values. Therefore, I believe it is just natural for our two countries to hold different views on some issues.

Now, people in the world are standing at the turn of the century when we're going to bring in the 21st century, and science and technology have developed significantly as compared with, for instance, the period when Newton lived. And I also believe that the world we are living in is a rich and diverse one, and therefore the concepts on democracy and human rights and on freedoms are relative and specific ones, and they are to be determined by the specific national situation of different countries.

And I am also strongly of the view that on such issues as the human rights issue, discussions can be held on the basis of noninterference in the internal affairs of a country. And it goes without saying that as for the general rules universally abided by in the world, China also abides these rules.

My stay here in the United States is rather a brief one. There is the fact that since I came here I have been immersed in the atmosphere of friendship from the American people, and I was also accorded a warm reception from President Clinton and Vice President Gore. However, sometimes noises came into my ears.

According to Chinese philosophy, Confucius said, "Isn't it a pleasure to have friends coming from afar." And naturally, I am also aware that in the United States different views can be expressed, and this is a reflection of democracy. And therefore, I would like to quote a Chinese saying, which goes, "Seeing it once is better than hearing about it 100 times." I've also got my real understanding about this during my current trip. However, I don't believe this will have any negative impact on our effort to approach each other.

President Clinton. Let me—I just have to say one other thing. [*Laughter*] First of all, the United States recognizes that on so many issues China is on the right side of history, and we welcome it. But on this issue we believe the policy of the Government is on the wrong side of history. There is, after all, now a Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The second point I'd like to make is that I can only speak from our experience. And America has problems of its own, which I have frankly acknowledged. But in our country I think it would amaze many of our Chinese guests to see some of the things that have been written and said about me, my family, our Government, our policies. And yet, after all this time, I'm still standing here, and our country is stronger than it was before those words were uttered 6 years ago. [*Laughter*] Excuse me, before those words began to be said 6 years ago—they're still being said every day. [*Laughter*]

Taiwan

Q. Mr. President, I have a question for both President Jiang and President Clinton. President Clinton, you stated your position with regard to Taiwan that this is a question for the Chinese people to resolve. But we all understand you have brokered peace in Bosnia, in the Middle East. Do you see any role for the United States to play in the securing of a permanent peaceful environment in the Taiwan Strait?

And for President Jiang, about the cross-strait dialog. President Clinton said that he has urged President Jiang to resume the interrupted dialog. I wonder if President Jiang will respond positively and take some measures to resume the dialog as soon as possible?

President Clinton. First of all, I think the most important thing the United States can do to facilitate a peaceful resolution of the differences is to adhere strictly to the "one China" policy we have agreed on, to make it clear that within the context of that "one China" policy, as articulated in the communiques and our own laws, we will maintain friendly, open relations with the people of Taiwan and China but that we understand that this issue has to be resolved and resolved peacefully and that if it is resolved in a satisfactory way, consistent with statements made in the past, then Asia will be stronger

and more stable and more prosperous—that is good for the United States—and our own relations with China will move on to another stage of success.

I think the more we can encourage that, the better off we are. But I think in the end, since so much investment and contact has gone on in the last few years between Taiwan and China, I think the Chinese people know how to resolve this when the time is right, and we just have to keep saying we hope the time will be right as soon as possible. Sooner is better than later.

President Jiang. To answer your question in rather brief terms, all in all, our policy is one of peaceful reunification and "one country, two systems." And as for more detailed elaboration on that, a few years ago I made my 8-point proposal along that line, and at the just concluded 15th national congress of the Chinese Communist Party I also delivered a report which gave a rather comprehensive elaboration on this. Therefore, I will not repeat them here.

President Clinton. I, too, will try to be briefer. Larry [Larry McQuillan, Reuters], go ahead.

China-U.S. Nuclear Cooperation

Q. Mr. President, could you elaborate a little bit more on your decision to approve these reactor—or to permit reactor sales? It's certainly something that has raised concerns by some Members of Congress. And also, could you describe just what kind of commitments you've received from China? Are they actually written?

President Clinton. Well, let me say, first of all, I am completely convinced that the agreements we have reached are sufficiently specific and clear that the requirements of the law will be met and that the national security of the United States will be advanced and that we will have greater success in our global efforts to keep nuclear technology and other dangerous weapons from falling into the wrong hands, as a result of the agreement we have made with China.

Discussions With President Jiang

Q. President Jiang, among the common ground you reached with President Clinton, what is the most important one?

President Jiang. I believe very importantly that I and President Clinton held full exchange of views on issues of mutual interest to us, and we also reached common ground on the major areas of our discussion. And I believe the most important thing is that both sides have expressed the desire to work in order to bring a world of peace, stability, and prosperity into the next century. I believe this is the most important common ground we have.

President Clinton. Jon [Jonathan Peterson, Los Angeles Times].

U.S. Troops in Asia

Q. Mr. President, the United States and China are inevitably big powers in the Pacific. Are you comfortable with the size of America's military presence in Asia? And I'd also like to ask President Jiang if he would view a reduction of American troops in the region as a step towards improving relations.

President Clinton. The question you ask of me, the answer is simple. It's yes. I believe that our presence in the Pacific, where everyone knows we have no territorial or other destructive ambitions, is a stabilizing factor, and it will lead us to greater partnerships in meeting common security threats in the years ahead.

President Jiang. Hong Kong correspondent, please.

China, Russia, and the United States

Q. I have a question for both Presidents. Yesterday, Beijing announced its invitation for Russian President Boris Yeltsin to visit Beijing, and today the heads of state of China and the United States have announced here in the United States to establish a constructive and strategic partnership between China and the United States. Therefore, I would like to have your comment—the two Presidents—your perception concerning the triangular relationship between China, the United States, and Russia.

President Jiang. I don't see much contradiction in this aspect, for I am coming here to the United States this time at the invitation of President Clinton for what is our fifth meeting with one another, and therefore we are already old friends. And so am I with President Yeltsin of Russia. And I still remember that in the spring of 1995, the three of us met in Moscow. Therefore, I don't see much contradiction in this regard. And we should all commit ourselves to building a peaceful and beautiful new century.

President Clinton. During the cold war, we were all three suspicious of each other, and we tried to play each other off against the other.

[*Laughter*] So when Russia argued with China, we were very happy. [*Laughter*]

Today, we must look to the future. Russia has a strong democracy. Its economy is coming back. We are working with Russia in Bosnia and in other places around the world. In land mass, it is the largest country in the world. It is a rich country. It is a European country and an Asian country. And both China and the United States should have good relations with Russia. And then the three of us should work together on matters of common concern. This is not the cold war; we need to be looking to the future and a different set of relations.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN].

Human Rights

Q. Mr. President and Mr. President, I wonder if you specifically had a chance to raise the cases of the two leading political dissidents in China, Wang Dan and Wei Jingsheng, with President Jiang and ask for their release? And to President Jiang, why not simply release these political prisoners? And also, why not allow greater religious freedom in Tibet, which has become such an emotional issue here in the United States as well? Thank you.

President Clinton. First, as Mr. Berger, I think, has already told you, my answer to that question is, I discussed every aspect of this issue in great detail.

President Jiang. To be frank with you, President Clinton discussed all these relevant issues with me. I just want to state here that I am the President of the People's Republic of China and not the chief judge of the Supreme Court of China. And as for the issues such as the one concerning Wei Jingsheng, this involves China's criminal law and will be resolved gradually according to the legal procedure by the court of China.

As for the issue concerning religion in Tibet, in China people have the freedom to exercise their different religious beliefs. However, on this question, I believe religious freedom in Tibet and the violation of criminal law are issues within different framework. And, therefore, I hope that mutual understanding between us will be promoted.

China-U.S. Relations

Q. My question is for President Clinton. In China, sometimes we are confused by American different policy to China. We know when you—there are factions in Congress which aren't friendly to China. So as President, how do you coordinate the unbalance to have a unified policy to China? Is there any elements to damage an effective Sino-U.S. relationship?

President Clinton. Well, let me say—make a general point first. It is very important that we understand each other so that if we have a difference, it's a real difference and not a misunderstanding. Therefore, in dealing with the United States, unless there is some clear signal to the contrary, you should assume that a statement by the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, the National Security Adviser, the Trade Ambassador, the people in our direct line of authority—they represent our policy.

We need the support of important people in Congress, and much of the leadership does support this administration's China policy. But I think it would be a mistake to think that the United States has no unified China policy because individuals or groups in the Congress disagree with it. We do have a lot of disagreement; we have had for 8 years now, ever since 1989. Until we resolve all these issues, in that sense, our relations will never be fully normal. But we have to keep pushing forward.

Karen [Karen Breslau, Newsweek].

We have one last—yes, this is the last one so the Americans and the Chinese will be even. [*Laughter*]

Tibet

Q. For President Jiang, sir, officials in your delegation have suggested that the protesters who have protested Chinese policies in Tibet are, in many cases, young people, students who have been misguided and misinformed by a Hollywood-led campaign. Sir, if that is so, and if we take to heart your old Chinese saying that seeing once is worth hearing 100 times, would you be willing to invite either a delegation, a senior delegation from the United States Congress or a group of international journalists to travel to Tibet and to see for themselves? Thank you.

President Jiang. I do, indeed, would like to welcome more people to go to Tibet and see with their own eyes.

President Clinton. Let me just, following up on that, make it clear again that the United States has no political objective in pressing the

cause of Tibetans, the Tibetan Buddhists, the Dalai Lama. We have only asked for the resumption of a constructive dialog based on a commitment that there would be no attempt to sever Tibet from China but instead an attempt to reconcile the peoples so that all freedom of religious expression and unique cultures could be preserved.

Thank you very much.

President Jiang. Thank you.

NOTE: The President's 152d news conference began at 3:30 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. President Jiang spoke in Chinese, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Joint United States-China Statement

October 29, 1997

At the invitation of President William J. Clinton of the United States of America, President Jiang Zemin of the People's Republic of China is paying a state visit to the United States from October 26 to November 3, 1997. This is the first state visit by the President of China to the United States in twelve years. President Jiang Zemin held formal talks with President Clinton in Washington D.C. and also met with Vice President Al Gore, Congressional leaders and other American leaders. Talks also were held between Vice Premier and Foreign Minister Qian Qichen and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

The two Presidents had an in-depth and productive exchange of views on the international situation, U.S.-China relations and the important opportunities and challenges facing the two countries. They agree that a sound and stable relationship between the United States and China serves the fundamental interests of both the American and Chinese peoples and is important to fulfilling their common responsibility to work for peace and prosperity in the 21st century.

They agree that while the United States and China have areas of both agreement and disagreement, they have a significant common interest and a firm common will to seize opportunities and meet challenges cooperatively, with candor and a determination to achieve concrete progress. The United States and China have major differences on the question of human rights. At the same time, they also have great potential for cooperation in maintaining global and regional peace and stability; promoting world economic growth; preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; advancing Asia-Pacific regional cooperation; combating narcotics trafficking, international organized crime and terrorism; strengthening bilateral exchanges and cooperation in economic development, trade, law, environmental protection, energy, science and technology, and education and culture; as well as engaging in military exchanges.

The two Presidents are determined to build toward a constructive strategic partnership between the United States and China through increasing cooperation to meet international challenges and promote peace and development in the world. To achieve this goal, they agree to approach U.S.-China relations from a long-term perspective on the basis of the principles of the three U.S.-China joint communiques.

China stresses that the Taiwan question is the most important and sensitive central question in China-U.S. relations, and that the proper handling of this question in strict compliance with the principles set forth in the three China-U.S. joint communiqués holds the key to sound and stable growth of China-U.S. relations. The United States reiterates that it adheres to its "one China" policy and the principles set forth in the three U.S.-China joint communiqués.

As permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, the United States and China support the UN in its efforts, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, to play a positive and effective role on global issues, including peacekeeping and the promotion of economic and social development. Both countries support efforts to reform the UN and to make the Security Council more representative, while retaining and improving its effectiveness. Stressing the need to put the UN

on a firmer financial basis, both countries will participate actively in discussions on the Scale of Assessments in the UN.

As two major countries in the Asia-Pacific region, the United States and China are ready to strengthen their cooperation to meet various challenges and make positive contributions to promoting stability and prosperity in the region. Recognizing that maintenance of peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula is of great importance, the two countries are working through the Four-Party Talks to help establish a durable peace on the Peninsula, and will continue consultations to this end. They also stress that it is in the interest of the two countries to maintain peace and stability in other important regions, including the Middle East, the Gulf, and South Asia.

The two Presidents agreed on a number of steps that will provide a framework for further promoting U.S.-China relations and strengthening their cooperation in international affairs.

High-Level Dialogue and Consultations

The United States and China agree to regular visits by their Presidents to each other's capitals.

They agree to a Washington-Beijing presidential communications link to facilitate direct contact. They also agree to regular exchanges of visits by cabinet and sub-cabinet officials to consult on political, military, security and arms control issues.

Energy and Environment Cooperation

The United States and China reaffirm the importance of bilateral cooperation across the broad range of environmental issues, as evidenced by the establishment of the U.S.-China Forum on Environment and Development in March 1997.

They consider it a critical challenge to develop and efficiently use energy sources, protect the global environment, and promote environmentally sound growth and development. Accordingly, they agree to strengthen their cooperation in energy and environment through an initiative to accelerate clean energy projects and the appropriate transfer of related technologies. The principal areas of cooperation will be in clean energy, urban air pollution control and rural electrification. This initiative also will foster broader cooperation on global environment issues such as climate change, desertification and bio-diversity. China's State Planning Commission and the U.S. Energy Department have signed the U.S.-China Initiative on Energy and Environment Cooperation to promote effective cooperation in these fields, including the use of clean energy.

Economic Relations and Trade

The two Presidents are prepared to take positive and effective measures to expand U.S.-China trade and economic ties. As both economies move into the 21st century, information technology will be critical to spurring technological innovation and improving productivity. In this regard, China indicated its intention to participate as soon as possible in the Information Technology Agreement. In addition, in the context of WTO negotiations, China will continue to make further substantial tariff reductions.

The United States and China agree that China's full participation in the multilateral trading system is in their mutual interest. To this end, they agree to intensify negotiations on market access, including tariffs, non-tariff measures, services, standards and agriculture and on implementation of WTO principles so that China can accede to the WTO on a commercially meaningful basis at the earliest possible date.

Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation

The United States and China agree that it is in their mutual interest to cooperate in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. To this end, they each have taken the steps necessary to implement the U.S.-China Agreement on Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation concluded in 1985. In addition, China's State Planning Commission and the U.S. Department of Energy have signed an Agreement of Intent to promote peaceful nuclear cooperation and research between the two countries.

Nonproliferation

The United States and China agree to work to bring the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty into force at the earliest possible date. They also agree to pursue at the UN Conference on Disarmament the early start of formal negotiations on the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Production of Fissile Materials Used in Nuclear Weapons and Other Nuclear Explosive Devices.

The United States and China reiterate their commitment not to provide any assistance to unsafeguarded nuclear facilities and nuclear explosion programs. China has placed controls on

exports of nuclear and dual-use materials and related technology and will take further measures to strengthen dual-use export controls by mid-1998. The United States will continue to enforce firm controls on the export of nuclear and dual-use materials and related technology.

As original parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention, the United States and China agree to cooperate in implementing the Convention within a multilateral framework. Both countries agree on the importance of government oversight of chemical-related exports.

The United States and China agree to build on the 1994 Joint Statement on Missile Nonproliferation. They reaffirm their respective commitments to the guidelines and parameters of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR).

Human Rights

The United States and China both recognize the positive role of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and other international human rights instruments in promoting human rights. They reiterate their commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

While the two countries have not resolved their differences on human rights, they have agreed to discuss them through dialogue at both governmental and non-governmental levels in the spirit of equality and mutual respect. The two countries agree to hold discussions on the structure and functions of an NGO forum on human rights.

Cooperation in the Field of Law

The United States and China agree that promoting cooperation in the field of law serves the interests and needs of both countries. They will strengthen cooperation in combating international organized crime, narcotics trafficking, alien smuggling, counterfeiting and money laundering. To this end, they intend to establish a joint liaison group for law enforcement cooperation composed of representatives of the relevant agencies of both governments. They agree to begin consultations on mutual legal assistance aimed at concluding a mutual legal assistance agreement.

The United States and China will assign counternarcotics officers to their respective embassies on a reciprocal basis. Recognizing the importance the United States and China each attaches to legal exchanges, they intend to establish a joint liaison group to pursue cooperative activities in this area. These may include exchanges of legal experts; training of judges and lawyers; strengthening legal information systems and the exchange of legal materials; sharing ideas about legal assistance; consulting on administrative procedures; and strengthening commercial law and arbitration.

As part of this program of legal cooperation, China's Minister of Justice will visit the United States in November 1997 at the invitation of the U.S. Attorney General.

Military-to-Military Relations

The United States and China have reached agreement on the establishment of a consultation mechanism to strengthen military maritime safety, which will enable their maritime and air forces to avoid accidents, misunderstandings or miscalculations.

They agree to share information and discuss issues related to their respective experiences in the areas of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

Science and Technology, Educational and Cultural Exchanges

The U.S.-China Joint Commission on Science and Technology will continue to guide the active bilateral scientific and technological cooperation program, which involves more than 30 agreements reached since 1979, and will promote the further use of science and technology to solve national and global problems. The United States and China also will identify areas for cooperative projects using space for Earth science research and practical applications.

The United States and China will expand educational and cultural exchanges. Both Presidents believe that increased people-to-people exchanges will help cultivate long-term bilateral relations.

President Jiang Zemin expressed his thanks to President Clinton and the American people for their warm reception and invited President Clinton to visit China in 1998. President Clinton accepted this invitation with pleasure.

NOTE: The joint statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary but was not issued as a White House press release.

Statement on the Death of John N. Sturdivant

October 29, 1997

Hillary and I were deeply saddened today to learn of the death of American Federation of Government Employees National President John N. Sturdivant.

For more than 30 years, John played a vital role in the success of the American trade union movement. A born organizer, his determination, leadership, and commitment were central ingredients to the growth of AFGE, the largest Government employee union.

A champion of labor-management partnerships, he played an important and highly visible role in our initiative to reinvent Government. He was a true hero of the reinvention process, and his efforts contributed in a great measure to a Government that really works for all citizens.

I saw his commitment to Federal employees first-hand when we worked together during the Oklahoma City tragedy. He was a man who considered every Government worker—AFGE member or not—his sister or brother. His vision and creative leadership in improving the safety and security for all Federal employees at work will be just one of his legacies.

But another legacy will be his tenacity and strength—which he clearly demonstrated during the Government shutdowns in 1995. These events were truly defining moments for John and his union. His leadership was an inspiration to all of us, and I was very proud to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with him in this fight.

Today our thoughts will be with his daughter, Michelle, his family, and the men and women he served with such distinction.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Aeronautics and Space Activities

October 29, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit this report on the Nation's achievements in aeronautics and space during fiscal year (FY) 1996, as required under section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2476). Aeronautics and space activities in FY 1996 involved 14 contributing departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

A wide variety of aeronautics and space developments took place during FY 1996. The Administration issued an integrated National Space Policy, consolidating a number of previous policy directives into a singular, coherent vision of the future for the civil, commercial, and national security space sectors. The Administration also issued a formal policy on the future management and use of the U.S. Global Positioning System.

During FY 1996, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) successfully completed eight Space Shuttle flights. NASA also launched 7 expendable launch vehicles, while the Department of Defense launched 9 and the commercial sector launched 13. In the reusable launch vehicle program, Vice President Gore announced NASA's selection of a private sector partner to design, fabricate, and flight test the X–33 vehicle.

Scientists made some dramatic new discoveries in various space-related fields such as space science, Earth science and remote sensing, and life and microgravity science. Most notably, NASA researchers cooperating with the National Science Foundation found possible evidence of ancient microbial life in a meteorite believed to be from Mars.

In aeronautics, activities included the development of technologies to improve performance, increase safety, reduce engine noise, and assist U.S. industry to be more competitive in the world market. Air traffic control activities focused on various automation systems to increase flight safety and enhance the efficient use of air space.

Close international cooperation with Russia occurred in the Shuttle-Mir docking missions and with Canada, Europe, Japan, and Russia in the International Space Station program. The United States also entered into new cooperative agreements with Japan and new partners in South America and Asia.

In conclusion, FY 1996 was a very active and successful year for U.S. aeronautics and space programs. Efforts in these areas have contributed significantly to the Nation's scientific and technical knowledge, international cooperation, environmental health, and economic competitiveness.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
October 29, 1997.

Remarks at the State Dinner Honoring President Jiang Zemin of China
October 29, 1997

Good evening. President Jiang, Mrs. Wang, members of the Chinese delegation, Ambassador and Mrs. Sasser, distinguished guests, friends all, Hillary and I welcome you to America's house.

Mr. President, in your lifetime you have witnessed the sweep of a remarkable century, both in China and abroad. And in your different occupations, you have lived a rich sampling of the human enterprise. While you lead China toward the future, we know you also are a student of the past, with an interest in our history, from Thomas Jefferson to Mark Twain. Not many heads of state can recite the Gettysbury Address, Mr. Lincoln's powerful hymn to the sanctity of our Union and our guarantee of freedom.

China has played an important role in our history. In 1784, shortly after America's independence, the first American merchant ship landed in China. The Chinese officials knew we were not European, so they simply called us the "new people." And though we were unfamiliar, the Chinese allowed us to trade freely with them. So one of the oldest societies on Earth, China, extended the hand of friendship to the world's youngest nation.

The two centuries since then are a tiny fraction of recorded Chinese history. Long before the United States was even born, China was a stronghold of creativity, knowledge, and wealth. From the printing China invented to the poetry it produced, from medicine and mathematics to the magnetic compass and humanistic philosophies, many of China's earliest gifts still enrich our lives today.

Now, the Chinese people are dramatically building on this legacy. Economic reform over the past 20 years has transformed China's landscape and its people's daily lives, lifting millions from poverty, giving more people education, shelter, choice of work, and a chance to provide for their children, bringing the Chinese people closer to the rest of the world and into a greater leadership role in the community of nations.

Now, on the verge of the new century, both our nations seek to continue this progress, to contribute to China's growing prosperity, to encourage its democratic development, to support its emergence as a responsible global power and partner.

Surely a new world is dawning on the other side of the millennium. From Shanghai to San Francisco, a community is emerging that can become "Pacific" in every sense of the word. Communication and commerce cross even the world's widest ocean in only a matter of seconds, making all of us neighbors.

Let us make the most of these new realities. Our commercial and cultural relationship is strong and growing stronger. Our people travel back and fourth, teaching and learning from each other. Mr. President, we Americans are proud that your son received a part of his education at one of our universities, and we want more of our young people to study in China. We want to work even more closely to promote peace, to fight drugs and organized crime, to build prosperity, to protect our environment for future generations.

We must press ahead on these fronts and more. I hope some day, Mr. President, the children of both our nations will say of us that

our decision gave new meaning in our time to President Lincoln's call for a new birth of freedom. The United States has benefited already beyond measure from the contributions of Chinese-Americans, whose unique culture and values of family, education, and hard work have strengthened the fabric of our society. Already, China has enriched America's history. Now, Mr. President, let us work together with confidence to enhance our common destiny.

The ancient text, the "I Ching," in English is called "The Book of Changes." It tells us leaders plan in the beginning when they do things; leaders consider problems and prevent them. With this summit we have considered problems, taken steps to prevent some of them, and we have begun to plan together for a future not of problems but of progress for America, for China, for the world.

It is in that spirit that I ask you to join me in a toast to the people and the President of the People's Republic of China.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Jiang's wife, Madame Wang Yeping; and James M. Sasser, U.S. Ambassador to China, and his wife, Mary. The transcript made available by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of President Jiang.

Remarks on Unveiling the STARBRIGHT World On-Line Computer Network

October 30, 1997

The President. Now, as you can hear, I'm a little hoarse, but I do want to say that was brilliant. [*Laughter*] If you can shift the heat like that, you should go to Congress. I want to thank Ricky and Mikey and Lauren and Vanessa, thank my good friend Steven Spielberg. Thank you, General Schwarzkopf, for your outstanding leadership. You've got a very important battle here on your hands, and I'm sure you're going to win it.

I'd also like to thank Congressman Lou Stokes and Congresswoman Pat Danner for being here. I thought I'd take and make a little fun of the Congress so they'll go back and tell it, and I'll be in trouble again this afternoon. [*Laughter*] I'd like to thank Ned Zechman and all the people from the Children's National Medical Center here.

As you can hear, I'm a little hoarse. The Chinese state visit and the change in the weather have taken a little of my voice away, so I've asked the Vice President to come with me and give the speech. And I'm going to introduce him in a minute, but let me just say I cannot tell you how important I think what STARBRIGHT is doing is. General Schwarzkopf and Steven Spielberg have already talked about it.

What we're trying to do in the Government is to hook up every classroom and library to the Internet by year 2000. But we also want to make sure all the children's hospitals are there. These children deserve them. And we need for them to be a part of this emerging network of learning and playing and growing. And as the General said, it looks like it's a healthy thing to do as well. So we're glad to be here. Mostly we're here just to say thank you to the foundation, to all of you, and to say we want to do our part.

I think it's appropriate that the Vice President is here to speak instead of me because he was talking about the information superhighway before I had even gotten an electric typewriter.

The Vice President.

[*At this point, Vice President Al Gore made brief remarks. The President then took questions from children using the network.*]

Q. We would like to ask you some questions. [*Laughter*]

The President. Okay.

Q. What kind of food do you like to eat?

The President. What kind of food?

Q. Yes.

The President. I like fruit. [*Laughter*] I like granola. [*Laughter*] I like chicken—[*laughter*]—and I like all kinds of vegetables. And it would be easier for me to tell you what kind of food I don't like to eat. [*Laughter*] It would be a

shorter list. [*Laughter*] Peaches are my favorite thing.

Q. Mr. President, as you were younger, were your dreams ever to be a President, always?

The President. No, not always. First I wanted to be a musician; then I wanted to be a doctor; then I actually wanted to be a journalist once. [*Laughter*] But I was always interested in politics when I was younger, and I thought I might like to go into it. And I was very fortunate, so I got to be President. But I thought about it, but it wasn't like my lifetime ambition from the time I was 10 years old.

Q. Did you always want to be Vice President? [*Laughter*]

The Vice President. Yes. You know, to children all around this country—I've always wanted to be Vice President. [*Laughter*]

The President. It's not a bad job. [*Laughter*]

General H. Norman Schwarzkopf. We're really getting into some very dangerous ground here, so I think we better—[*laughter*]—better terminate this thing. Let me just say——

Q. Mr. President——

General Schwarzkopf. ——you've just seen the power of STARBRIGHT——

Q. Mr. President—[*laughter*]——

The Vice President. We always have trouble ending press conferences. [*Laughter*]

The President. Yes, I know.

General Schwarzkopf. But you've just seen the power of this system——

Q. What's your favorite sport to watch or play?

General Schwarzkopf. We'll take one more from Fort Worth.

The President. What's my favorite sport?

Q. Okay, what's your favorite sport you like to watch or play?

The President. My favorite sport to watch is probably basketball. My favorite sport to play is golf. I'm too slow to play basketball very well. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:37 p.m. at the Children's Hospital National Medical Center. In his remarks, he referred to Ricky Adams, Mikey Butler, Lauren Alexanderson, and Vanessa Gonzalez, STARBRIGHT Pioneer Children; motion picture director Steven Spielberg, chairman, and Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, USA (Ret.), capital campaign chairman, STARBRIGHT Foundation; and Edwin K. Zechman, Jr., president and chief executive officer, Children's National Medical Center. The STARBRIGHT World on-line computer network connected the Nation's largest children's hospitals to the Internet to enable seriously ill children to meet, play, and communicate with one another. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Signing Legislation Conferring Honorary Veteran Status on Bob Hope

October 30, 1997

Today I signed into law H.J. Res. 75, which confers upon Bob Hope the status of honorary veteran of the U.S. Armed Forces and extends to him the gratitude of the American people for his lifetime of accomplishments and service on behalf of our men and women in uniform.

Bob Hope is a great American whose life has defined patriotism and service. In times of war and peace, good times and bad, he entertained our troops and brought to them a familiar and comforting sense of home while they defended our nation's interests around the world. Bob Hope richly deserves this unique honor, and I am proud to be able to sign this measure into law.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 75, approved October 30, was assigned Public Law No. 105–67.

Statement on Campaign Finance Reform
October 30, 1997

I am very pleased that the Senate has agreed to schedule a vote on campaign finance reform. This will pave the way for the first up-or-down vote ever on the McCain-Feingold bill. At long last, we have an opportunity to give the American people the kind of elections they deserve. I want to commend the entire Democratic caucus and a few brave Republicans, whose steadfastness has now produced the first real opportunity to enact campaign finance reform.

Statement on Fast-Track Trade Legislation
October 30, 1997

I applaud Speaker Gingrich for scheduling a vote in the House of Representatives for next Friday, November 7, on the renewal of traditional trade negotiating authority. I am grateful for his commitment to move forward and work to secure passage of this legislation that is vital to our national interest.

Renewal of traditional trade negotiating authority, which every President has had since 1974, will allow me to negotiate strong trade agreements that break down foreign barriers to our goods and services and directly benefit American workers and American companies. This authority represents a partnership between the President and the Congress in support of both American jobs and American leadership in the world today. I look forward to continuing to work closely with Speaker Gingrich and others in both the House and Senate on a bipartisan basis to secure enactment of this legislation this year.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Brazil-United States Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation Agreement With Documentation
October 30, 1997

To the Congress of the United States

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, with accompanying annex and agreed minute. I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the agreement, and the memorandum of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement concerning the agreement. The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the agreement and various other attachments, including agency views, is also enclosed.

The proposed agreement with Brazil has been negotiated in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 and as otherwise amended. In my judgment, the proposed agreement meets all statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States. The agreement provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation between the United States and Brazil under appropriate conditions and controls reflecting a strong common commitment to nuclear nonproliferation goals.

The proposed new agreement will replace an existing United States-Brazil agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation that entered into force on September 20, 1972, and by its terms would expire on September 20, 2002. The United States suspended cooperation with Brazil under the 1972 agreement in the late 1970s because Brazil did not satisfy a provision of section 128 of the Atomic Energy Act (added by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978) that required full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards in nonnuclear weapon states such as Brazil as a condition for continued significant U.S. nuclear exports.

On December 13, 1991, Brazil, together with Argentina, the Brazilian-Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials (ABAAC) and the IAEA signed a quadrilateral agreement calling for the application of full-scope IAEA safeguards in Brazil and Argentina. This safeguards agreement was brought into force on March 4, 1994. Resumption of cooperation would be possible under the 1972 United States-Brazil agreement for cooperation. However, both the United States and Brazil believe it is preferable to launch a new era of cooperation with a new agreement that reflects, among other things:

—An updating of terms and conditions to take account of intervening changes in the respective domestic legal and regulatory frameworks of the Parties in the area of peaceful nuclear cooperation;

—Reciprocity in the application of the terms and conditions of cooperation between the Parties; and

—Additional international nonproliferation commitments entered into by the Parties since 1972.

Over the past several years Brazil has made a definitive break with earlier ambivalent nuclear policies and has embraced wholeheartedly a series of important steps demonstrating its firm commitment to the exclusively peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In addition to its full-scope safeguards agreement with the IAEA, Brazil has taken the following important nonproliferation steps:

—It has formally renounced nuclear weapons development in the Foz do Iguazsu declaration with Argentina in 1990;

—It has renounced "peaceful nuclear explosives" in the 1991 Treaty of Guadalajara with Argentina;

—It has brought the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco) into force for itself on May 30, 1994;

—It has instituted more stringent domestic controls on nuclear exports and become a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group; and

—It has announced its intention, on June 20, 1997, to accede to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

The proposed new agreement with Brazil permits the transfer of technology, material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. It provides for U.S. consent rights to retransfers, enrichment, and reprocessing as required by U.S. law. It does not permit transfers of any sensitive nuclear technology, restricted data, or sensitive nuclear facilities or major critical components thereof. In the event of termination key conditions and controls continue with respect to material and equipment subject to the agreement.

From the U.S. perspective, the proposed new agreement improves on the 1972 agreement by the addition of a number of important provisions. These include the provisions for full-scope safeguards; perpetuity of safeguards; a ban on "peaceful" nuclear explosives using items subject to the agreement; a right to require the return of items subject to the agreement in all circumstances for which U.S. law requires such a right; a guarantee of adequate physical security; and rights to approve enrichment of uranium subject to the agreement and alteration in form or consent of sensitive nuclear material subject to the agreement.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic

Energy Act. The Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committees as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
October 30, 1997.

Remarks at the Tropical Shipping Company in Palm Beach, Florida
October 31, 1997

The President. Thank you. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. As you can see, we are slightly delayed. [*Laughter*] When I took off this morning at 6:30 from the White House it was clear and beautiful. We had our normal 15-minute helicopter ride to Andrews Air Force Base, which was shrouded in fog. We flew around for 20 minutes in the airplane. When we got on the ground, it was like being in a sci-fi movie. It took us another 20 minutes to find Air Force One. [*Laughter*] You couldn't see your hand before you. And then we sat and sat and sat. So thanks for waiting. And Happy Halloween. [*Laughter*]

Now, your leader here told me about your normal Halloween dress. And I feel cheated that you didn't wear your costumes this morning. [*Laughter*] I used to do that, but since I became President they have relegated me to a small pin. [*Laughter*] But I hope you have a good time when we get out of here.

As you can tell, my voice has given out on me, and therefore, most of my remarks are going to be delivered by our fine Secretary of Commerce, Bill Daley, who is from Chicago, my wife's hometown, where they just—[*applause*]—somebody is from Chicago out there. They had a birthday celebration for Hillary's 50th birthday there. And I didn't think anything could make that a pleasant occurrence, but it actually did, and she was happy with it. [*Laughter*]

Secretary Daley just came back from our trip to Latin America with me, and he'll have some more to say about fast track. But before I introduce him, and before I completely lose my voice, I want to say that I have worked very hard so that there'd be more stories like Deborah Braziel's in this country. And in the last 5 years, we have vigorously pursued an economic strategy that would move us away from big deficits and move us away from living day-by-day, to have long-term, stable growth that hard-working Americans could participate in and benefit from.

We've had a commitment to reduce the deficit and balance the budget, to educate and train people and invest more in that and in technology, and to sell more American products and services around the world. That's been our strategy, and it's worked.

And I want to say a special word of thanks to Congressman Foley and Congressman Deutsch here, a Republican and a Democrat, for helping us to pass the historic balanced budget agreement that passed the Congress last summer. We haven't had a balanced budget since 1969, but the deficit has gone from $290 billion to $22½ billion in the last 4 years, and now we're going to balance the thing. It's going to be good for us.

We just learned today that over the past year our economy has grown at 4 percent. That's the fastest rate of growth in a decade, and one big reason is $125 billion in new exports. You helped the American economy to grow. You helped the American economy to create over 13 million jobs, and I thank you for it.

This strategy is working, and we have to continue to pursue it all. Yes, we reduced the deficit by 90 percent, but we needed that bill last August to balance the budget because our costs will keep going up if we don't continue to cut. We also need to invest more in education, and we've done more to open the doors of college than ever before, with tax credits and scholarships and better loans and education IRA's. And a lot of your children will now be able to take advantage of that, and maybe some of you will want to take advantage of that.

But it's a three-legged stool; we have got to have the exports. This fast-track debate in Washington is totally, I think, off the radar screen for most Americans. I bet, if you ask most people what fast track was, they'd say it's a new television series or maybe a new offensive football strategy. It's simply the same authority that Presidents have had for the last 20-odd years to negotiate agreements, take them back to Congress, and have them vote up or down.

If I go and make an agreement with somebody who lives in a different system of government, they don't understand if—they can understand if the Congress rejects the agreement, but they don't want to have to negotiate it again with 535 people after they negotiate it with my representatives. So most countries simply won't enter into agreements with us unless I have the authority to make an agreement and say, "Now, the Congress is the ultimate decider here. They've got to vote up or down. If it's bad for America, they're not going to vote for it. But at least you won't have it rewritten. We'll vote it up or down." That's all this bill does, and that's why Presidents have had it for the last 20-something years.

So I hope you will stick with us. I hope you'll urge the Congressmen and Senators to vote for it. And I hope you'll tell them that without regard to party, this is an American issue. It's helped to create jobs here at Tropical. It will help to take us into the 21st century. And if they'll stick with you on this, you will stick with them.

Thank you very much. Now I'd like to ask Secretary Daley to come up and say what I wish I had the strength to say.

Secretary Daley.

Thank you, and God bless you.

Secretary Daley. Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your patience. Even with an unbelievably bad voice, he is better than anyone else who could stand up here, so it is difficult.

I thank you also for not being cheered out after the great victory by the Marlins and being here. I thank you for putting up with this late substitution. On Halloween, I know you're all expecting quite a treat, but instead you have gotten a trick, and I'm sorry about that. [*Laughter*] But I think we could all sympathize with the President. And, Mr. President, I do feel your pain. [*Laughter*]

If you'll all bear with me, the President has asked me to read his remarks that he would have given. This is a rather awkward situation for me to stand here in front of him and read his remarks. There's probably only one person in this entire audience who is truly happy that this is occurring, and that's the President's speechwriter, because this will be the first time his entire text has ever been read. [*Laughter*] So let me begin.

"Six years ago, when I announced my candidacy for President, I said that America had a vital mission for the 21st century, and that was to keep the American dream alive for every person responsible enough to work for it; to keep America the world's strongest force for peace, freedom, and prosperity; and to bring our people together, across all the lines that divide us, into one America.

"We started with a new economic policy for the new economy, putting in place a bold three-part strategy to shrink the deficit, invest in our people, and lower unfair trade barriers to our goods. And this strategy has succeeded: strong annual growth and low inflation; more than 13 million new jobs; the deficit down 90 percent, even before the balanced budget law saves a single penny; America is leading the world in auto production once again; and unemployment is below 5 percent.

"We have made tremendous progress. But we have much more to do to prepare America for the 21st century. And Congress faces a decisive choice, whether to continue with a strategy that has helped give America the strongest economy in a generation. For one week from today, the House of Representatives will decide whether or not to keep America's exports growing with its vote on fast track. I applaud Speaker Gingrich for scheduling this vote and for his commitment to work in a bipartisan basis to enact this most important legislation this year.

"The arithmetic of the new economy is the following: We have 4 percent of the world's population and 20 percent of its income; 96 percent of the world's consumers live outside the United States; and the developing countries are growing 3 times as fast as the developed countries. So if we want to keep our income with our population base, we have to sell even more to the other 96 percent, especially those who are growing so rapidly.

"The workers here at Tropical Shipping know that more than anyone. And so do the workers

throughout this great State of Florida. For the exports from Florida have increased over the past 4 years by more than 50 percent, to over $30 billion. And that's one reason why this economy in Florida has been able to create a million new jobs during that same period. And here in West Palm Beach, Boca Raton metropolitan area, exports are up over $200 million since 1993.

"But there is still much, much more to do and many barriers to those American products. So we owe it to the working men and women of America and around our entire country to level the playing field for trade so that when our workers are given a fair chance, they can and they do outcompete anyone anyplace in the world.

"Congress must take this opportunity—it must not take this opportunity away from the American people to compete. For more than 20 years"—as the President stated—"every President, Democrat or Republican, has had this authority. If Congress grants this authority, we can use it to open trade where American firms are leading, such as computer software, medical equipment, environmental technologies. America can use it to open the markets of Chile and other Latin American countries to our goods and also our services.

"We all know we must do better to raise the living standards and environmental standards throughout the world. This trade authority will give me the leverage to negotiate agreements that do exactly that.

"The bills now waiting for a vote on the floor of the House and Senate offer the most detailed and concrete authority to negotiate these issues which have ever been included in this sort of legislation. And because we know that expanded world trade does not always benefit all Americans equally, we're working with Members of Congress to develop new initiatives to bring more Americans into this winner's circle. And with these initiatives we will increase our investment in communities that suffer from dislocation and in those workers who lose their jobs because of trade agreements, technology, or any other reason.

"So let's all be clear. Walking away from this opportunity will not create or save a single American job. It will not help a child in any country of the world come out of a sweatshop. It will not clean up a single toxic site in any nation. Turning away will not expand our economy, it will not enhance our competitiveness, and it will not empower our workers. It will give away markets, and it will give away jobs. It will jeopardize America's preeminent role and position in this world.

"Fast track is the key to U.S. leadership in the world economy, and now is not the time to raise questions about that leadership. Over the past 4½ years, our three-part strategy for security and growth has worked better than anyone had imagined. We have reduced the deficit to the lowest levels since the early 1970's. We have invested in our people with historic new commitments to education and health for all Americans. And we have raised American living standards by opening new markets to quality American goods and services. And thanks to this strategy and the hard work of American people, we stand poised at the threshold of a new century, stronger than ever before.

"America must not retreat on the strategy that has brought us to this place of promise. America must not return to a mind-set which is rooted in the past. Instead, America must move forward on all three crucial elements to our strategy. As you are doing here in south Florida, America must boldly seize the opportunities that stand before us into this next great century.

"Thank you very much. God bless you, and God bless America."

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:15 p.m. in the warehouse. In his remarks, he referred to Deborah Braziel, Tropical Shipping Co. employee, who introduced the President.

Remarks at Lighthouse Elementary School in Jupiter, Florida
October 31, 1997

Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. Hello! Well, I finally made it. First, you know, I hurt my leg, and I couldn't come. And this morning, I got up at 5:30, and I was getting ready to come here, and I thought, I'm going to be able to keep my promise to the children at Lighthouse Elementary. Then we got to the airport, and it was so foggy in Washington that I couldn't see my hand before me, and we had to wait for 2 hours to take off. So I made you late, and now you are a little bit wet. [*Laughter*] But you look beautiful to me, and I thank you for making me feel so welcome. Thank you.

I want to thank Congressman Deutsch and Congressman Foley for coming with me, and, Mayor, thank you for making me feel so welcome. Principal Hukill, thank you for what you said. And I thought Jessica did a wonderful job introducing me, didn't you?

I'd also like to thank the people who are here from the Palm Beach County Literacy Coalition, Palm Beach America Reads. The district president of the Miami-Dade Community College, Dr. Padron, is here, I think. And I thank you all for being here. And I thank the middle school band for being here. I hope you'll play me some music when I'm finished speaking; I want to hear you.

I am so glad to be here with all of you today, because one of my most important responsibilities as President is to do everything I can to see that you get a world-class education. You know you are living in a world that is dominated by computers and technology. But you also live in a world which you can't fully enjoy them unless you can read well, unless you can do basic math, unless you can learn the things that your teachers are trying to teach you.

And about a year ago I tried to think of what I wanted to say to America in one sentence about our schools. And it is that I want an America in which every 8-year-old child can read a good book on his or her own, in which every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, in which every 18-year-old, without regard to their family's income, can go to college and every adult can keep on learning for a lifetime. Will you help me make that kind of America? Will you do that? [*Applause*]

I want to thank all of the people here who helped Lighthouse Elementary succeed, to show that every school, to succeed, needs to be a community school or, as my wife says, a school where the whole village is involved in helping children learn. There are 250 volunteers who contribute at least 1,000 hours of their time to the students and the teachers every month. That's wonderful. If every school could say that, education in America would be much better. You should be proud of yourselves.

I also want to congratulate the students here who participate in the Sunshine State Readers program and read 15 books a month and write reports on them. I wish I still had time to read 15 books a month. You will never regret it. And if you don't read that much a month, every one of you should do whatever you can to read more. You will learn a lot and help yourselves, and it's a lot of fun.

Let me finally say that we are going to do everything we can in Washington to help make sure that a college education will be there for you if you'll work hard at school and learn what you need to know. We want to help your families send you to college. We want to help get high standards in the later grades as well. But in the end, it all depends on every one of you, what's in your heart and what's in your mind.

When you were singing your school song today and you felt good doing it, that's the way I want you to feel when you're in class. I want you to be proud of what you can learn, and I want you to believe that every one of you was given a mind by God that can learn. You can all learn. You can all do better. You can all learn more.

So be brave, and have a good time, and make the most of your education. And thank you so much for making me feel so welcome today.

God bless you all.

NOTE. The President spoke at 1:16 p.m. on the athletic field. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor

Karen Golonka of Jupiter; Una Hukill, principal, and Jessica Haft, student, Lighthouse Elementary School; and Eduardo Padron, president, Miami-Dade Community College.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session at a Democratic National Committee Luncheon in Palm Beach, Florida

October 31, 1997

The President. Harriet got on a roll; I didn't want her to stop. What did you say? No, I was just thinking Harriet was on a roll. I didn't want to stop her.

Thank you, and thank you, Jerome. We are old friends. And I want to thank Sidney and Dorothy for having me back in their wonderful home. I was here a little over 5 years ago. They look much younger even than they did then, and I have all this gray hair to show for the last 5 years, but I've enjoyed it immensely.

You mentioned the St. Mary's Hospital Board, and for those of you who don't know, that was the hospital that took care of me when I tore my leg off by falling 8 inches here a few months ago. I visited the little school in Jupiter that I was supposed to visit that day when I couldn't go. And I'm delighted to be back here.

We're in Florida, among other things, pushing the fast-track legislation. There's going to be a vote in Congress next week. And Secretary Daley, the Secretary of Commerce, and my Special Counselor, Doug Sosnik, who has a wife from Argentina, the three of us just got back from Latin America. And I came back even more convinced than ever that it's the right thing to do for our country.

Let me just be very brief. What I'd like to do is to talk a minute or two, and then if you have a couple of questions, maybe I could hear from you. That would help save my voice, and it will be more interesting for you.

We learned today that growth in the last quarter—this quarter—is 3.5 percent, and growth has averaged almost 4 percent over the last year, the highest in more than a decade. I think that has come about because we both broke political gridlock in Washington in 1993 with the economic plan and in 1997 with the Balanced Budget Act and because, perhaps even more important, we broke an intellectual gridlock.

Harriet mentioned that she knew me a long time before I became President. Most Americans didn't. And one of the things that never ceases to amaze me is when I read things written about our policies and they say, "Well, he's adopted this Republican policy and that Democratic policy and just making it up as he goes along." I was reading the other day—last night, getting ready to come down here, an article I wrote in 1988 that basically sounds like the speeches I'm giving today. But if you're a Governor out in the hinterland, you don't exist for people that interpret you to America until you move to Washington. So I thank Jerome and Harriet for being my old friends.

But what I wanted to do when I came to Washington 6 years ago was to get people to stop thinking in these sort of outdated left-right terms and start thinking instead about what we were trying to do, what is the mission of America. And if you think about it in that term, it helps you to pick the proper course.

With our economic policy, it seemed to me there was a huge fight between whether we should run a huge deficit and cut taxes or whether we should run a slightly smaller deficit and spend more money. And I thought both of those were wrong for the modern economy. And people laughed at me when I went to Washington and said, "Here's what we're going to do. We're going to reduce the deficit, balance the budget, and spend more money on education and the health care of our children and empowering our poorest communities." And they said, "Yeah, and the $3 bill is coming back." But that's what we've done, and it worked.

On crime, it seemed to me we were having a phony debate in Washington about whether we needed to talk tougher and have harsher sentences or do more to help prevent crime in the first place. The sensible thing to do is to sentence more harshly people who should

be, and prevent everybody you can from committing crimes, and also work on the environment. That's what the Brady bill, the assault weapons ban, 100,000 more police on the street were about. And we've contributed to a dramatic decline in crime in the last 5 years.

On welfare, the debate was, "It's an unfortunate system, but don't you have to take care of these children?" or "These people don't really want to work, so you have to make them work"—sort of polarizing debate. My experience as a Governor was that nearly every person I ever met on welfare was dying to go to work; that the system penalized them because they generally didn't have the education and skills they needed, on the one hand, or on the other, if they took a job that was a minimum wage job, they lost Medicaid health coverage for their kids, and they didn't have the money to pay for child support.

So we said, "Let's be tough on work, require people that can work to work, but take care of their children, because everyone's most important job is taking care of their kids." We've had over 3 million people drop off the welfare rolls, the biggest decline in history, the smallest percentage of Americans on welfare since 1970, after 20 years of high levels of immigration.

I guess what I'm saying is, what I think works is saying: The Government can't sit on the sidelines. The Government can't be a savior. The Government's job is to create the conditions and give people the tools to make the most of their own lives and to build good communities and families.

And I believe we're much closer than we were 5 years ago to my dream of the 21st century America where there's opportunity for everybody responsible enough to work for it, where we're still leading the world for peace and freedom, and where the country is managing its diversity, even celebrating it, but coming across all those lines into one America. And for all of you who have helped me to do that, I'm very grateful.

Now, we still have some challenges. One of them is this fast track bill. A third of our growth in the last 5 years has come from trade. This bill gives me the power to negotiate trade agreements. If the Congress doesn't like them, they can vote them down. It has all been caught up in, I think, worries of uncertainty and instability among certain workers, because not everybody wins when there's more trade, although most job loss in America, 80 percent, is due to technology.

So what should we do? We ought to provide more education and better transition for people who lose their jobs through trade or technological changes, not walk away from trade. These jobs pay more, on average. And we have no choice. Latin America is going to grow, on average, 3 times the rate of America. We're 4 percent of the world's people. We've got 20 percent of the world's income. If we want to keep it, we better sell more to the other 96 percent. So the fast-track debate is a big debate.

We had a big meeting with China this week; the President of China was here. We have severe disagreements over human rights, political rights, religious rights. But the best way to advance those issues, in my view, is to work with China and try to make a partner out of China in the 21st century, not create a new cold war with a different country on the other side. If it comes out that way, it ought not be our fault. We ought to have the sure knowledge, if there is a polarizing situation in the 21st century, that it's not our fault—that we did everything we could to create a responsible, international system of free trade, peace, common efforts against terrorism, weapons proliferation, shared environmental and disease problems, and respect for democracy and human rights. So I think we're doing the right thing.

We've got a number of other challenges. I'm in a big debate with the Congress—in some ways, the most fateful one—over whether the United States should have national academic standards in the basics in schools and an exam—voluntary—to see if our children are meeting those standards. And I suggested we start with a reading test in the fourth grade and a math test in the eighth grade—just had another study this week that said that kids who take algebra in the eighth grade are far more likely to stay in school and far more likely to go to college and far more likely to do well in college. We're the only major country without any kind of national academic standards, and I think it's crazy not to do it. I'm still fighting that out.

We were thwarted this year in our efforts to pass campaign reform, but I think we've got a good chance to pass it next year. And I might say, I appreciate the fact that all of you who are here at this event are giving us what in the current jargon is called "hard money" and what also will be provided for under the new

campaign finance reform law. We need to change the finance system.

But I would also point out—those of you politically active a long time know this—the money has not driven the cost up, the costs have driven the money up. It's like every other endeavor in human life: The cost of communicating with voters has exploded exponentially. So if we really want to get a handle on this problem, we also have to say, "If you observe the campaign finance limits, you should get free or reduced air time and access to voters." If we do that, we can also change the nature of debates and elections.

You look at a British election, for example, where each party gets a certain amount of time in different time blocks, and where people have reasoned debates, and they're much more like the Presidential debates are here, and almost nothing else is like that. And I'm convinced if we have free and reduced air time, more citizen participation like the debates we did in '92 and '96, that our campaign insisted on to bring real people into the debates, the voting record of the country would go way up.

Well, anyway, these are just a few of the things I wanted to talk about. The last thing I wanted to say is, in the '98 elections going forward, people will not be able to paint this sort of gnarled, twisted picture of Democrats anymore. You can't say we're weak on foreign policy and national defense. You can't say we can't be trusted to manage the economy. You can't say we're spending the country blind. You can't say we're against responsible tax cuts or that we're not strong for welfare reform or sensible criminal justice policies.

If you look ahead to the future, the major issues that will affect the lives of ordinary Americans—education, the environment, health care, the overall strength of the country—these are issues that our party, with its new direction, is strong on. And you are helping to contribute to that, and in doing it, I think you'll help make America a better place.

Thank you.

I've got time for one or two questions if anybody wants to ask a question.

Education

Q. It's really not a question. It's just sort of a comment and sort of a personal anecdote—when people have talked about the public schools and a lot of criticism about it. My daughter is in seventh grade at the School of the Arts here, and recently was sick—in St. Mary's Hospital, actually—missed 3 weeks of school. And in the public schools where I would expect very little to happen, every one of her teachers called her to find out how she was. Her principal sent her balloons to cheer her up—[*inaudible*]—been involved in the School of the Arts and I guess the foundation quite a bit.

There are some really good stories, and it would be nice if they got out somehow. This is just one that I know personally. And I never would have dreamed—as my daughter had gone to private school up until this year—and for whatever it's worth, people ought to try to find out more success stories from the public schools.

The President. Ninety percent of our children are in public schools. If most of them weren't doing a good job, they wouldn't be there. That's the first point. Second thing is—it's very important to make this point because I've been working at this now since, seriously, since 1979, and I think I've been in enough schools and looked at enough data and talked to enough people to know—the schools are better than they used to be, and they're getting better.

The real problem is there are some that aren't good at all. And what do they need? You can do one of two things. You can say, "Okay, well, we ought to just make it possible for people to abandon them." The problem is, only a portion of the people would abandon them and the people that are left will be even worse off, because they'll have less money and a lot of them are in financial trouble now. Or you can do what I think should be done: You have to have high standards; you have to have accountability; you have to have reform; and then you have to have adequate investment.

Now, this school you mentioned—one of the things that I think every school district ought to do is, I think they ought to give the parents of the children a choice of the schools they attend within the districts, and I think every district—I hope some day before too long every district will have what educators call a charter school, which is a part of the public schools but it's created—for example, suppose there were no art school here—where teachers can get together and create a whole new school with a separate mission, with fewer rules and regulations, and it only stays in existence as long as the parents and the students are satisfied that

its's fulfilling its mission. There are now 700 of these schools. In our budget, we're going to create 3,000 more. Once you get enough of them to be in every district in the country, and if we can get more people to give choice to the parents within the school districts, you're going to see dramatic improvements.

We need the national standards. We also need—I have been a very strong supporter of the national board for teacher certification to get board-certified teachers as master teachers, one in every school in the country. There are only about 1,000 now. Our budget contains funds to help train 100,000 in the next 4 years, and they are dramatically better trained than most people.

So I'm with you. They're getting better. They can do a good job. Most of them are doing better than they used to.

Yes.

Iran

Q. What is your position on the joint venture between the Malaysian-French oil group that is hoping to get financed by Goldman-Sachs to mine new oilfields in Iran and will increase Iran's economy by about $400 billion over 20 years?

The President. Well, you know what my position is: we don't like it. We're in an intense debate within the administration now about exactly what we ought to do about it. I just have a different view of—the United States generally has a different view than most of our allies. They all think we're all wet. But I just believe that we should not be conducting ordinary business with a country that funds, trains, and supports terrorists. I don't have the same opinion that—they can have a different religion than we do; they can have different politics; they can attack me on the evening news every night—whatever they want. But I don't think we should be doing business with a country that funds, trains, and supports terrorists. And I don't think we should be bashful about telling our friends that we think that's wrong. And if we're the only country in the world that thinks that, I think that's still what we ought to say.

Now, what we have to decide is, within the parameters of the law which was passed—which I signed because I support that position—what the appropriate action is in this case. And frankly, I haven't gotten a recommendation from my administration yet, and I haven't had a lot of time to even talk to them about it because we've been so preoccupied with what's going on with our relationship with China in the last couple of weeks.

But I keep hoping that Iran will take a different course. It's a very old culture. It's a very great country. There are still a lot of people there that were educated in our country. And the people voted in the last election, obviously, at least for a relaxation of their ordinary lives at home. And I would like it very much if they would take a different course. But until they do, I think we have to be quite firm, even if we're all by ourselves.

Child Care and Brain Development

Q. [*Inaudible*]—programs. Recently it has come to our mind that at the University of Miami we conducted a study with rats, and it has to do with the warehousing of our children at day care centers. And the rats that were brought up in a nonstimulating environment versus the rats that were stimulated had a profound effect, once those brains of those rats were dissected. And it's something else now that the Life Foundation has become extremely interested in, because I'm a mother of six and grandmother of nine. This is the future. And these rats that were not stimulated became violent, did not live as long, and brains, when dissected, were atrophied; versus the brains of the rats who lived in a stimulating environment, lived a longer life, were more productive in every way, and had brains with arteries that were clear to the brain and obviously were happier rats.

So, therefore, it goes to say that the children—our children that are being warehoused, this is a very big problem in America. And I really believe that it's not just the Government's obligation and responsibility to take care of these children and to help out, it's our responsibility as well.

The President. Well, let me say it's both our responsibilities. And given that the budget realities of where we are now, that's the way it has to be attacked. But very briefly, this year Hillary and I hosted two conferences at the White House. One was on early childhood and brain development and the other one, last week, was on child care.

We now know, scientists know that an enormous percentage of the brain's capacity develops in the first 3 years of life. We also know that children in supportive environments, whether

it's from their parents or in a child care facility where they get not only love and affection but I mean actually stimulating environments, have an average of 700,000 positive interactions in their first 4 years of life. Children who are left to sit in front of a television, even by a loving parent, or at a child care center where they're not being stimulated, have an average of 150,000 positive interactions in the first 4 years of life—700,000 to 150,000, while the infrastructure of the brain is being developed. It's not rocket science.

Now, the child care thing—the basic fundamental problem is lower income parents spend as much as 25 percent of their income on child care. And if you want to raise the standards for the child care centers and make sure that a higher percentage of them have more stimulating educational programs, the money has to come from somewhere. Now, we may be able to increase the child care tax credit. I'm working on some options of things we can do. We can help to actually fund the training of more child care workers. But we also have to do more to make child care, that is quality care, affordable. It's a huge issue for the country.

Q. I'd like—if we could, I know that you're having a little problem with your voice——

The President. [*Inaudible*]—to lose my voice. I lost it once. It was pretty scary. [*Laughter*]

Q. ——ask that you sort of try to—I know you'd like to go on—but if we could call off the questions now if you don't mind, Mr. President——

The President. Thank you. I enjoyed being with you. Thank you so much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to luncheon cohosts Harriet and Jerome Zimmerman and Sidney and Dorothy Kohl; and President Jiang Zemin of China.

Remarks at a Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Dinner in Boca Raton, Florida

October 31, 1997

Thank you very much. You may or may not have already noticed that I don't exactly have all my vocal capacities. The good news is you'll get a shorter speech. [*Laughter*] The bad news is you'll have to listen harder to what does come out.

I want to start by thanking John and Peggy for bringing us into their magnificent home and even more for their commitment, which was so powerfully expressed in what John said.

You know, I tell people all the time that I have been in public life now almost continuously since 1974. I have been in public office all but 2 years for the last 20 years. Most of the people I've known in politics were good, honest people who worked a lot harder than they had to work and fought for what they believed in and tried to make this country a better place. And I really appreciated what you said about those Members of Congress.

Even our friends on the Republican side, when that pitched battle we had over the Contract With America—virtually all of them really believed they were doing the right thing. But I didn't, and Mr. Gephardt didn't, and Mr. Frost didn't, and the other Members of Congress who are here—Congressman Deutsch, Congressman Kennedy, Congressman Baldacci—we didn't. And we won.

But you don't work like that, under those kinds of conditions, if you don't feel it. And I must tell you, John, that it means a lot just to know it got across to somebody, because we're very well aware of the presentation that's given to the American people about people in public life, the nature of the political process, and then even the nature of fundraising.

To hear people tell it, the very act of getting people to support you is somehow suspect. You just described your activities in Washington, and I must tell you, that's consistent with probably more than 80 percent of the people who help us. And if the others have something they want to talk to us about, well, that's democracy, too, and there is nothing wrong with it. So I thank you very much.

I want to thank Dick Gephardt and his legion in the House, first for the help they gave me in 1993 when we passed the economic plan which was principally responsible for reducing the deficit by 90 percent, without a single vote from a Republican Member in the Senate or the House, not a single, solitary one. Before this new balanced budget law, which I'm very proud of—but before it takes effect, don't forget the deficit dropped from $290 billion to $22.6 billion because of what a lot of brave people in our caucus did in 1993. And a lot of them lost their seats because of it, because the benefits were not apparent by the '94 election. And it made me more proud than ever to be a member of the Democratic Party.

There were a lot of other things that were done, thanks to the leadership that the Democrats here gave us. In 1994 we passed a crime bill, bitterly opposed by the leadership of the other party. They said it was all wrong. They went out in rural areas and tried to convince people we were going to take their guns away. And again, they cost us a few seats. We had some Members in Congress who gave up their seats to vote for 100,000 police, to vote for the Brady bill, to vote for the ban on assault weapons. But we've had 5 years of steeply dropping crime rates, and now we know whether we were right or they were right. The voters didn't know in 1994, but we were right.

And the President gets the credit. When the economy is up, the President gets the credit. John Kennedy thought it was fair. He said, "Victory has a thousand fathers, but defeat is an orphan." So if it goes down, I'll be here, folks. [*Laughter*]

But that plan could not have been passed without the support of our people in Congress. The crime bill could not have been passed without the support of our people in Congress. We wouldn't have the right kind of welfare reform bill without the support of our people in Congress because I had to veto two bills first to get the one I wanted. We had record—3 million plus people moved from welfare to work.

And I'm very proud of what these members of this caucus have done. I'm also proud that we got caught trying to provide health insurance to people in America who don't have it. You know, our opponents said when we tried to pass the health insurance program in 1994, they said, you know, "If you support the President's health insurance program, the number of people without health insurance will go up." And as one Democrat said to me the other day. "I supported your program. We got beat, but I supported it. And they were right; the number of uninsured people went up." And now we're trying to do something about that. In the last budget, we got funds to give health insurance coverage to half the children in America who don't have it.

But I want to make it clear, even with a Republican majority in Congress, nothing I do would take place without support of our caucus in the Congress. Do you believe that this balanced budget would have the biggest increase in health care for poor children since 1965 if it weren't for enough Democrats who could support my veto? Do you believe, for example, that we would have, for the first time in the history of the country, in this budget, opened the doors of college to everybody, literally, with a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college, tax credits for the other years, better loan programs, more scholarships, more work-study funds, education IRA's? It happened because we were together and we worked together.

So I'm grateful, and you can see—I'd like it very much if we could win 11, 12, 20, 30 more seats. What are the stakes, though? Let's talk about this. What are the stakes, and what are the chances? Why is the country working now?

First of all, when I started running for President 6 years ago, I basically was driven by two things. The first reason was, I didn't really think the country had a plan for the 21st century. It's a big, complicated country, and I thought we were just going to kind of wander into a new millennium, and I didn't believe we were very well-prepared.

The second reason was, I thought the debate in Washington was downright counterproductive, and that our Democrats had turned into sort of cardboard cutouts of real people, just what you were talking about. They said we were weak on defense and weak on welfare and weak on crime and couldn't be trusted with tax money and all that stuff they said about us. And as a result, it sort of relieved people of the burden of having to think, because if they made us unacceptable, particularly in races for President, well, then the voters didn't have to think. I think that's why folks in the other party get so mad at me sometimes. We've gotten the

American people to thinking again. [*Laughter*] They're not on automatic anymore.

For example, why should we have had this old debate on the budget: Are we going to explode the deficit with tax cuts or just have a little smaller deficit with spending? So I said, "Vote for me, and we'll cut the deficit and spend more money on education." And people said, "Yeah, right." But that's exactly what we've done, and it worked, because we're Democrats.

Take the crime debate. Every time you read about crime, it was to hear the way they had framed it: "You've got to be tough on crime." "Well, what do you mean by that?" "Put everybody in jail longer." And, "The other guys, they just want to let them out because they're softhearted." So we said—I said, "I don't know anybody who thinks like that, not a single living soul." So we said, "Why don't we find the people who really deserve to be in prison longer and keep them, and spend more time trying to keep our kids out of prison and take these guns off the street and out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them?" And it worked; we put the police on the streets. This was not rocket science. This was the way people think out here in the real world when they're not being presented in artificial terms from a long way away.

On welfare, the debate was structured as: "All these people on welfare, they don't want to work, and we're tough. We're going to make them work." And the other side, our side, was, "Well, that's probably right, but we feel so bad about the kids we don't want to do it." I didn't know a single living soul who really thought that way, and I'd spent a lot of time in welfare offices. I never met anybody on welfare who didn't want to go to work.

So we said, "Okay, make people who are able-bodied go to work, but get them the education and training, and let's don't hurt their children because their most important job is raising their children. Provide the child care for the children. Provide the medical care for the children. Then you can be tough on work and good to the kids." Guess what? It worked. Why? Not because it was rocket science. It was common sense, mainstream values, thinking about tomorrow, and getting away from the hot air.

Same thing on the environment. I believe in preserving the environment. I've worked hard on the Florida Everglades. We've got an agreement in this Interior bill to save the Yellowstone Park from gold mining and to save a bunch of the redwood forests that are precious, and there are not many of them left in California.

But I always thought it was crazy—you know, they said, "Well, the environment is nice, but we've got to grow the economy." And then we were made to look like sort of blissed-out tree huggers who never got over the McCarthy campaign. [*Laughter*] And that wasn't consistent with my experience. It looked to me like, for example, if we had a really sensible economy, we could organize it in a way that would promote a clean environment and create more jobs, not fewer jobs.

They said when we tried to take—and this was before my time—we took CFC's out of the atmosphere to stop the hole in the ozone layer. Have any of you missed them? Do you know the name of anybody who has lost a job because of it? But the hole over the ozone layer is shrinking, and the layer is thickening, and it's good for your children and grandchildren.

We had all these coal-fired powerplants that were putting out a lot of sulfur dioxide and making acid rain. The Democrats in Congress—before my time—the Democrats in Congress authorized a trading system so that the free market could trade permits to allow the most efficient way to take the sulfur dioxide out of the atmosphere. We're 40 percent ahead of schedule at less than half the projected cost because the Democrats found a way for the free market to clean the environment and grow the economy. That's our policy, and that's what we intend to do in the future. And it's the right thing to do.

I say this because I think it is terribly important that we look to the future. I'm glad the economy is in good shape. We learned at the last—over the last—this year, this quarter, compared to last year, we grew at 3.5 percent. We've got the lowest inflation since 1964. That's good, but we've got more to do. Not everybody who needs a job has one. Not everybody who is losing jobs in the technological changes and the trade flows is getting the kind of training that he or she needs to move on with their lives. We've go more to do on the economy.

Dick talked about education. We need desperately to have national standards in education, and we need to measure whether our children are measuring up. And we ought to give them more choice in the public schools they attend. I want every grade school kid in America to

go to a school like the one I visited in Jupiter today, the one I should have visited a few months ago before I hurt myself.

We've got more to do. We've got more to do in so many areas. And if you think about it, our Democrats are not vulnerable anymore to the old cardboard pictures they painted of us, not just because of me or the Vice President but also because they were with us. They can't say, "You can't trust that crowd anymore. They're not good with your money. They won't give you a tax cut. They can't manage the economy. They can't manage crime. They're weak on welfare. They're no good in foreign policy and defense." All that stuff is out. We can have a real conversation in 1998.

And what is it about? What is it about? Just what you said: How are we going to prepare this country for the 21st century? What still needs to be done? How are we going to preserve Social Security and Medicare for our generation, the biggest generation, without asking our kids to pay too much to take care of us because we're bigger than our kids are in numbers? How are we going to give a world-class education to every American? How are we going to embrace all this diversity we have and still be bound together as one America? How are we going to stop being the biggest polluter in the world when it comes to carbon dioxide, which is warming the planet with potentially serious consequences to our people and people around the world, and still keep this economy growing so everybody can make a good living? How are we going to provide working families with the tools they need to succeed at home and at work—still the biggest challenge we've got?

I'm glad everybody has got a job, folks, but now—you ask our hosts; they now have a one-year-old daughter—that little child has become their most important work. It dwarfs everything else. Every day—every day—there are people in this country—from hard-working lower middle class people who are spending 25 percent of their income on child care and still can't afford child care where their children are stimulated, to upper middle class people who feel like they can't hold on to their jobs unless they spend so many hours at work they're not with their children when they need to be—every day there are people in this country who are making choices between being good parents and good workers. And that's why the Democrats ought to expand family leave so people can get a little time off from work to go to a parent-teacher conference or take their kids to the doctor's. That's why the Democrats need to keep working until all the children in working families can be insured with health insurance. That's why we need to keep working until we have uniform standards of excellence and lots of local reform in schools. That's why we need to keep working on these things.

We have done so much, but believe me, maybe it's just because I've just got 3 years and a few months left, but I think all the time about 2010 and 2015 and 2020 and what this country is going to be like when my child is my age. And I'm telling you, the best days of America are still ahead if we keep on doing what we're doing.

That's what this election in '98 is about. Why is it important that you're here? Because the voters—there are a lot of voters out there who are still like you were for a long time. They don't think it matters. They think everybody is just screaming at each other in Washington. And what happens? Usually at the end of these campaigns, the party with the most money wins because the airwaves get full of these 30-second ads which either persuade people who are undecided or turn them off so much they stay home. And the marginal voters that stay home are the working people who would vote for us if they showed up.

That's why this dinner is important. You ask Martin Frost to go through the 20 closest congressional races in the last election, 1996, when the Vice President and I were honored to be returned to office with the electoral votes of the people of Florida. We were honored. We won a nice victory. But you go through those races, and you will see that in the 20 closest races, in the last 10 days, we were outspent 4 to 1.

So I have to tell you, I am unapologetic about being here. I am proud of you for being willing to help carry on this debate. We can have a discussion, an honest discussion about the future in 1998, but we have to make it possible for Patrick Kennedy and John Baldacci and Martin Frost and Dick Gephardt and Peter Deutsch and all those people we've got running, fabulous people who are not in office, to be heard, because we now are in a position to finish this work of preparing our country to be what our children deserve.

I'm proud of you for being here and very grateful. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:54 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts John W. and Peggy Henry.

Remarks During the Education Session of the Democratic National Committee's Autumn Retreat on Amelia Island, Florida

November 1, 1997

[*The discussion is joined in progress.*]

The President. I'll try to get through this. I think I'll get better as we go along. We'll see.

First of all, I believe that the condition of our children will continue to be one of the major issues for the country for the next 10 to 20 years. And I think we have to admit that with all our economic success, with the fact that we've got 3 million fewer people on welfare and crime is down and the schools are getting better, there are still a lot of kids in this country who don't have the childhood they need and that we need for them to have. And I'd just like to make a few comments on the issues that all of you have raised.

First, I think almost every family, even families in comfortable incomes, feel the tension of their job in the workplace and their job at home. Americans, we know, in general, are working longer than they were 20 years ago. There are more hours spent at work today by the average American family at all income levels than 20 years ago. And I think that means that things like child care and family leave are much more important.

Now, if I might just make a comment, the family leave law has probably touched more people in a profoundly personal way than just about anything else we've done. People still come up to me on the street all over the country and talk about it. And I believe we should go beyond it. I think we ought to expand the law to require that people should be able to get a little time off to go to regular parent conferences with the teachers at school and regular medical appointments.

And I believe we ought to have more flextime options for people in the workplace, so that if they build up overtime—a lot of people are required to work overtime; others wish to work overtime—I personally believe that if the employee makes that choice, then he or she should be able to take the overtime in cash or in time with their families. So I don't think—when we talk about all these other things we need, I don't think we should get away from first base.

The other thing I think Valerie said, there's very little the Federal Government can do about this except in some of our specific programs like Early Head Start. But there are some States that have social service and public outreach programs that do a very good job in visiting families before babies are born and trying to help young people, especially without much background, get the basics of parenting down. Now, we take that for granted, but it's a big mistake. An enormous amount of good can be done in that.

And I guess Ellen's probably already talked, but you know, when we had this conference on early childhood and the brain, I read a lot of the scientific data, and one research project I reviewed said that a child in a supportive family in a child care environment would get 700,000 positive contacts in the first 4 years of life. A child in an environment that might be loving but ignorant, just not knowing what to do, where the child was left in front of the television a lot, might get as few as 150,000 positive contacts in life. It's not rocket science to figure out what the difference in impact is.

So, beyond the work and family issue, if I could talk just a moment about child care, the United States basically doesn't have the national systems in many areas that other countries take for granted but especially in health and in child care. Businesses can do more. We are now reviewing whether we should change the tax laws to try to accelerate the activity of larger businesses and make it more possible for small businesses to contribute in some way to their employees' child care. We also need to raise the standards. That entails costs. We have to meet them either directly or indirectly, helping people to do that.

And we are going to try to do more to train child care workers and to contribute to that because it is phenomenally important what is done with all those hours those babies have, starting at very early ages, like Richie said, in the child care centers.

Then there is a second issue we haven't talked about much, although Diana alluded to it when she mentioned the lady who had been on welfare with an 8-year-old child, and that is the need of children for supervision after they start school when their parents are working after school hours. And we're working very hard and have put some funds into and proposed more to help schools design programs to stay open to give kids things to do in the after-school hours. I think that's terribly important.

I think what we're trying to do in education—I still think we've got a lot of work to do there. We're working very hard—I had a long talk with Governor Chiles yesterday to make sure that the money we have for children's health will be used to add 5 million children to the rolls of the health insured.

Then the last big issue I think is very important is how do you connect children to the larger society. And safety is important. Having positive role models and specific help is important. That's why this mentoring issue is so terribly important. It's one of the goals that was set at the Presidents' Summit of Service in Philadelphia. The most important mentoring now being done—new mentoring project in America is America Reads. We have 800 colleges signed up, tens of thousands of college students working today with young children, helping them to read, also serving as role models. And there are countless other organizations. The church that Hillary and I attend in Washington has 45 America Reads volunteers. We're going to try to mobilize a million people to make sure that all our 8-year-olds have reading confidence by the end of the third grade—huge issue. I think children should be given a chance to serve, themselves, when they reach an appropriate age.

And finally, I think it's very important that we broaden our focus of education. Children need to understand the relationship of the social environment to the natural environment. They're natural environmentalists anyway. But we need to build a mindset among our kids that they can grow the economy and have a stable family life, they can grow the economy and preserve their environment, and that we are living in a period where we've got all these conflicts that we have to resolve as a society if we want to have people living a good life in the 21st century.

And finally, I think it's very important that children from earliest childhood, through the use of the Internet or whatever else is available, gain a greater understanding of the relationship of the United States to the rest of the world.

I must say that when my voice is working, sometimes I get credit for being a reasonably effective communicator. But I have completely failed—according to every public opinion survey, I have completely failed to convince a substantial majority of American people of the importance of trade to our economic development and the importance—although specifically they understand it, but as a general principle—and the importance of our involvement in the rest of the world to our own success here at home, whether it's in peacemaking efforts or contributing to the United Nations or participating in other international efforts.

So these are some of my thoughts: First start with work and family, with child care and family supports; then look at education, health care; then look at how the children relate to the larger society and how children from difficult circumstances can have a safe environment with a mentor, with positive experiences, learning about how we can build a seamless life between the social environment, the natural environment, and the larger world. That's the way I look at this. And I think if we keep our focus on children, number one, we'll be doing the right thing, and second, I think the American people will like the Democratic Party, because we'll be doing the right thing.

Thank you.

[*At this point, the discussion continued.*]

The President. Before I go, I just want to talk about the standards issue. You should all understand, the good news is schools are getting better. They're getting better. The troubling news is they are not getting better uniformly, and the United States is the only major country that has no national academic standard—not Federal Government standard, not federally enforced but just a national measurement—so that every parent, every teacher, every school can know how kids are doing.

The more diverse we get within our country and the more we compete with people around the world, the more we need some common standard. And that's the biggest fight we've got going in Washington right now in terms of what will really affect our children's future.

So I hope you'll all talk about this. Governor Romer is not only in better voice, he knows more about it than I do. But we've been fighting for this for 10 years, and it's crazy that we haven't done it. So I hope we can rally our party behind it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:52 a.m. in Salon Two at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Valerie Rogers, wife of Annapolis, MD, energy executive Wayne Rogers; Ellen Galinsky, president and cofounder, Families and Work Institute; Richie Garcia, teacher, Music Institute of Hollywood; Diana Lawrence, wife of Cincinnati, OH, attorney Richard Lawrence; Gov. Lawton Chiles of Florida; and Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado.

Remarks in the Globalization and Trade Session of the Democratic National Committee's Autumn Retreat on Amelia Island

November 1, 1997

[*The discussion is joined in progress.*]

Role of National Economic Council

Q. Perhaps the time has come to elevate the National Economic Council to the level of stature that the National Security Council has had. Yesterday I attended in Washington a Council on Foreign Relations meeting which was a retrospective of the first 50 years of the National Security Council, at which a half-dozen former and the current National Security Adviser were present. And the scope of their remarks and their ability to integrate across the disparate organizational interests of Defense, State, other U.S. Government and nongovernmental organizations to create policy synthesis was, although not perfect, very impressive. And I was wondering whether you had a comment on whether the United States Government perhaps needed at this time a comparable structure.

[*At this point, the moderator invited the President to respond.*]

The President. First of all, while it doesn't have a 50-year history, I think the record will reflect that's exactly what we've done. I brought Bob Rubin in to be the head of a new National Economic Council to reconcile all the different economic agencies. And then Laura Tyson did it. Now Gene Sperling and Dan Tarullo do it. As a result of it, for the first time in most business people's experience, you have the State Department aggressively working in Embassies around the world to help American business; you have the Export-Import Bank, Overseas Private Investment Council working with the Agriculture Department, the Commerce Department, and all the other economic agencies, especially, obviously, the Treasury Department.

And it works like the NSC does. We try to get everybody together, reach a common policy, and then all back it. Sometimes we don't quite get there, but we've had a remarkable amount of success, and I think that it is the single most significant organizational innovation that our administration has made in the White House. And I think that the economic record of the administration is due at least in part to the institution of the National Economic Council.

[*The discussion continued.*]

Integration of Diplomatic and Economic Policy

Q. ——I think the question is whether, organizationally the Government needs to think about different ways to both create that and sustain a free trade area of the Americas.

The President. Well, basically, I agree with you. The reason that I asked Mack McLarty to take on that job is that I thought our relationship with Latin America was of profound importance and that it cut across economic and political lines, and we needed to have somebody concentrating on it who could deal with not just specific diplomatic or security issues but the whole range of political and economic issues. And it's worked.

And what I'm hoping we can do now is take a look at whether we could do the same sort of thing in other parts of the world and how we'd have to reorganize the State Department and how we might integrate our diplomatic and economic efforts even more closely than we have to date.

Let me just say generically, one of the things that stunned me when I became President was how antiquated all the organizational and information structures of the Federal Government were. When I walked in the Oval Office as President the first day, Jimmy Carter's phone system was on the desk—you know, where you punch those big old plastic buttons and the light comes up—[*laughter*]—and you dialed. And if you were having a call with three people, everybody else in the White House that had the line on the button could pick it up and listen. It was unbelievable—1993—we had an almost 20-year-old phone system.

And believe me, that is a metaphor for other problems. One of the things that Speaker Gingrich and I have discussed as a possible bipartisan project is an effort to totally upgrade the information systems and communications systems of both the executive and the legislative branches, to try to get us in tune with the world. I know we had some high-tech executives testifying before Congress recently, and they were asked—they said, "One real problem is in communications. We operate at 3 times the speed of normal business decisions." Normal business operates at 3 times the speed of Government; therefore, we're at a 9-to-1 disadvantage in trying to harmonize these policies. [*Laughter*]

So I think Bob's made some very good points about that.

[*The discussion continued.*]

Trade Policy and Domestic Economic Development

The President. Before I go, if I could just say one thing about this trade issue, because we need your help on this. I think we ought to say, first of all, that the Democratic Party has moved on the trade issue. Even a lot of the people who are against fast track basically want it to pass in the sense—and they know that we need to open more markets to Latin America and that there are political as well as economic benefits to a free trade area of the Americas, to the African initiative that I have announced. They know the biggest middle class in the world is in India. They know that the Indian subcontinent, if the differences between Pakistan and India could be resolved, would be an enormous opportunity. They know these things. This is not a secret. And there is much more of a willingness to embrace this in our caucus in the Congress than I think is—than you would sense.

The question is how to get over the hurdle of the feeling that it's not just foreign markets that are more closed to us but that other countries—through the use of labor practices we think are wrong, or Mark mentioned the pollution problem in Mexicali, which we are moving to address and have some money to do so—that they'll gain unfair economic advantage; and secondly, the feeling that while we all talk a good game—and I think this is really the issue—while everybody talks a good game, our country really does not have a very good system, or at least it's not adequate, for dealing with people who are dislocated in this churning modern economy.

And I might say that the Council of Economic Advisers did a study for me which indicated that 80 percent of the job dislocation was the result of technological change, only 20 percent from trade patterns. But my view is, if you're my age and you've got a kid in college and you lose your job at some company, who cares what the cause is?

So I think that really thoughtful people need to think about how are we going to set up a system of kind of lifetime education and training and growth, and how are we going to give people who are dislocated the transitional support they need for their families so they don't lose all self-respect and become desperate, and try to increase the flow here because we know we have—today—you've got significant shortages in America in high-wage job categories that could be filled by people who are being dislocated today from other high-wage or moderate-wage jobs.

So what I would like to ask a lot of you who agree with me on this trade issue to think about is, is we have moved our party. You may not be able to tell it on the vote here in the fast track, but the truth is, if you listen to the arguments, there's almost nobody standing up saying anymore, like they used to a few years ago, "Trade's a bad thing. We're always going to be taken advantage of. It's always going to

be a terrible thing." You don't hear that much anymore. People are genuinely concerned now about making sure that the rules are fair and that the dislocation is addressed.

So I say that to ask you, first of all, to keep on working on fast track, because our opponents are wrong and it won't create a single job if we lose; it will cost us jobs. So that's the short-term thing; we've got to fight for that. But we also have to recognize that you've got three categories of people out there: those that are displaced by trade; a much larger group of people that are just being dislocated by technological and economic changes that are going to occur anyway; and then you've got a group of people that we're trying to address with the empowerment zones who haven't been affected one way or the other by trade or economic growth because they live in islands that haven't been penetrated by free enterprise in America. And in a funny way, we should look at them as a market, the way we look at the Caribbean or Latin America or Africa or anyplace else. We should look at these people as a market.

Mark Nichols represents a Native American group. If you think about the Native American tribes that aren't making a ton of money off their gambling casinos, that need jobs and investment, if you think about the inner city neighborhoods, if you think about the rural areas that haven't been touched, I think as Democrats we ought to be more creative about thinking about how we can push an aggressive trade agenda and say we need all these people, too, and it's a great growth opportunity—and not be deterred in trying to do what we ought to be doing on trade but also understand that this other thing is a legitimate issue and we have to address it.

In the next few days we're going to do more in the Congress to do this, but I think—I'm talking about this is going to be an ongoing effort. It's going to take about 10 years, I think, to just keep pushing at it as we learn more and more and more about how to do it. And if the people in the country get the sense that this is a dual commitment on our part and that we're passionate about both, I think that is not only the winning position, I think, more importantly, it is the right position.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:20 a.m. in Salon One at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Mark Nichols, chief executive officer, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians.

Remarks in the Arts and Culture Session of the Democratic National Committee's Autumn Retreat on Amelia Island

November 1, 1997

[*The discussion is joined in progress.*]

Q. With regard to the national, also looking to the international, I have a couple of questions I'd like to ask the President. What impact do you think, on our culture and our arts, Cuba will have after Castro?

The President. Well, if you think baseball is an art form, and I do—[*laughter*]—it will be huge. [*Laughter*]

No, to be more serious, there are a lot of Cuban artists, Cuban musicians. All you have to do is look at the impact of South American, Central American music and arts in the United States now, Caribbean art. I think it's obvious that it will be significant. It will be one—when we get back together with more normal relations with Cuba, it will be one of the principal benefits of it.

Let me say, if I might, on the general point, Glenn made the points that I wanted to make about this. The assault on the NEA and the NEH needs to be seen against the background of the apparently less ideologically driven reduction in the availability of music and art generally in the schools, in the public schools, which we saw because of financial problems and other decisions being made.

If you look at what's happened—and let me explain that. The cutting of the budget of the NEH and the NEA and the attempt to do away with them basically had two legs of support, not one. There was obviously the sort of right-wing ideological attack based on the symbolism

of some controversially funded projects, photography exhibits, or whatever. Beyond that, there were Members of Congress, with the deficit being what it was, making the same sort of judgments that school board members made all across America: "I can't dismantle the football team and the basketball team; I'll get rid of the arts and the music program for all the kids, because, by definition, most of them aren't all that good in art and music. And nobody is going to come down on me if I do it. And I don't have to take on any institutional interests to do it. And after all, it's just a piddly amount of money."

Now, I think because the Balanced Budget Act has been passed and we've cut the deficit by more than 20 percent and because we have taken on the ideological argument, I think, and, first of all, tried to respond to some of the more legitimate concerns about how the projects were funded and, secondly, tried to reaffirm the positive notions that—what the NEA and NEH has done—I think at the national level we've sort of stemmed the hemorrhage. I would submit that that's not nearly enough, first of all, because it's only a small portion of the money, and secondly, because I think what you said is terribly important. We have all this data that kids that come from different cultures with different languages have their language facilitation, their ability to learn English, to read in English, to think and relate to people in a new culture dramatically accelerated if they're more proficient and more exposed to music and arts and other ways of hooking their mind in. We have a lot of evidence that kids from very difficult situations do much better in math if they have a sustained exposure to music, for reasons that are fairly obvious, if you think about it.

So what I would like to ask all of you to do—I'd like to invite you to do something. I don't have an answer; this is not a set-up deal. I never thought about it until I realized I was going to come do this panel. I have given a lot of thought to what our gift to the next century ought to be in terms of our approach to the arts. And yes, I'm glad I stood up for the NEA and the NEH, and I won a political battle—fine. It's one percent of the money.

What should we do with this one percent of the money? If we want more than this, what case should we make for getting more? What would we do with it? And in a larger sense, what should our mission be in terms of the public role of the arts, particularly for our children? What arguments could we make to make the schools have it a priority again?

I see something like the Harlem Boys Choir or all these incredible arts programs in New York or whatever, and I feel two things: I am exhilarated, like we all are; but then I wonder, how many other little kids are going out there to some other school every day where they still don't even have a music teacher? And what about them?

That's not an argument not to do what's being done, but I would invite you—a lot of you know so much more about this than I do, but I'm telling you, I've been in school after school after school after school where the buildings are old, and they can't be maintained, and they shut down the music and arts programs, and they shut down, by the way, all the recreational programs except for the varsity sports, which I also think is a mistake. People are whole people. Even poor kids—you talked about this—it's hard to say, "Why spend money on the arts when you have problems with welfare and poverty and all that?" Because poor people need their spirits nourished. Most children are not all that conscious of being poor unless they're genuinely deprived or brutalized. But when they grow up, they remember experiences that lift their spirits when they're young.

So I guess what I'm saying is, we need an affirmative strategy. We played good defense, and we won—big deal. How would you go to a conservative Republican group in town X and argue that this investment ought to be made, either in the National Endowment of the Arts or in the community, or that the arts and music programs ought to be restored, and here's why? That's what we need now, and that's what we ought to be doing now. We shouldn't be playing defense with this issue.

I mean, so what? You won a fight in Congress over one percent of the money. It was very important symbolically because it gave dignity and strength and integrity to your efforts, and I'm very glad we fought it. It also makes a lot of difference to some programs in the country. But we need an affirmative strategy for the next century.

And I hope one of the things that will come out of this seminar is that some of you will come out of this being willing to work with our Millennium Project and with the White House generally to get off the defense and get

on offense. And I don't mean to hurt anybody else. I don't see this as necessarily a big political winner for us. I'm not interested in the politics of this. I'm just talking about what's right for the children and the future of this country.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:50 a.m. in Plaza One at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Glenn D. Lowry, director, The Museum of Modern Art.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Line Item Vetoes of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

November 1, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel the dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the "Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998" (Public Law 105–65; H.R. 2158). I have determined that the cancellation of these amounts will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 1, 1997.

NOTE: The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on November 4.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Line Item Vetoes of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

November 1, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel the dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the "Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998" (Public Law 105–66; H.R. 2169). I have determined that the cancellation of these amounts will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 1, 1997.

NOTE: The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on November 4.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner on Amelia Island
November 1, 1997

Thank you very much. Please be seated. We're going to reverse the order tonight, and I'm going to introduce the Vice President because you've all heard me speak before—[*laughter*]—because I need to save my voice to campaign for our candidates in New Jersey and in New York tomorrow. [*Applause*] Thank you.

Let me once again thank all of you for coming. I hope you have enjoyed this. I certainly enjoyed it today. I was glad to meet with the various panels, and I enjoyed Governor Romer's speech at lunch very, very much. Didn't he do a terrific job?

Ladies and gentlemen, 6 years ago when I began running for President, I wanted to win the election to change the country, and I felt very strongly that we were not preparing America for the 21st century and that our party needed to break the logjam not only with a set of new policies but with a set of new ideas. I thought the political debate had become, frankly, stale and, at least to someone like me governing a State out in the country, often completely meaningless.

I believed we had to move the debate toward what was good for the future, not the past; what would support positive change, not the status quo; what would bring us together, not divide us; and move away from the old left-right, liberal-conservative, and frankly outdated name-calling and labeling that dominated national politics. Six years later, we've made a lot of progress, not only in moving the country to a better place but in changing the nature of political debate.

I very much hope that the simplistic antigovernment, reactionary approach had its last gasp in the Republican congressional victory in 1994. The fact that we beat back the Contract With America and signed the right kind of welfare reform, got a balanced budget with the biggest investments in education and health care since 1965 and that we're moving forward in a way that brings the country together around the ideas of opportunity, responsibility, and community that we have espoused now for a long time is deeply encouraging to me.

The fact that all around the world now people are beginning to talk in the same terms—the First Lady is in Great Britain today; she's been in Ireland—I frankly was very flattered that Tony Blair's campaign was often compared to ours and that the so-called New Labor movement has a lot in common with what we've tried to do here. I believe all over the world countries that are serious about helping people make the most of their own lives, assuming a leadership role in dealing with the challenges of the modern world are going to have to basically adopt similar approaches.

If you hadn't helped us, none of that would have been possible. But what I want to say to you is, if I hadn't been smart enough to pick Al Gore to be my running mate, none of it would have been possible.

Let me just give you a few examples. Sam Rayburn used to say it's a lot easier to tear something down, even a jackass can kick a barn down, but it takes a carpenter to build one. Now, we took the position that the old debate that Government could not be a savior, but couldn't sit on the sidelines either, was a false debate and that we had to have a new kind of Government that was smaller, that did more with less, that could balance the budget but also invest more in our future. Al Gore's reinventing Government project was the instrument through which we put that principle into practice.

And 5 years after we took office, our Government is smaller by 300,000, several thousand pages of regulation, several hundred Government programs that were out of date. It has been modernized in many ways, but we did not walk away from the problems, the challenges, and the opportunities of the American people.

The reinventing Government project was often, frankly, made fun of because it's not the sexiest issue in town. But it's what enabled us to cut the Government by 300,000 and increase the quality of public service and have money left over after we reduced the deficit, passed the balanced budget bill, to still invest in our future. The American people owe the Vice President a great debt of gratitude for that achievement alone.

Second example: When I became President, I got a very interesting letter shortly after I took office from former President Nixon, written a month and a day before he passed away. And it was about Russia, the importance of Russia to our future, and how we had to work with them to make sure we didn't repeat the ugly history of the last 50 years but instead had a partnership for peace and prosperity and cooperation.

Well, I struck up a pretty good relationship with President Yeltsin, and I stuck by him through tough times because he was standing up for democracy and prosperity. But we had a huge number of exceedingly difficult issues, and frankly we still have some tough issues, and we always will because it's in the nature of relationships between two great countries.

The Vice President agreed to head a commission along with the Russian Prime Minister, Mr. Chernomyrdin, for which there was really no precedent in global affairs. And the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission is the instrument through which the good intentions and principles articulated first by me and then by Boris Yeltsin have made the United States-Russia partnership the success it is. They've made it possible for us to go together into Bosnia. They made it possible for us to dramatically reduce the number of nuclear missiles we have. They've made it possible for us to detarget missiles so that none of our missiles are pointed at each other's children. They made it possible for us to do a whole range of things.

The Vice President has done a similar thing with the Vice President of South Africa. He has worked out an environmental partnership with top officials in China. In other words, it's fine for the President to make these statements; it's quite another thing if you have to look up 4 or 5 or 6 years from now and nothing has been done. It won't happen because Al Gore was the Vice President of the United States with unique responsibilities for helping to build our common future.

I could give you any number of other examples. I remember not long after I became President, when I was still reading critical columns—[*laughter*]—someone wrote a column in which they said something like—well, anyway, the import of it was that obviously I was a weak person, and that's why I had a wife who was so influential and why I gave my Vice President so much power, more than any President ever had before. And that sort of tickled me, because it seemed to me that if I had a partner in the Vice President who had knowledge in areas greater than mine, who had expertise in areas greater than mine, and who had all this energy and ability and a passionate dedication to this country and its future, I would be a fool not to use it. And I would be disserving you and every other American citizen if I had done anything other than make Albert Gore the most influential and effective Vice President in the history of the United States. So I think I did the right thing there.

We've had a unique partnership. Believe it or not, we don't always agree. [*Laughter*] Our disagreements have been among the most stimulating experiences of my presidency. But if I want to disagree with the Vice President, since I get the last vote, I know at least that I have to go to school and I better have my facts straight.

I will never be able to convey publicly or privately the depth of gratitude I feel for the partnership that we have enjoyed. But I just want you to know that every time I see another economic report like the one we saw yesterday, that the economy grew another 3.5 percent in the last quarter; every time I think about the 13 million people who have jobs, the 3 million people who aren't on welfare, the more than 12 million people who have taken advantage of family and medical leave, and all of the achievements that this administration has played a role in, I know—I know that one of the most important factors was the unique and unprecedented relationship I have enjoyed with this fine, good man.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Vice President.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:32 p.m. in Salons Two and Three at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom; President Boris Yeltsin and Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin of Russia; and Executive Deputy President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa.

Remarks at a Rally for Congressional Candidate Eric Vitaliano in Staten Island, New York

November 2, 1997

The President. Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, as you may have noticed in the last couple of days, I'm a little hoarse—[*laughter*]—so I can't speak too loud, though I hope I will be heard.

I want to thank President Springer for making us feel so welcome. Thank you, Assemblywoman Connelly, and all the other leaders of our party who are here. I want to thank Senator Bob Torricelli from New Jersey for being here with me, and in a moment I want to ask him to say a few words—he is always in stronger voice than I am. [*Laughter*] But most of all, I want to thank Eric Vitaliano and his wonderful family for making this race for Congress for your future and for our country.

I'm so happy to be back in Staten Island. I'm glad to be here especially on this mission, because the people who live on this island and the people who live in Brooklyn in this congressional district are representative of the people I ran for President to give voice to and to give a future to.

I want to just ask you to remember what it was like in 1991 and '92, when I started running for President. The economy was down, the country was drifting, politics was used to divide people with hot air and bogus charges, and we had no strategy to restore the middle class, to rebuild the economy, to reclaim the future for our children. And so I set out from a very different place, but representing people very much like you, to bring a vision to this country and unite us behind the idea that in the 21st century every American responsible enough to work for it, regardless of their race or station in life, ought to have a chance to live the American dream; that this country ought to continue to lead the world for peace and prosperity; and that we ought to unite, across all the lines that divide us, into one America.

Now, no one can come into this district and tell you for whom to vote. But I want to ask you, why has the other party spent all this money on ads trying to tear down Eric Vitaliano? And why did my predecessor and my distinguished opponent in the last election come here on behalf of his opponent? Because they are still trying to implement the contract on America and their agenda—and we don't think they're right—and because they have—this is the most important thing—they have opposed every single thing we have tried to do that has moved this country forward in the last 5 years.

So I don't want you to vote for me or against President Bush or Senator Dole or even Speaker Gingrich. I want you to vote for yourselves and your families and your future. This election—this is not about New York City politics, New York State politics. This is about what this man can do for you to set the right course for this country that will help the children of Staten Island and Brooklyn to have a brighter future. That's what this is about, nothing more and nothing less. I'll just give you some examples. And you remember, they all came for Mr. Vitaliano's opponent. I'm proud to be here for him.

But let me just give you some examples—vote for your future. I said we ought to break out of the bogus political debate in Washington that was paralyzing America. I said we could reduce the deficit and balance the budget and still invest in the education of our children. They all opposed it. We were right and they were wrong. We've got 13 million jobs and low unemployment.

I said that we could talk tough on crime till the cows come home, but until we acted tough and smart, till we supported more punishment and prevention, and until we put 100,000 police on the street in America, we couldn't bring down crime. Well, they opposed it. But we were right, they were wrong. Crime has been going down in this country for 5 years. That's what you ought to vote for.

They said Government was inherently bad and ought to be demolished. I said, no, it ought to be smaller and less bureaucratic, but we still ought to invest in the education of our children, in cleaning up our environment, in protecting the public health. They opposed us on all those issues. Today, the deficit has been reduced by 90 percent, the Government is 300,000 people smaller, but we're spending more on education

and public health and environmental protection. We were right, and they were wrong.

Make no mistake about it, this is about you and your life. This man has shown you in his public service that he knows how to take sensible, tough, but smart policies on crime; that he is committed to preserving the environment—when he got the legislation through to close that landfill. He has shown you that he cares about middle class families and middle class values and the future of children and that he believes it ought to be a future that includes all kinds of Americans. That is what is at issue. Make no mistake, that is what is at issue.

And what you have to decide is whether you believe the course that I have taken, which has moved away from the old liberal-versus-conservative debate to build a common future for America's future—whether that kind of course, which requires independence, which requires the ability to differ, which requires the ability to think, and requires the ability to pull people together—whether that's the course you want, or whether you want one more soldier in the army that opposed our economic policies, our education policies, our environmental policies, our crime policies, right down the line. If you believe the country is better off today by having that kind of leadership and that kind of direction, you have only one choice on Tuesday: you have to show up for Eric Vitaliano and send him to Congress.

We are determined to open the doors of college to every American who will work hard enough to earn the grades to go. We are determined to make sure every 8-year-old in this country can read, that every single classroom in America is hooked up to the Internet, that every adult who loses a job has an immediate—immediate—chance to go back and get new skills and get back into the work force. We are determined to move this country forward together. We are determined to prove we can keep cleaning up the environment while we grow the economy. We are determined to keep working on the crime problem until it not only goes down but everybody in every neighborhood feels safe when their children are on the streets and in the parks again. That's what we're determined to do.

And maybe most important of all, we are determined to give families and communities the tools to solve their own problems. The first bill I signed was the family and medical leave law. The people who are trying to beat Eric Vitaliano opposed it.

So I ask you to think about this. And on Tuesday when you get up, don't be thinking about me; don't be thinking about those other folks that came in here for Eric's opponent. Be thinking about your children, your grandchildren, the people you live here with, the kind of Staten Island you want to build, the kind of New York you want to build, the kind of future you want to build. And make sure you show up, and drag three or four of your friends along with you, and tell them that America has a lot riding on the decision made in Staten Island and Brooklyn.

Thank you, and God bless you. [*Applause*] Thank you.

Now, 2 years ago, I was in the same sort of fight with Bob Torricelli in New Jersey. They said we couldn't win. They ran the same kind of negative ads against him. They said the same things against him. One thing is, they're perfectly predictable. [*Laughter*] But Bob Torricelli triumphed with the help of people like you. He's worked all over America to help us have that kind of election in other places, and I'd like to ask you to make him welcome. Senator Bob Torricelli from New Jersey.

[*At this point, Senator Robert G. Torricelli of New Jersey made brief remarks.*]

The President. One more thing. One more thing. In these elections, these special elections, very often the outcome is determined not by those who vote but by those who have an opinion who don't vote. And I want to say a special word of thanks to the unions, to the police officers' association, to the teachers, to the firefighters, the city workers, to every group of people who are supporting Eric.

But let me tell you, those of you who are part of organizations and those of you who are active in the Democratic Party and those of you who are here as concerned citizens and especially those of you who are here who are students, who have the most at stake because you have the most years still ahead of you—you must go, and you must bring your friends. Don't make your endorsements meaningless by not making them manifest by a big turnout. Don't let the people who don't vote determine this. Let the people whose eyes are bright and focused on the future have the energy and the compassion and the patriotism to show up on

Tuesday so we'll have a big celebration Tuesday night.

God bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:06 p.m. in the athletic center at the College of Staten Island. In his remarks, he referred to Marlene Springer, president, College of Staten Island; State Assemblywoman Elizabeth A. Connelly; and Mr. Vitaliano's opponent, Vito Fossella, Republican candidate for New York's 13th Congressional District.

Remarks at a Rally for Gubernatorial Candidate Jim McGreevey in Edison, New Jersey

November 2, 1997

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, if you have heard the radio spot I did for your next Governor, you know that I am not in very strong voice. I've been a little hoarse. But the subject of my speech is the last line of the radio address: I may have lost my voice, but you can find your voice on Tuesday, election day.

I want to thank the people of New Jersey for being so good to me and to Al Gore in 1992 and in 1996. I thank the Members of your congressional delegation who are here who work with us every day, Congressmen Payne and Menendez, Pallone and Pascrell; and our good friend Congressman Harold Ford from Tennessee. I thank Barbara Buono, Senator Bryant, Chairman Giblin for helping in this campaign. I want to say a special word of thanks to your Senator, Senator Lautenberg, who did so much work on the balanced budget. And I want to thank Senator Torricelli for the work he did—for the work he has done on the balanced budget and the work he has done to stand up to the negative partisan attacks of the leaders of the other party. You should be very proud of both of them for what they have done.

I'm glad to be back here at Middlesex. Hillary and I were here 3 years ago. Since I came here, with the help of these Members in Congress, we passed a balanced budget which includes the HOPE scholarship, which is a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college so that every American can go on to a place like Middlesex. And I want to thank the students here for their engagement in community service, for their involvement in AmeriCorps. And especially I want to thank the volunteers in the America Reads program who are making sure our children can read.

Now, this is an interesting Governor's race. As I said the last time I was here, Senator McGreevey, I don't get a vote in New Jersey, and he won't get a vote in Congress—why am I here? Why have two members of the Republican majority in Congress come here to campaign for the Governor in the last few days? Because it really matters in the world we're trying to create for the 21st century not only what we do in Washington but what happens in the State capitals.

And so I say to you, in the last 2 days you should listen to what they say and how they voted. You listen to see what I say and what I've done. But when you sort it all out, you should vote based on what's best for you and your children and the future of New Jersey.

This election is terribly important to me because the people of New Jersey are important to me, and because you can send a signal to the rest of the country about the direction that we have to take into the new century. You know, just remember what it was like 6 years ago when we started: the economy was in bad shape; the country was increasingly divided; the middle class felt like it was on the ropes and ignored; and we seemed to be drifting toward the future. Washington was dominated by exceedingly partisan debates and a lot of hot air rhetoric.

And I said, I think we can do better. We can create a country where the American dream is alive for everybody responsible enough to work for it. We can create a country where we're coming together across the lines that divide us, not being driven apart as so many other people around the world are being driven. We can continue to lead the world for peace and prosperity. But we have to change, and we have to move forward.

And I've worked hard to do that. But what I want you to understand today is that everything we do in Washington depends upon whether it is supported, implemented, and added to in State after State after State for its ultimate success.

I've worked so hard to get this country out of debt. You know, the deficit of this country was so bad when I took office, we had quadrupled the debt of the country in the 12 years before I became President, over the previous 200—increased 4 times. And I said we're going to reduce the deficit, we're going to balance the budget, but we're going to invest more money in the education and health care and environmental protection of our country so that we can have a better country.

We took some tough votes. When Senator Lautenberg and then-Congressman Torricelli and the other Members of the House, they stood up and voted for our economic plan in 1993, they were excoriated, and the people who are here campaigning against Senator McGreevey said we were going to bring the economy down. The people who are here from Washington campaigning against him said our economic policy would be a disaster. Well, we've had 4 years of experience. They were wrong, and we were right. And we're right about this race, too.

They said they were tough on crime. I said, let's show it. Let's punish the people that ought to be punished and spend more effort trying to prevent our kids from getting into trouble in the first place and support the police—and support the police with 100,000 more police and the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. Their party was overwhelming against these measures. And now we've had 4 years to know whether they were right and we were wrong—and we know: Crime just keeps coming down. Our approach was right. We were right; they were wrong. And we're right about this race, too.

On the environment, New Jersey is a State that has shown time and again it is passionately committed to cleaning up the environment and preserving it. They said, "We don't have time to reauthorize the Superfund." They said, "We have to relax our environmental laws because it's too hard on the economy." They said, "It's just too much trouble; we're going to relax all these laws." I said no, no, we're going to have cleaner water, cleaner air, clean up more toxic waste sites, and grow the economy—and grow the economy.

We've had a test now—4 years of experience we have—and we stopped the contract on America and its assault on the environment. And we know now—after 13 million jobs, the last quarter the lowest inflation in over 30 years, the best growth picture in a generation—we know our ideas are right and theirs are wrong. We know. You don't have to guess anymore.

And so I say, what's that got to do with the Governorship of New Jersey? Plenty. Let me tell you, folks, I was a Governor for 12 years—and on the hard days in Washington I think it was still the best job I ever had. [*Laughter*] And let me tell you exactly what it has to do, based on 12 long, good years. Number one, our economic policies of getting this country out of debt won't work in States that get themselves in debt. You have to have fiscal responsibility in Washington and at the State capital in New Jersey. You have to do it together.

Number two, we have to be partners. We can't restore middle class values, middle class lifestyles, and a future for our children by providing sensible tax relief and a strong economy if you have to deal with the problems that you have here in New Jersey with the car insurance rates and the property tax. We have to work together to rebuild the lives of ordinary American families in New Jersey.

Number three—and these are very specific—education. We're doing everything we can to hook up all our classrooms and libraries to the Internet, to open the doors of college to all, to provide more choices in schools, to provide more excitement and innovation and reform, and most importantly, as Jim McGreevey said, to raise standards. But the work, the day-to-day work in education, and the money comes at the State and local level. Everything we are trying to do in Washington can quickly be undermined unless you have a passionate believer that every child can learn, is entitled to the world-class education that every child needs.

Child health—10 million children in this country and tens of thousands in New Jersey live in working families without health insurance. We passed a bill to provide health insurance to 5 million of those kids as part of the balanced budget. But the plans have to be devised by the State. I trust Jim McGreevey to work with us to insure the children of New Jersey.

Welfare reform—we have reduced the welfare rolls by over 3 million, but we have a lot of work still to do. They said, just cut people off. I said, make people who can work, work; but remember, everyone's most important job is being a good parent. Provide the child care, provide the support; then require people to work. Our plan is working. But it has to be implemented by the States. I trust Jim McGreevey to help us drive the welfare rolls down more, in ways that support being strong for work but good to the children of this State. And it's a big issue for you.

Finally, in the last few months, Hillary and I have had two conferences in Washington about young children, preschool children—one on the development of children's brains, in which we discovered that an enormous amount of the capacity all of us have as adults was developed in our first 4 years of life; in which we discovered that if a child has loving and supportive parents and a good child care environment, they'll get about 700,000 positive interactions in their first 4 years, but if a child lives in either a home or is in a child care center or both where the children are not being stimulated, they might get as few as 150,000 supportive interactions in the most important period of a child's life.

Then we had this child care conference in which we discovered that some families are spending up to 25 percent of their income on child care; that some of our best educated child care workers are more poorly paid than some of our rudimentary workers in our society; and that we are simply not doing enough.

Now, I want to design a system in this country by the time I leave office where I can have confidence that people can succeed at home and at work, and no one has to sacrifice being a good parent to do their job. I want to see—I'm telling you, we have to balance the budget, we have to run a stronger economy. We cannot afford to do the whole job at the national level. It will have to be done in partnership, partnership with private companies, partnership with the States. I trust Jim McGreevey to care about the children of the working families of the State of New Jersey.

So that's about it, folks. [*Laughter*] I want you to understand this is not about me, or about my Republican congressional friends who are in here campaigning for the Governor. This is not about Washington or about what the pundits will say. Only one thing matters: Is it good for you and your children and the future of this State?

But I can tell you, based on 12 years as Governor, almost 5 years as President, and the things that I have seen work and my passionate commitment to the future of this country, you can trust Jim McGreevey to fight for that future as Governor.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:10 p.m. in the gymnasium at Middlesex County Community College. In his remarks, he referred to State Assemblywoman Barbara Buono; State Senator Wayne R. Bryant; Tom Giblin, State Democratic chair; and Gov. Christine Todd Whitman of New Jersey.

Remarks at a Rally for Mayoral Candidate Ruth Messinger in New York City

November 2, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. Now, I'm a little hoarse, so you're going to have to bear with me. And I'll try to be heard in the back. I won't be funny as Al Franken—[*laughter*]—because I don't want to be driven from office. [*Laughter*] But I thank him for being here tonight and for always being there for me. Thank you, Al. I thank our friends, Peter Yarrow and Judy Collins, for performing at one of the—at this event. I thank all of you for being here.

Let me begin by saying from the bottom of my heart, I am profoundly grateful and will be to my last day on this Earth to the people of this State and especially the city of New York for the wonderful support you have given to me and Hillary, the Vice President, and our

administration. Thank you. [*Applause*] Thank you very much.

I look out at this sea of people here tonight from so many different racial and ethnic and religious backgrounds, somehow bound together across all your differences by a common concern for the future of your children, and this is what distinguishes Democrats in this time: a common understanding that if we want all of our kids to do well, including our own, we have to go forward together.

And I want to tell you tonight why I'm here. I know why you're here: you have a vote in New York. [*Laughter*] You're entitled to know why I'm here. I'm here for three reasons.

Number one, in 1991, when I first started running for President, the borough president of Manhattan endorsed me. Now, that may seem like a smart decision in 1997—[*laughter*]—but let me remind you, in 1991, when Ruth Messinger endorsed me, most people in New York didn't know who I was. [*Laughter*] A lot of people in New York couldn't find my State on a map. [*Laughter*] Other people pointed out it was only about as populous as Brooklyn and what did I have any business running for President for? [*Laughter*]

And then when I got into the race, there were a lot of people who said that I shouldn't be President, and others who said, well, even if I could be President I couldn't be elected, and she ought to leave me. And there were lots of times when it would have been more comfortable for somebody who was the borough president of Manhattan to be somewhere else. But through all the times, when I was going through my own particular New York marathon in 1992—[*laughter*]—she stuck by me. And I'm standing with her tonight, and I'm proud to do it.

Now, there is a second reason. The second reason I'm here is that I am very proud to be a Democrat. And I am proud to be a part of a party that has a broad tent and is inclusive and welcomes all kinds of people. We heard for years that if they ever gave us the range of any executive authority, we'd be soft on crime, foolish on welfare, we would wreck the economy, raise taxes, and mess up the foreign policy of the country. Well, 5 years later, the country is stronger around the world; we've advanced the cause of peace and freedom; we have the best economy in a generation, 3 million fewer people on welfare; the environment is cleaner; the schools are better; and we're opening the doors of college to all Americans. I think they were wrong, the Democrats were right, and I'm proud to be here as a part of that.

I would also like to say—and in that connection, let me say I am especially pleased to see the people who contested the Democratic primary for mayor here. The fact that Ruth's former opponents are here says a lot about their character and their concern for the people of New York. And I thank them for being here.

Here's the third reason, and it's the most important, because the third reason relates to you. After all, this election is not about me or any big Republican leader who may have been here. It only matters to those of you who live here, to your children and your children's children and the future. So I was thinking to myself—and I had been thinking about this for weeks because I care a lot about Ruth, and I knew when she got into the race it would be a hard race, and I knew there were good reasons it would be a hard race—so I said to myself, if I were a citizen of New York, knowing what I know about the way the world works and what's going on in our country, why would I vote for her? What are the good reasons?

Well, let me begin by saying I think it's a good thing that crime has come down in New York, and I don't think any Democrat should criticize any legitimate effort that brought it down. After all, remember, the first aggressive community policing and the first drop in the New York City crime rate began when David Dinkins was mayor. Don't forget that.

Now—wait a minute—so, if in the last 4 years there's more community policing, more sophisticated deployment of law enforcement resources, if people aren't getting hassled on the street as much, there's not as much crime and less violence and people are less likely to get hurt, that is a good and noble thing. That is an American ideal. That doesn't belong to either party. And I am proud that our party in Washington, over the opposition of the Washington Republicans, came out for the Brady bill, for the assault weapons ban, for putting more police on the street, for doing things that would help to bring the crime rate down.

Now—and I believe with all my heart that there is a bipartisan, American consensus now that we ought to keep pushing more police officers on the street, working with communities, preventing crime from happening in the first

place, catching people when they do something wrong as quickly as possible, making the streets safer. Now, having said that, every election ought to be about tomorrow. What about tomorrow?

There are three things I want you to think about. Number one, while the crime rate has gone down in this country and in New York City substantially in the last 5½ years, crime among people between the ages of 12 and 18 has not gone down so much; in some places not at all. The second fact about that is, most crime by juveniles is committed between 3 o'clock in the afternoon and 7 o'clock at night. Why? Because they're out of school, not at home, and mama and daddy are still at work.

Now, it is my opinion, having been involved in law enforcement now for more than 20 years, that the most serious proposal put forward in any of the elections occurring in this election year likely to deter juvenile crime and lower the crime rate is Ruth Messinger's call to keep all the schools in New York open after school hours.

Second reason—I heard you amen-ing when Ruth was talking about the schools—if you really want a safe society, you must have a well-educated society. New York is blessed by having a phenomenally diverse population, people from over 100 different racial and ethnic groups in your school system. But they're all kids with minds given to them by God, and they can all learn. They can all learn. But they deserve good schools with high standards, high accountability, adequate investment, and yes, we ought to do some more in Washington. And I'm going to do my best to help the cities alleviate the overcrowding problem, to repair these schools and build new facilities. We've got to do that.

But I just got back from Chicago, where Hillary and I went because they opened up the town to her one day—it's my wife's hometown—to celebrate her 50th birthday. And let me tell you that not so many years ago, Chicago had, by common consent, the worst schools of any major city in America. They were shut down every year by a strike, whether there was an issue or not. And that's all people knew about them. In the last 4 years, the people of Chicago, led by a mayor who put education first, have begun to literally revolutionize their schools. They have mandatory summer school for children who don't perform. They hold kids back if they don't pass an exam to go on to high school. But they don't just punish kids, they give all children a chance to succeed. New York City should give every child a chance to succeed. Ruth Messinger cares about that.

The third thing I want to say is this. I am very proud of the fact that our economic policies have led to over 13 million new jobs, an unemployment rate below 5 percent, and the best economy in a generation. I'm proud of that. But it bothers me that there's still too many people in America who have not felt the economic recovery. I have done what I could to provide special tax incentives for people to invest in inner cities, to set up new banks for people to loan money to people who couldn't get money in any other way to start their own businesses, to do other things that would rebuild the economy of areas where the unemployment rate is too high. But anybody who's ever worked in this field will tell you that the Federal Government cannot do this alone. You have to have State support. You have to have local support. You have to be able to work with the private sector. And you have to try new ideas. Believe me, no one has fully solved this problem.

So I say to you, I believe if I were mayor of New York City, I would say my three priorities are: I'm going to get the unemployment rate down to the national level, I'm going to fix our schools, and I'm going to give these kids something to do after school to keep them out of trouble in the first place and keep the crime rate going down.

Now, this ought to be a positive experience for you and a positive election, and so I say to you——

[*At this point, there was a disturbance in the audience.*]

The President. Let me just say this. Wait, wait, wait. I believe in his right to free speech more than he believes in mine. So we let him talk a little bit. If you want to talk to me, go out there. Don't mess with the mayor's race. She doesn't deserve this.

Who do you believe——

[*There was another disturbance in the audience.*]

The President. Let me say something. While he's on his way out, let's talk about AIDS a minute. Let's talk about this. You all be quiet and listen to me. This AIDS issue is a serious issue. But you never get to the facts if you're

just screaming. And I can't win a screaming match today. [*Laughter*]

You might be interested to know, if you think it's important, that we have dramatically increased spending on AIDS research, dramatically increased spending—while I was cutting other things and balancing the budget—dramatically increased spending on AIDS treatment; that the new drugs dramatically approved much faster under my administration than ever before have lengthened the life and the quality of life of people with AIDS. And in terms of research, we are spending today more than twice as much per person with AIDS—with a fatal case of AIDS—in research than we are women with breast cancer, and more than 8 times as much as men with prostate cancer. I think we have done a good job on this issue. I'm proud of it, and I think you should.

Now, secondly, since we're here about the mayor's race, who do you think is more likely to care more about the AIDS issue as mayor of New York?

Audience members. Ruth! Ruth! Ruth!

The President. Now you've got a day and a half. You've got a day and a half. I want to ask you to do something. I was glad to come up here tonight. I don't have a vote. You have a vote. I won't be here on Tuesday to drag people to the polls, but you can. So think about the next day and a half and say, "You know, I'm thinking about the future of New York. I'm worried about the kids, and I want them off the streets and doing something positive after school. I'm worried about our schools, and I want them to be the best in the country. And I know we've got to try something new and innovative if we're going to cut the unemployment rate from 10 percent to 5 percent. And Ruth Messinger has a plan to deal with all three. I believe I'll help her."

Go out and do that, and have a good Tuesday. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:25 p.m. in Royal Ballroom B at the Sheraton New York Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to comedian Al Franken; musicians Peter Yarrow and Judy Collins; and Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago, IL.

Remarks at a Rally for Gubernatorial Candidate Donald S. Beyer, Jr., in Alexandria, Virginia

November 3, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. This looks like a crowd of winners to me. Ladies and gentlemen, I am so honored to be here with Senator Robb and Mrs. Robb and Congressman Moran, Congressman Scott, your mayor, your Democratic State chair, with Bill Dolan and Susan Payne. And let me say, I thought Yvonne gave a great speech, didn't you? [*Applause*] And I am very, very proud to be here—very proud to be here with Don Beyer and his fine family.

Now, let me say to you, I think the last two speeches were about as good as it gets. [*Laughter*] And I may have nothing to add, but let me speak to you as someone who will never be a candidate for public office again——

Audience members. Awwww——

The President. ——unless you let me run for the school board down here someday. [*Laughter*] But I was a Governor for 12 years, and I've been your President for 5 years, and I've seen most of the major political battles of the last 20 years unfold. Many times they were Democrats against Republicans in traditional ways, liberals against conservatives. That is not what this is. This is nothing more or less than what Don Beyer said: This is a vote for an easy hit today or doing the right thing for tomorrow.

And I was a Governor for 12 years—nobody likes to fool with licensing their cars, with taxing their cars; it is a pain. This is a brilliant ploy because there is hardly anything in life more irritating. [*Laughter*] So let us give the opposition credit; they have found an irritant that we would all like removed. The question is, at what price? At what consequence? And what happens after it's done?

This really is a question about whether Virginians will be selfish in the moment or selfless

for their children and their future, not because there is anything inherently wrong with getting rid of a pain in the neck, wherever it is—[*laughter*]—but because as we grow older and we assume responsibilities, we all do things in life because we can't think of a better way to do something even more important. And I say to you, that's what's at issue here.

This reminds me back in 1993, when Senator Robb bravely stood by me, and we adopted that tough economic program. And the easy thing to do was to oppose it. And our Republican friends said, "The President's economic program is going to raise your income taxes." It didn't, but they convinced a lot of people it did—unless you were in the same income group that Don Beyer and I are in. [*Laughter*] Ninety-nine percent of the people didn't have their income taxes raised. And they said it would bring a recession. Well, 5 years later, we have reduced the deficit by more than 90 percent before the balanced budget law kicks in, because we did the right thing. And we have 13 million new jobs and the lowest unemployment rate in a generation and the lowest inflation rate in over 30 years. But in 1994, some good Members of Congress lost their seats because they did the right thing for the long term and the people hadn't felt it yet.

I was in New Jersey yesterday; you heard Don Beyer talking about that. Well, the Governor said, "I'll cut income taxes by 30 percent," and it sounded so good. And she did. But what she didn't say was, they'd have to run the State into huge debt to do it and, oh, by the way, local governments had the power to raise the property tax by every dollar that they cut the income tax, which was more regressive, more burdensome, and wound up being a bigger pain in the neck. And so, a race which we shouldn't even be having up there because the economy is good, with an incumbent Governor, turns out to be a real horse race, because people figured out 4 years later, "I went for the quick hit, and maybe I got sold a bill of goods."

Now, you don't have 4 years, you just have 24 hours. But it's amazing how common sense can strike people in the flash of an eye. This is a great State. This is the State of our Founding Fathers. You have a tradition to uphold. You have a meaning that is special not only to you but to the rest of America. How could you knowingly damage the education of our children and the future of your State for something that will be immensely satisfying for about 30 seconds, maybe an hour, maybe a week at most, and then you'll be paying for it for the next 4 years?

That is the issue. You have to get people to think not about the immediate frustration being relieved or the comfort of the moment but about what they really believe in.

The other thing I want to say is, I know that a lot of people vote who don't have children in school. But if we hadn't learned anything in the last 2 years in America, surely we have learned they are all our children. I think it is amazing that all these former Republican Governors have come out against this plan. I also think it is amazing that it's the Democrat in this race, not the Republican, who is standing up for higher standards and accountability and moving our State—your schools forward, not just with more investment in education but with higher quality of education. I am proud of the fact that it is the Democratic Party in Virginia and in Washington, DC, standing for high standards, accountability, and excellence, as well as investment in education.

So I say to you, this is really a race where you have to choose the moment over the lifetime—or today or tomorrow; or a mature, full, whole vision of the future, or what gratifies you personally but very briefly. This is going to be like one of those meals you order and you're hungry 30 minutes later—[*laughter*]—or it's going to be like something you do and afterward you are so proud of yourself.

Think how this State will feel on Wednesday morning when Don Beyer is Governor. Think how you'll feel. Think how you felt every time in your life when you did something you knew wasn't quite so, wasn't quite right, selfishly gratifying, and you felt lousy the next day. And think how you felt every time in your life you were tempted to do something that was selfish and you didn't do it, and the next day you felt wonderful. You felt more alive. You felt more human. You said, "This is what I'm here on this Earth for." Every time you gave up something so you could do something else for your children; every time you gave up something so you could give a little more to your favorite charity; every time you didn't sit home and watch a ball game and instead went out and helped the Scouts or some other community group—think how good you felt. That's how this State is going to feel if you vote for Don Beyer,

because you'll know you did it for the future, for your children, for your noblest instincts. That's why you will do it.

Now, I've seen all these polls. Let me tell you something I know about them. I've been on both sides of them—[*laughter*]—always more fun to be ahead than behind. The remarkable thing about these surveys is they all agree on one thing: There is still an enormous undecided vote.

Now, that means two things. Number one, it means if everybody who is willing to make the mature, long-term, noble choice here on this issue shows up to vote, that counts about 1½ times as much as it would in a race where there's not a big undecided vote. So before you go pat yourselves on the back too much for being here, just remember, if you and everybody else you know who is for Don Beyer don't show up, then your good intentions don't amount to a hill of beans. So you have to be there.

The second thing is, with all these undecided votes, that's telling you something. That's telling you that the electorate of Virginia is just like all of us are whenever we're confronted with this kind of choice: Yes, I want the pie after the meal. [*Laughter*] No, I want to feel good tomorrow. [*Laughter*] I think I'll spend this money. No, I had better put it in my child's college savings account.

That's what's going on; that's what this undecided vote's about. There's a scale in the mind and psyche of the voters, and the scale can still be shifted. So you need to think about it. You've got 24 hours and then all day when the polls are open tomorrow. And if the polls are right and there are all these undecided votes, you could practically just start walking up and down the street here today talking to people and find a bunch of them. And so I want you to do it.

I'm telling you, once in a great while an election like this comes along where a murmur starts in the people, and it spreads like wildfire, and people really get caught up in it—and it doesn't happen till the last minute. That is what is happening now. You have a chance to win this election if you go—if everybody you know who is for Don and L.F. and Bill goes, and if you go out there and say, "I am not going to treat this election like it's over. There are too many undecided people. There must be 10 or 20 people I can call. I can go out into the mall and walk up to strangers and ask them to think about this."

Remember, this is about how the State is going to feel the next day. It's about where the State is going to be 4 years from now. And it's about where your children are going to be in the 21st century. Do the right thing, and you'll love it.

God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:43 p.m. at Market Square. In his remarks, he referred to Lynda Robb, wife of Senator Charles S. Robb; Mayor Kerry J. Donley of Alexandria; Sue Wrenn, State Democratic chair; William D. Dolan III, candidate for State attorney general; Susan Payne, wife of L.F. Payne, Jr., candidate for Lieutenant Governor; Yvonne Jukes, president, Fairfax Education Association; and Gov. Christine Todd Whitman of New Jersey.

Remarks on the 10th Anniversary of National Public Radio's "Performance Today"

November 3, 1997

Thank you very much, Martin. Ladies and gentlemen, as you can hear I'm still a little hoarse, but I'm delighted that you're here, and I'm delighted to be here. And I thank you for mentioning the biggest thrill I've had lately, the opportunity to conduct the National Symphony. Actually, I have been used to dealing with the Congress for so long now, I was surprised that they followed my lead. [*Laughter*] But we got through it just fine.

Welcome. The first concert held in this magnificent house was on New Year's Day, 1801, when President John Adams invited the Marine Band to play. In nearly 200 years, there have been a lot of other concerts here. More than

a century ago, President Chester Arthur inaugurated the first concert right here in the East Room. And 20 years later, Theodore Roosevelt made showcasing the world's finest musicians in this room a standing tradition. Pablo Casals was among the first artists Theodore Roosevelt invited to perform, in 1904.

It was more than 50 years later that the concert to which Martin referred at the outset of the performance tonight occurred, when Casals came back for another East Room performance when President and Mrs. Kennedy lived here. This was made even more momentous, of course, by the fact that his performance was enjoyed not simply by Cabinet members and diplomats gathered in the room but by Americans of all walks of life who could tune in on their radio stations and hear the concert.

Hillary and I are very proud that we're able to continue this fine tradition tonight to have the finest of music, from classical to jazz to opera to gospel, with all Americans. We're honored to celebrate with you the 10th anniversary of "Performance Today." It has been an extraordinary effort by National Public Radio. In just 10 years "Performance Today" has become an important part of the lives of so many of our fellow Americans—1.5 million Americans in more than 200 communities listen to "Performance Today" every single week, and I know its audience will surely grow. If every American could hear what we heard tonight, there would be a fire sale on radios throughout America and everyone would want 10 or 20 more.

We want to do what we can to continue to support the young musicians we've heard tonight—and I consider them all young. [*Laughter*] Even 50 is young to me. [*Laughter*] As part of our White House Millennium Initiative, we'll host a series of cultural showcases shining a spotlight on the next generation's most promising musicians, celebrating their great American creativity. Who knows what great musicians and composers will enliven our concert halls and airwaves in the 21st century—the next Marsalis or Graves or Roberts or Galway or Perahia or Ngwenyama? And thank you, young lady, by the way, for sticking up for the National Endowment for the Arts, as well. We appreciate you very much.

All of these great performers who have been here tonight have made us feel a little more alive, a little more human, and a little more noble. We thank them. And perhaps the best way we can honor their gift to us tonight is by resolving to celebrate the gifts of the future, both in the White House and on "Performance Today," for many, many years to come.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:45 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Martin Goldsmith, host of NPR's "Performance Today" program; and musician Nokuthula Ngwenyama.

Message to the Congress on the National Emergency With Respect to Sudan

November 3, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b), I hereby report to the Congress that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare that the policies of the Government of Sudan constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States and to declare a national emergency to deal with the threat.

Pursuant to this legal authority, I have blocked Sudanese governmental assets in the United States. I have also prohibited certain transactions, including the following: (1) the importation into the United States of any goods or services of Sudanese origin, other than information or informational materials; (2) the exportation or reexportation to Sudan of any nonexempt goods, technology, or services from the United States; (3) the facilitation by any United States person of the exportation or reexportation of goods, technology, or services from Sudan to any destination, or to Sudan from any destination; (4) the performance by any United States

person of any contract, including a financing contract, in support of an industrial, commercial, public utility, or governmental project in Sudan; (5) the grant or extension of credits or loans by any United States person to the Government of Sudan; and (6) any transaction by any United States person relating to transportation of cargo to, from, or through Sudan, or by Sudanese vessel or aircraft.

We intend to license only those activities that serve U.S. interests. Transactions necessary to conduct the official business of the United States Government and the United Nations are exempted. This order and subsequent licenses will allow humanitarian, diplomatic, and journalistic activities to continue. Other activities may be considered for licensing on a case-by-case basis based on their merits. We will continue to permit regulated transfers of fees and stipends from the Government of Sudan to Sudanese students in the United States. Among the other activities we may consider licensing are those permitting American citizens resident in Sudan to make payments for their routine living expenses, including taxes and utilities; the importation of certain products unavailable from other sources, such as gum arabic; and products to ensure civilian aircraft safety.

I have decided to impose comprehensive sanctions in response to the Sudanese government's continued provision of sanctuary and support for terrorist groups, its sponsorship of regional insurgencies that threaten neighboring governments friendly to the United States, its continued prosecution of a devastating civil war, and its abysmal human rights record that includes the denial of religious freedom and inadequate steps to eradicate slavery in the country.

The behavior of the Sudanese government directly threatens stability in the region and poses a direct threat to the people and interests of the United States. Only a fundamental change in Sudan's policies will enhance the peace and security of people in the United States, Sudan, and around the world. My Administration will continue to work with the Congress to develop the most effective policies in this regard.

The above-described measures, many of which reflect congressional concerns, will immediately demonstrate to the Sudanese government the seriousness of our concern with the situation in that country. It is particularly important to increase pressure on Sudan to engage seriously during the current round of negotiations taking place now in Nairobi. The sanctions will also deprive the Sudanese government of the material and financial benefits of conducting trade and financial transactions with the United States.

The prohibitions set forth in this order shall be effective as of 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, November 4, 1997, and shall be transmitted to the Congress and published in the *Federal Register*. The Executive order provides 30 days in which to complete trade transactions with Sudan covered by contracts that predate the order and the performance of preexisting financing agreements for those trade initiatives.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 3, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 4. The Executive order of November 3 is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

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

November 4, 1997

The President. Good afternoon. I just wanted to test our stamina in the cold this afternoon. [*Laughter*]

I am very pleased that the Senate has voted with a very strong bipartisan majority to clear the key procedural hurdle to pass trade negotiating authority to expand American exports, create American jobs, and strengthen American leadership in the world.

Let me begin by thanking Senator Lott and Senator Daschle for their strong leadership and for the powerful arguments they made on behalf of fast track and our national interests. Today's

vote shows that a bipartisan coalition for American leadership which has sustained us throughout this century can help us meet the challenges of the next century.

The case for extending fast track is plain. Our economy is the strongest in a generation, growing over 4 percent the last year with $125 billion of that coming from exports. The only way to continue to increase incomes and create jobs is to tear down more foreign barriers to American products and services. Foreign nations already enjoy open access to our markets. This legislation will give us the authority to increase access to foreign markets, especially in the fastest growing regions of the world.

The world economy is clearly on a fast track. If we don't seize these opportunities, our competitors surely will. An "America last" strategy is unacceptable. We have a unique obligation to lead. If we fail to lead on trade, our influence will suffer in other areas important to our security, undermining the trend toward free markets and democracy in other nations, weakening especially our relationships in Latin America, damaging cooperation on issues from drug trafficking to immigration.

Now, in addition to this, of course, we should seek to raise labor and environmental standards in developing countries and to stop abuses like child labor. But this legislation will give us more leverage in pressing those goals. We should seek to do much more in helping American workers and their families when their jobs are lost because of trade or because of technological change, and I will have more to say about that tomorrow. But we cannot raise our own living standards or improve labor and environmental conditions in other parts of the world by withdrawing. What we have to do is to continue to reach out to open more opportunities for Americans and to work with other countries to improve standards there.

In the coming days, I look forward to working with Speaker Gingrich and Representative Fazio. And I look forward to the same sort of determined congressional leadership that has borne fruit today. I call upon all the Members of the House, without regard to party, to make the choice they know is the right one for America when they vote on Friday.

Thank you.

Iraq

Q. What do you plan to do about Iraq?

Q. Mr. President, the Iraqis once again—Saddam Hussein, in particular, seems to be raising questions about your willingness, your administration's willingness to break ranks with other U.N. Security Council members and possibly use military force in the face of this latest showdown with Iraq. What do you say to Saddam Hussein at this point?

The President. Saddam Hussein should comply with the United Nations resolutions and he should allow us to resume the inspections. If he has nothing to hide, if he's not trying to develop weapons of mass destruction, then he shouldn't care whether Americans or anyone else are on the inspection team. This may be just another dodge. The resolution is clear, the inspection regime is unambiguous, and we have confidence in it, and that's why we participate in it. And that's what he ought to do.

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*]——

Q. [*Inaudible*]—his threat to target American flights over Iraq what your response would be?

The President. That would be a big mistake. But the U–2 flights—let me say, the U–2 flights, which you reported on extensively in the last couple of days, are flights in which we are involved, but they are carried out under the authority of the United Nations for a United Nations purpose. And we will continue to consult with our allies on that.

But let me say again, the world has an interest, stated in the United Nations Security resolution, in preventing Iraq from developing weapons of mass destruction. That's what this is all about. There is an inspection regime which has clearly been approved by the United Nations. And Saddam Hussein must restore respect and opportunity for that inspection regime. That's all this is about. And we have to be very firm about it.

Q. Mr. President, what do you plan to do——

Q. Mr. President, do you believe at this hour that the United States is headed toward a military confrontation with Iraq, or is this diplomatic mission likely to resolve things?

The President. I believe, at this moment, we should do everything we can to resolve this diplomatically, and we should reserve judgment. This ought to be resolved diplomatically. There is a procedure there, and the Iraqis should let it be carried out by the United Nations.

There was one other question.

Q. How long will you wait, Mr. President?

Assistant Attorney General Nominee

Q. Mr. President, what do you plan to do to save Bill Lann Lee's nomination, and is there anything you can do to overcome Senator Hatch's opposition?

The President. Well, I'm disappointed in Senator Hatch's statement because I think everybody who knows Bill Lee believes he is superbly qualified to be head of the Civil Rights Division. The Civil Rights Division enforces the laws of the United States against discrimination, and we need a strong and nationally recognized leader in that position.

You know, in his hearing, no one could say anything bad about this man. I mean, here he is, the son of Chinese immigrants that's worked his heart out all of his life. He's devoted his entire life to fighting for equal opportunity and against discrimination. He is superbly qualified. And that's what I want to say—how can anybody in good conscience vote against him if they believe that our civil rights laws ought to be enforced? That is a question that we will be pressing to every Senator without regard to party.

I had thought there was a bipartisan consensus in the United States for enforcing the civil rights laws of America. I still believe there is in the country, and I think there ought to be in the Senate.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:13 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq.

Statement on Fast-Track Trade Legislation

November 4, 1997

This week Congress has the opportunity to renew decades of partnership between the Congress and the President in building America's economic future and security through trade.

That partnership has been a key component of this Nation's successful economic strategy, which has given America its strongest economy in a generation and helped build this country into the world's greatest trading nation. By working together for over 60 years, Congress and the President have provided a foundation for prosperity at home while bolstering democracy, security, and living standards around the world.

Our predecessors learned the bitter lessons of protectionism firsthand during the Great Depression and wisely set the world on a path toward mutual prosperity. Today, with our economy and our workers, farmers, and firms the envy of the world, America can lead from strength. In a world where economic activity in one corner of the globe can affect economic activity in every other, America's leadership in international trade is more vital than ever.

Over the past 5 years, American exports have helped power and sustain a U.S. economy of unparalleled productivity, strength, and vitality. From year to year, we have added hundreds of thousands of high-wage, high-productivity jobs in our dynamic export industries.

Our challenge today, and for our children, is to sustain that growth and our standard of living well into the next century, while promoting worker rights and environmental protection at home and abroad. To secure our economic future, we must take advantage of quickly expanding market opportunities around the globe that are available for America's workers and firms—if we seize them. Some 96 percent of the world's consumers live outside our borders.

Here at home, we have the world's most open and competitive marketplace. Americans thrive on fair competition, as the sustained growth in our economy has shown. But in some foreign countries, particularly in the new, emerging marketplaces around the world, American products and services are not given a chance to compete. Now is the time for us to unlock those markets and make them as open to fair competition as our own.

Legislation is pending before the Congress this week that will allow us to do that, while addressing important labor and environmental concerns. It makes Congress a vital partner in shaping our trade strategies and strengthens the hand of our negotiators. It tells our trading partners that America is united at the negotiating

table in securing the best possible market opportunities for our firms, farmers, and workers.

American leadership has helped prompt tremendous progress towards democracy, stability, and economic security in our hemisphere and around the world. Our sustained efforts to bring about fair and open trade worldwide have been a major reason for our success.

I am committed to pursuing not only more open markets for our companies and working people but more open societies that encourage respect for core labor standards and for the environment. To accomplish those goals, to build on our strength, and to sustain American leadership over the years to come, Congress must join me in a partnership for the future.

Remarks at a Dinner for Senator John F. Kerry
November 4, 1997

Thank you very much, John, Teresa, ladies and gentlemen. First of all, I would very much like to thank Senator Kerry for explaining the commitments he made in the last election, because we were all wondering why we were here tonight. [*Laughter*] And now we know we've come to help Reverend Kerry keep his vow of poverty. [*Laughter*]

Let me say on a only slightly more serious note, I liked a lot of things about the campaign of 1996. I liked the fact that we were able to go out and finally say that there were two different visions of this country. The American people voted for one of them in 1994; they voted for another one in 1992. They fought us on everything we tried to do with the economy, with crime, with welfare, with the environment. The results were in, and the American people made a judgment.

And John Kerry in many ways had to run the most difficult of all races for an incumbent, because he had to run against a sitting Governor who was immensely popular and was not sort of a cardboard cutout of the contract on America. And I was absolutely determined that if I could do anything to help him get reelected, I would do it. And I loved every minute of every day I ever spent in Massachusetts, and I was tickled that he won.

And I might say, in the campaign that he had to put together to win, with the grassroots support and the intensity, it was—Massachusetts became the only State in the country where every single Republican running for Federal office was removed. And it was a great, great effort. And it is not because—contrary to what a lot people think—the State is a doctrinaire liberal State; that's just not true. Those of you who live there know that. [*Laughter*]

So, I'm glad to be here. I'm also glad to be here because I do consider that John and Teresa are sort of soulmates of mine and Hillary's and our whole crew. They believe in the nobility of public service, and they believe in the imperatives of change.

You know, when I came here back in '93, one of the reasons I ran for President is that I really thought our country was getting in deeper and deeper and deeper trouble and drifting more and dividing more because Washington continued to be dominated by the same old stale debates and name-calling and categorizing that didn't bear much relationship to the real world in which I lived.

You know, on the budget, are you going to cut taxes and explode the deficit, or spend more money and just run it up a little less? On crime, were you tough or soft? That's the dumbest thing I ever heard. I never met anybody who was for crime. I'm still looking for the first person to come and say, you know, "My policy is, vote for me and I'll bring you more crime." [*Laughter*] We should either treat everyone on welfare as if they're pikers who are milking the system, or just give them more money for the same system—all these things that you heard in these debates and it was—it was so jangling. And I realize a lot of it—now I know a lot of it is the way it is presented to the people through the interlocutors. But what we tried to do was to change the way people thought.

And I agree with John—a lot of—I'm not sure that it's all that clear to the American people that that's been done, but it is true. I said, you know, on the economy, why don't we cut

the deficit and balance the budget and find a way to spend more money on education and research and technology? If we had the right priorities and right discipline, we could do that. And everybody said I was crazy, but 4 years later—we started with a $290 billion deficit, we have one that's $22 billion now, and we're spending more money on education. We just opened the doors of college to all Americans that are willing to work for it in this last balanced budget, thanks in no small measure to John Kerry's support and the fact that he stepped up to the plate in 1993 and helped us when everybody in the other party said I was bringing a recession to America.

On welfare, we said able-bodied people should be required to work, but don't take away the guarantee of health care and nutrition from those children, and give child care to the parents, because the most important job any of us ever have is taking care of our children.

On education, we said we want to spend more money, but we want to raise standards, too. On crime, we said, yes, be tough, but how about being smart for a change. Put more police on the streets, and take the assault weapons off the street. If somebody's got a criminal or a mental health history, don't let them buy a gun. That may seem common sense to you, but the leaders of the other party and almost all their members opposed us on every single one of those things.

And we were just determined to break new ground. John understood it from the beginning. He knew that we had to break new ground not only to make the Democratic Party a majority party but, far more important, to bring the country together and to move it into a new century. And I'm proud to be here for that reason.

Today he was one of a majority of our caucus voting to invoke cloture on the fast-track legislation, which I think is a very good thing for America. It will give me a chance not only to break down more barriers to our goods and services but also will give me more leverage to do what those who oppose us in our party say they want, which is to lift the labor and environmental standards that other countries observe, as well. So I feel comfortable here because I think we're engaged in an important enterprise.

I also want to say a special word about the campaign finance reform issue because John's worked very hard on that. He didn't take any PAC money running for Senator. I didn't take any PAC money when I ran for President. And I started off being the next-to-least well-known person in the field in New Hampshire.

Now, some say, well, is there any difference between the two parties because the Democrats raised so-called soft money? All I know is what John just said: All of our Senators, 100 percent of them, said, "Bring the bill up; we'll vote for it."

But I think it's also important that you understand what's driving campaign finance reform. I do not believe that campaigns are too costly and require contributions that are too large because people like you are running up to us throwing big checks at us to try to get major influence. I think what happens is people like you worry that people like us are going to get beat if we don't have enough money to buy increasingly expensive advertising. In other words, this is not a supply-driven problem. This is a demand-driven problem. And some of the people that excoriate us the most over this campaign finance problem—I haven't noticed any of them calling me and offering to give all the people who observe stricter limits free or reduced air time. That is the problem. So we have to find a way solve it. It's more likely that we'll solve it because John Kerry is in the Senate. And it's important because the faith of ordinary citizens need to be restored in the day-to-day processes of our institutions—all of them.

You know, when we denigrate other people in terms of their motives and what they're doing to institutions, when we attack people personally, when we pretend that people are somehow ethically inferior to ourselves—when we do that, any of us, whether we're in public life or the press or whatever—we may gain a short-term advantage, but in the end what we do is we increase public disillusionment with all institutions. And that's what all the surveys show is going on.

I had a fascinating conversation with Senator Dole not long after the election. He came by the White House and we sat and talked. And I said, "You know, Bob, you've been here in this town a lot longer than I have." He said, "Yeah, that's what I tried to convince the voters of." [*Laughter*] And we were having a great talk. And I said, "Now, tell me the truth. Is politics in Washington more honest or less honest today than it was 30 years ago?" He said,

"My Lord, it's not even close." He said, "It's far more honest today than it's ever been. There's far less corruption, far less impropriety." He said, "It's by far the best it's ever been."

Why don't the American people think that? And insofar as any of us ever contribute to their not thinking that, we ought to reconsider our positions. We need to fix the campaign finance system because it's over 20 years old; it's no longer consistent with the present realities of campaigning. But many of the very people who say, "All those politicians, they're all raising too much money," a lot of those people vote for the people who have the most effective negative television ads on, or just the most television ads on.

So we have to say this is an American responsibility. We have to work through it. And we need to find a commonsense solution to this, not a name-calling solution. But we'll do it. We always figure out how to do these things. It's more likely that we'll do it because John Kerry was reelected to the Senate.

Let me just make one general point. If you look at the fight we had over the Contract With America, if you look at what we tried to do with the economy, with the environment, with crime, with welfare, all these issues, if you look at the arguments we have over affirmative action or over whether we should open positions of public service to gays and lesbians, or any of these issues, you see a contrasting view of how we should define our American community. And in a funny way, that may be the most important issue of all.

My three little watch words are: opportunity, responsibility, community. Everybody ought to have an opportunity, everybody ought to be responsible, and everybody who is responsible should be part of our community. And if we can reach across all the lines that divide us to make one America, then everything else will probably come out all right. That's what I believe.

But we are having a debate today that you could see in the '92 election, in the '94 election, in the '96 election, that I predict will play itself out for another decade or so, about how we're going to define America in the 21st century: What will it mean to be an American? How will we define our country? And it's a debate we periodically have.

The first time we had it, ironically, it was the predecessors of the Republican Party, the Federalists, who gave the right answer, when John Marshall became the Chief Justice of the United States and basically said there are times when there must be one Nation, one law guaranteeing the constitutional rights of the American people, the minority as well as the majority.

Eighteen sixty, Abraham Lincoln redefined the Nation, said, "If I have to give my life, I'll do that to keep the country together and to recognize the rights of people previously oppressed."

In the Progressive Era, Theodore Roosevelt, coming out against abuses of child labor, the preservation of our natural resources, using the power of the Nation to bring us together and to look to the future and to put our children first, redefined again the importance of our conscious working together as a Nation, and the Government as an instrument of citizens coming together.

Then a funny thing happened. The mantle of carrying the Nation on shifted from the Republican Party to the Democratic Party, and Woodrow Wilson took it up. And then it was reinvigorated under Franklin Roosevelt in the Depression and World War II and then under Harry Truman. And then after the war, there were, frankly, progressives in both parties who shared a consensus that maybe the cold war helped them to hold together. After all, it was a Democratic Congress and President Nixon that produced the EPA and the first Clean Air Act.

Then in the last two decades, you have seen again a splitting apart of the consensus of what it means to be an American. We, as Democrats, believe that individual rights are important. We believe our individual values are important. We believe what happens to all children affects our children. We believe we don't have a child to waste. We're proud of our heritage, but we think we owe everybody else's as much respect. And we believe that our Government should not be a pain in the neck, it shouldn't be any bigger than necessary, but it ought to be strong enough to give people the tools to make the most of their own lives and to build strong families and strong communities.

Increasingly, the other party has said that Government is the problem, and that we're bound together as a community if we say we believe in the same things, but we really don't have any enforceable obligations to one another. I disagree.

But if you look at the real debates we've had—on welfare reform, I had no problem with requiring everybody on welfare to go to work. I had a big problem with taking away the guarantee of health care and nutrition from their kids, for example. On crime, I had no problem with making people who did terrible things serve longer sentences. But I knew we'd lower crime more if we put 100,000 cops on the street and took the assault weapons off the street. And it turned out that was right. But those were joint decisions we made together for the common benefit of everyone.

I want you to think about the political debates that we see just in the next 2 years, and you remember what I said tonight. And you will see people redefining their own allegiances based on new issues for a new time and what they think binds us together as a country.

I'm convinced that we were able to win the White House because more and more people who thought they were Republican or independent, who lived in suburbs, began to feel common cause with their neighbors and be willing to make common policies that affected us all in ways that they didn't before—on the budget, on crime, on welfare, on education, you name it, across the board.

But I think that's what makes our party special. It's not liberal/conservative. It's whether you believe that you are a piece of the main and a part of the whole, whether you really believe that your family will only be as good as it can be if everybody else's family has a chance, too. That is the single driving passion of our party today, and I think John Kerry embodies it. And I'm proud to be with him tonight.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:23 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Senator Kerry's wife, Teresa; and William F. Weld, former Massachusetts Governor.

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

November 5, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. Mr. Vice President, Senator, Members of the Congress, thank you so much for being here. And to the members of the administration, thank you for your efforts on fast track.

The choice Congress confronts this week will profoundly affect our growth, prosperity, and leadership well into the new century, for Congress must decide whether to extend the President's fast-track authority to negotiate agreements that tear down unfair trade barriers to our exports and create high-wage jobs in our economy.

Yesterday a bipartisan majority in the Senate voted overwhelmingly to move forward on extending fast-track authority. On Friday, the House of Representatives will vote on fast track, and I strongly encourage the House to take the same bold stand for America's future. A Member of Congress who votes for fast track is doing the right thing for America.

If we turn our backs now on trade and fail to seize the opportunities of the global economy, our competitors will eagerly take our place. That is an "America last" strategy. It's unacceptable; it won't work.

The rejection of fast track won't create any new jobs or raise any American incomes. It won't advance environmental or labor standards abroad. It would reduce our ability to do both. And I think that is very important. By freezing the status quo, we would simply be saying that we are going to freeze ourselves out of getting a fair deal in other markets; we are going to sit by while other countries get a better deal in other markets; and at the same time, we are going to reduce our influence on the labor and environmental standards in other countries and undermine our ability to continue to grow the American economy and create good, new jobs here.

Still, there are things that we have to do to try to continue to push the elevation of labor and environmental standards around the world as we press for open markets, and I believe we owe it to ourselves and our future to leave no one behind who is willing to work and learn

in order to compete and win in the global economy.

Our social compact ever since I came here has always been opportunity for everyone who is responsible and a community in which all Americans have a chance. That's why we've worked hard with Congress to create a package of initiatives which I will include in my next budget to equip all people to reap the rewards of change. We know that the technological and trade changes going on today favor people with higher skills. We know that they are accelerating the pace of change in our economy and indeed in every economy throughout the world. It is, therefore, imperative that we do more to make sure all our people have a chance to benefit from these changes.

First, we must greatly expand our efforts to help workers who lose their jobs because of technology or trade or other economic changes. At the suggestion of Congressman Bentsen, I'm going to establish a commission on workers and economic change in the new economy. Right now, we're going to commit to provide $750 million in additional funding to retrain dislocated workers. We want to create a special fund to guarantee that there will always be adequate resources to help workers hurt by trade. We want to target funds to help so-called secondary workers; that is, not only workers from a textile factory, for example, that might close but those in a nearby button factory who supply the textile factory.

This is very important. Changes in the economy do bring job dislocation. Most of them come because of technology. Some of them come because of trade. Our efforts here, combined with what we have already done, will mean that while we were cutting spending and balancing the budget during my term of office, we tripled funding for dislocated workers continuing training, to move people back into the economy with the skills they need.

Second, we have to step up our efforts to help communities adjust to this new economy. We should provide more rapid, more comprehensive, more coordinated assistance from all the Federal agencies in a way that is modeled on what we now do in our military base closure efforts, when we're trying to convert the bases to other uses. We should double the funds to help areas that have experienced major plant closings, and we should expand the development bank serving trade-affected areas.

Third, we must develop the untapped potential of our inner cities and rural areas, for too many of these places have not been touched by growth or dislocation. They need more investment. Our budget agreement doubles the number of empowerment zones, with tax incentives to invest in these rural and urban areas. But we must do more. We should increase loans for people who live in distressed rural and urban communities. We should make $100 million in flexible grants available every year in the new empowerment zones to attract new jobs and new small businesses, and we should provide for more skills training for young people in high poverty areas.

By giving a helping hand to workers at home and a strengthened hand to our negotiators as they open markets abroad, we can bring more Americans into the winner's circle of the new economy. We can grow the economy and let more people participate in that growth. There's no reason why our Nation cannot see to it that every American has the tools and conditions to succeed in this new economy. Our prosperity enables it; our understanding of the social contract demands it.

Now, the House faces a crucial vote on Friday. For me, the options are clear: We can rise to the challenges of the future, write the trade rules, continue our remarkable growth; or we can turn our back on the world and fail to compete for new markets, new contracts, and new jobs. I believe that the evidence is clear. We have produced over 13 million new jobs in less than 5 years because we have expanded the ability of Americans to sell their products and services around the world. It would be a great mistake not to continue that.

We cannot afford to return to a mindset that pretends that we can protect what we have now and never grow in the future. We must seize the opportunities of the future and take care of the people who have difficulties with change. We must do both, but—we must do both.

Thank you very much.

Republican Electoral Victories

Q. Mr. President, you asked voters yesterday to send a message to Washington in the elections. What do you thing the message was on the Republican victories?

The President. Well, they won in places that they had before, and we won the places we had before—in the urban areas where we had

elections. And I think the lesson of this year is that when the economy is up and crime is down, people believe the country and their States and their communities are moving in the right directions, and they tend to stay with incumbent candidates and parties.

I will say this—I was surprised and terribly impressed by the remarkable campaign of Mr. McGreevey in New Jersey. And I was profoundly grateful for a vote which may well have some national significance in Houston, when the people of Houston voted to retain their affirmative action program in city contracting. I say that because that's a second version of the debate that was held in California, and I expect that debate will be held in other communities throughout the country. So that may or may not have national significance, but it might.

But the others, I think—economy is up, crime is down; people think the country and the States and the communities are going in the right direction, and the incumbents all benefited.

Possible Impeachment Proceedings

Q. Could we ask your reaction to the announcement by Congressman Bob Barr this morning that he will ask for a resolution for a preliminary inquiry by the House Judiciary Committee into possible impeachment proceedings against you for, among other things, possible abuse of Presidential power. What would your reaction to such a move be?

The President. Well, Congressman Barr, as I remember, was the man who carried the NRA's water to try to beat the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. He's always had a rather extreme view of these things. I don't really have any comment on that.

Q. Mr. President, going back to fast track——

Iraq

Q. Mr. President, on Iraq, sir, what do you think the signals should be—what signals should Saddam Hussein take—I'm sorry—from the U.N. decision to postpone these U–2 flights over his territory?

The President. Well, as I said yesterday, that was a decision for Mr. Butler to make. But if I were in his position, I wouldn't draw too much of a conclusion from it. They want the United Nations group to be able to talk to Saddam Hussein and to be able to speak directly and frankly. But Mr. Butler has, in his tenure, has done a good job of doing the inspections, and he made it clear that the U–2 flights would be resumed. I personally felt that it was important.

So I think that you've got to say that Mr. Butler's got a good record of doing these inspections, that he's aggressively determined to stop the development of a weapons of mass destruction program, and he did say the flights would be resumed. So if I were Saddam Hussein I wouldn't draw too much inference from it except to say they'd like to have a talk in the most open circumstances possible.

National Standardized Testing

Q. Mr. President, Congressman Goodling says you have an agreement on national testing. What is it, and is it going to turn into a signable bill?

The President. Well, I met with Congressman Goodling this morning, and I do want to thank him, because we have been working for weeks and weeks and weeks to try to work out his concerns and mine. He did not—he told me months ago, when we started talking about it, he did not want to see an inordinate duplication of the efforts already undertaken at the State level and by some large school districts where they're already doing some kind of standardized test.

I said my concern was not to have—was to have some sort of clearly accepted standard of excellence that all our children would be expected to meet in reading and math. And we believe, based on our conversation today, that we at least have an agreement in principle about how our students can master the basics and achieve higher academic standards and be measured for doing that, to hold children's educational performance to a uniform standard without undermining the efforts that are now going on in States, if they actually do measure whether the children know what they need to know.

So the agreement was reached in principle, but there's some complexity in terms of just turning it into language, in terms of how this test would be evaluated compared with one another and what we propose to do in terms of research over the next couple of years. But the bottom line for the American people is I think we have opened the door to giving people in every State, every school district, and every school the assurance that their children's performance in reading and math can actually be

measured and be made meaningful in terms of what every child in America should know, so they will know how they're doing.

And if that—if it can be done, I will be a very happy person, indeed. And I'm hopeful that we have done that. I say that just to give Mr. Goodling a little protection, and the President as well, just because we've reached an agreement in principle; we've got to turn it into the language. I'm very hopeful. This will be a huge thing, long-term, for American education if we have, in fact, worked this out.

Q. Mr. President——

Iraq

Q. On Iraq, we get the impression that if you had your druthers, you'd rather have not had a break in these U–2 flights, that you understand why it's happened, but you don't think it's necessarily a great idea.

The President. I don't think it's fruitful for me to second-guess Mr. Butler now. One of the things that I have seen in his—he hasn't been there very long, but since he's been there he's been quite aggressive. And keep in mind what our goal is here. Our goal is to use these inspections to try to ensure that a weapons of mass destruction program is not developed. And since there is absolutely no reason to believe that Mr. Butler has been anything other than extremely faithful to his task, I think we should let these talks unfold.

I would have been disturbed if the flight had been suspended and there hadn't been a clear statement that they would be resumed shortly. But since he made a clear statement that they would be resumed shortly, I think we have to give him the benefit of the doubt on this, and let's see if we can work through it.

Q. Do you compare notes with President Bush about your joint nemesis, your shared nemesis, Saddam?

The President. It's interesting, when this whole issue first broke was when I was on my way over to the—it was the night before I went over to the Washington Children's Hospital to be with General Schwarzkopf at the STARBRIGHT Foundation announcement, so we had some interesting conversations about it. And I've seen former Secretary Baker since then, and we're all commiserating, and obviously I asked these people for their advice about it.

But we just—look, this is a frustrating policy, the one we're following, because it requires long-term patience and discipline. It's frustrating for him; it's frustrating for us; it's frustrating for everybody else. But you know, there is a reason these United Nations resolutions were passed. There's a reason this inspection regime was set up. We think it's a bad idea for any more dictators who have shown aggression toward their neighbors to develop the capacity to have nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons. We think it's a bad idea. And we know of no way to do that—to avoid that in peaceful terms than to have some sort of inspection regime.

And as I said yesterday, the UNSCOM inspection regime has actually led to the destruction of more dangerous weapons than the Desert Storm did, because it's been done with great discipline over a period of years. So I would ask the American people and our allies around the world not to get too frustrated, to be patient, but to be firm, and let's try to hold on to this inspection regime, because that is the most peaceful way of dealing with this and permitting everyone to go on with their lives.

Q. Are there days when you wish President Bush had gone——

Fast-Track Trade Legislation

Q. One last question on fast track. Mr. President—thank you—there is a certain pocket of people who are affected through fast track, we understand—blue-collar, low-income persons—where education failed them from the beginning, and they went into a trade. What do you say to those people who are losing and plan to lose their job or expect to lose their job because of this?

The President. I would say that we will continue to have some economic disruption in this country if we don't adopt fast track. If we don't adopt fast track—our market is still the most open market in the world, the most competitive market in the world, and we have the most technological change, and we know that most job changes are caused by technology, not by trade—the vast majority—so if we don't adopt fast track and we just sit where we are, a lot of those people will still confront the same challenges.

My argument is, adopt fast track, give me the power to create more jobs by opening markets, but also do more for those folks. Our programs were organized for a time when the economy didn't change as quickly as it does now. So Secretary Herman, for example, has worked

very hard to radically accelerate our response time and to get all these programs working together the way we worked when a military base was closed. That's what we're trying to do.

So my answer would be, we should invest more money to give you more training more quickly and to give you more support while you're going through it. We should put more money into those communities where no economic benefit or burden has been felt because there has been no new investment one way or the other. But that's not a reason not to continue to expand trade. What we should do is both.

The way to preserve the social compact in America is to create more opportunity and then take more responsibility for preserving families and communities. Our policy is the right one. But we will not create or save jobs in the short run or the long run by refusing to open markets to our products. We will not raise labor and environmental standards abroad; we will lose our ability to do that. We will lose our leverage if we decline to open new markets for American products. This increases our political influence on labor and environmental and other issues, even as it opens up our economics.

But the main thing is, I just ask the American people to give me the benefit of the doubt on this. We have worked for 5 years. We have created over 13 million jobs. We have reduced the deficit by over 90 percent before the balanced budget checks in. In the last 2 years, more than half our new jobs have come in high-wage categories and a third of the growth has come because of trade. This is our only strategy. We're only 4 percent of the world's economy; we're trying to hold on to 20 percent of its income. We've got to sell more to other people. There is not an option. And refusing to do it won't save jobs, won't keep incomes up, and won't help us help other people around the world.

Thank you.

Q. Do you worry about the impact on the stock markets if fast track fails—global markets?

The President. Well, let me say if it passes, I think it will have a very positive impact on the stock market here and around the world.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Senator Dirk Kempthorne of Idaho; Richard Butler, Executive Chairman, United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) charged with dismantling Iraq's weapons of mass destruction; Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, USA (Ret.), capital campaign chairman, STARBRIGHT Foundation; and former Secretary of State James A. Baker III.

Statement on Russian Ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention

November 5, 1997

I warmly welcome the action by the Russian Government today in ratifying the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). This landmark agreement, which the United States ratified last April, is already proving its value in enhancing international security. To date, 104 countries have ratified the CWC, which outlaws the development, production, possession, and use of chemical weapons. Russia's ratification makes it possible for Russia to join the United States in playing a leadership role in ensuring that all of the Convention's benefits are realized. I congratulate President Yeltsin, the Russian Duma, and the Federation Council on successfully completing CWC ratification. Russia's action today is an important step forward in achieving our mutual arms control objectives. I look forward to further progress in the months to come.

Exchange With Reporters at the George Bush Presidential Library in College Station, Texas

November 6, 1997

Iraq

Q. President George Bush, have you given any advice—what advice do you have for President Clinton in dealing with Saddam Hussein in this latest standoff? And do you have any regrets?

President George Bush. I agree with the President's stance of being firm with this man, and he's doing exactly the right thing. It is important that we have people with us in this, and it is important that the United Nations not waver one single bit. So I have no advice.

Q. Do you regret that your administration didn't more aggressively try to depose Saddam Hussein?

President Bush. In what way would I have deposed him? I'm not sure I understand the question. How depose him?

Q. During the war, do you regret not being more aggressive in trying to take him out?

President Bush. No, I have no regrets. The mission was to end the aggression, and we ended the aggression. We tried to do it peacefully without firing a shot. That failed the end of the aggression. His legions are defeated, and they cannot project the offensive force they once had.

Now, if you're asking me if I'm happy he's still there, no. But for those that now say, ex post facto, we should go in and have killed him, then I would then ask the question, whose son, whose daughter would I ask to give their lives in a perhaps fruitless hunt in Baghdad, where we would have become an occupying power? I have no regrets. The military said, "We've accomplished our mission." We ended the war, and we did the right thing. And history will say we did the right thing.

Q. What do you make of his staying power, President Bush?

Q. Mr. President, what do you think of the report from Mr. Butler that says Iraq is tampering with the U.N. surveillance cameras and moving weapons-related equipment?

President Clinton. Of course, that may be why he wants to interrupt the inspections, and why it's so important that they resume immediately. You know, the idea of getting the Americans out may just be a ruse; it may be that there is something that they're covering up, which is exactly why the international community has to resume the inspections.

Q. President Bush, what do you make of his staying power, Saddam's staying power, after all these years?

President Bush. Lots of staying power. A lot of staying power. If you're brutal, you don't care about the lives of your people and the welfare of them, you can stay in power a long time. I thought he'd be gone because of that brutality.

Any others?

George Bush Presidential Library

Q. What do you think of this library, Mr. Clinton?

President Clinton. I like it. It's very impressive. And the displays are particularly interesting to me.

Fast-Track Trade Legislation

President Bush. May I inject an answer to a question that has not been asked? I have great respect and I expect—I'm not trying to speak for President Carter or President Ford—for what President Clinton is trying to do in getting fast track through this Congress, through this Republican Congress. And he is doing the right thing. The Congress must support him in the House of Representatives, as they did in the Senate. And I am passionately committed to his position, President Clinton's position, on free and fair trade.

And I don't know if anyone wants to add to that. But this is an important moment, given what's happening out there.

President Gerald Ford. Well, I strongly reiterate my previous comment to the effect that fast-track legislation is critically important for substantive reasons and for U.S. leadership around the world. We've had that kind of legislation since the day I was President, and we hope to have it because it's important, critically, to the future of the United States as a leader—for the Nation.

So we hope and pray you'll get the votes tomorrow, Mr. President.

President Jimmy Carter. Well, all of us former Presidents have endorsed not only NAFTA earlier but also fast track now. In January, my wife and I and others were down in Latin America and saw the tremendous progress being made there. As a matter of fact, the MERCOSUR countries, which President Clinton visited recently, have already signed separate trade agreements with Mexico, with Canada, and with Europe. And I think, first of all, we're going to get left out if we don't sign fast track and get the negotiations done. And secondly, it's going to be a slap in the face to our natural friends and allies in Latin America.

The last 3 or 4 days I've been calling as many Democratic Congress Members as I could, trying to get the Democrats to come and support fast track. I think we have a much better chance among Republicans than we do Democrats. So I think we've got a lot of work to do, but it couldn't be a more important issue at this moment than to get fast track approved.

Q. How does it look, President Clinton?

President Clinton. It looks like we'd be better off if they were in Congress—[*laughter*]—and if I was. We're working hard. And let me say, the strong position that President Bush, President Carter, and President Ford has taken is immeasurably helpful. You know we have a lot of opposition, and I think you all know where it's coming from. I wish we could have a secret vote in the Congress; we'd pass it three or four to one.

But we're going to do the very best we can, and we're very hopeful. And we've been gaining ground in the last day—we had a great announcement yesterday by a group of Texas Members of the House, supporting it, and we're working on another group today. We're just going to keep working until tomorrow morning and see where we are. But I think we've got a good chance to win.

President Ford. Let us know if we can help make any calls.

Presidential Libraries

Q. What kind of ideas does this give you for your library?

President Clinton. Well, I'd like to have one that's as graphically representational as this one is and both personal—it's beautifully personal. I was over there—I was a little late getting in the line here because I was reading all of your biographical background and looking at your kids when they were young—no, it's wonderful. But I think it has a wonderful balance between the personal and the public service of President Bush.

President Carter. Each library has gotten larger and larger, so I can't wait to see President Clinton's that he's going to build in—[*laughter*].

President Clinton. I don't have as much land. I'll have to build a high-rise. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:40 a.m. in the George Bush Presidential Library at Texas A&M University. In his remarks, President Clinton referred to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq. A reporter referred to Richard Butler, Executive Chairman, United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) charged with dismantling Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks at the Dedication of the George Bush Presidential Library in College Station

November 6, 1997

Thank you very much, President and Mrs. Bush, President and Mrs. Ford, President and Mrs. Carter, Mrs. Reagan, Mrs. Johnson, David and Julie Eisenhower, Caroline Kennedy Schlossberg, Reverend Graham, Governor and Mrs. Bush, Vice President and Mrs. Quayle, and to all the foreign dignitaries and American officials who are here.

The sun is shining on Texas A&M today. And the sun is shining on America today. You know, we have an interesting country, with a lot of religious, racial, and political diversity. Once in a while, we all get together. This morning, I think it's fair to say that all Americans are united in tribute to President George Bush for his lifetime of service to America.

I enjoyed immensely listening to the previous speakers. When Mrs. Reagan spoke—I hope someday Al Gore will be glad that we had lunch once a week. [*Laughter*] When President Ford spoke, I said, I hope I will look that good when I am 25 years younger than he is. [*Laughter*] When President Carter spoke, I thought, thank goodness he just reminded the whole world that Presidents have to raise all the money for their libraries. [*Laughter*]

In 1942, young George Bush heard Secretary of War Henry Stimson challenge his generation to be, and I quote, "be brave without being brutal; self-confident without boasting; part of an irresistible might, but without losing faith in individual liberty." President Bush not only heard those words, he has lived them. And he has rallied his fellow citizens to serve as well in their communities, for their country, and for the cause of democracy around the world.

There are many things that I, not only as President but as a citizen, am grateful to George and Barbara Bush for. I'd like to just mention a few today. As President and afterward, he has worked to ensure that "A Thousand Points of Light" is not merely a striking image but a lasting legacy. I thank him for that initiative and for cochairing the Presidents' Summit on Service.

As President, he summoned all the Governors, including me, to the University of Virginia for a summit on education, where we stayed up more than half the night in a totally bipartisan fashion to write national education goals for our country. And when he was President, Mrs. Bush espoused the importance of literacy and the importance of citizens volunteering to make sure all our children can read. I thought of that when we launched our America Reads initiative, which now has tens of thousands of college students at hundreds of universities all across America, trying to do what Barbara Bush always said we should do, to make sure every one of our fellow citizens could read and read well. And I thank them both for that.

As President and afterward, President Bush stood for American leadership for peace and prosperity, for freedom and democracy. He was the last President of the cold war, but he knew that American responsibility could not end with the cold war. And he showed us that in Desert Shield and Desert Storm. The vigilance President Bush displayed in dealing with Iraq, as we all know, is required again today. And I believe the American people support that vigilance, thanks in no small measure to your example not so long ago. And I thank you for that, Mr. President.

As President and afterward, President Bush pushed America to embrace new alliances of trade as instruments of both economic growth and growing democracy. He launched NAFTA and the talks that led to the World Trade Organization. I was proud to complete those efforts, and I am very grateful for the support he continues to give, along with our other former Presidents, to the imperative of American leadership in expanding alliances of trade, not only for our economic welfare but to support our political ideals.

Tomorrow the House of Representatives will vote on whether to extend fast-track authority to negotiate trade agreements. I hope Congress will follow the lead that President Bush and the other former Presidents have set to expand trade and our vital horizons in the 21st century. I thank you, Mr. President, for that.

For more than 4½ years now, even though our relationship began under somewhat unusual circumstances, I have been very grateful that whenever I called on President Bush, he was always there with wise counsel and, when he agreed, with public support. It's hard to express to someone who hasn't experienced it what it means in a moment of difficulty to be able to call someone who, first of all, knows exactly what you're up against and, secondly, will tell you the truth. And he has done that time and time again. I am persuaded that the country is better off because of it. And I thank you, Mr. President, for your counsel and your assistance.

This magnificent library will be a place for scholars who try to understand what has happened in some of America's most important years. It's a place for citizens who want to know right now what went on in the life and career of George Bush. It's also a place from which any person would draw enormous inspiration, a place for the reaffirmation of our faith in America.

Benjamin Franklin told our Constitutional Convention, "The first man put at the helm will be a good one, but no one knows what sort will come afterward." Mr. President, I think if Benjamin Franklin were here today, he would say that in George Bush, America has had a good man whose decency and devotion have

served our country well. And that is the story this library will tell to generations to come.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:25 a.m. in front of the library building at Texas A&M University. In his remarks, he referred to former First Ladies Barbara Bush, Betty Ford, Rosalynn Carter, Nancy Reagan, and Lady Bird Johnson; Dwight David Eisenhower II, grandson of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and his wife, Julie, daughter of former President Richard M. Nixon; Caroline Kennedy Schlossberg, daughter of former President John F. Kennedy; Rev. Billy Graham, who gave the invocation; Gov. George W. Bush of Texas, son of former President Bush, and his wife, Laura; and former Vice President Dan Quayle and his wife, Marilyn.

Remarks on Fast-Track Trade Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters
November 6, 1997

The President. Good evening. Today I was proud to represent all Americans in honoring the service of President George Bush at the dedication of his Presidential Library. It was an extraordinary moment for many reasons, but one of the most impressive things to me was that there were four men, two Democrats, two Republicans, who have held this office, all agreeing strongly that for America to continue to lead in the world economy, Congress must extend the President's power to negotiate new trade agreements.

A large bipartisan majority in the Senate supports extending this authority. Speaker Gingrich and I are convinced that the authority will strengthen our leadership, and we want the House to follow suit. A vote against fast track will not create a single job, clean up a single toxic waste site, advance workers rights, or improve the environment anywhere in the world, but it will limit America's ability to advance our economic interests, our democratic ideals, our political leadership.

So, once again, before Congress votes tomorrow, I call upon the House of Representatives to vote for American leadership, for America's economic future, and pass the fast-track trade negotiating authority.

Q. Mr. President, how close are you at this point? How close do you think you are in the House?

The President. I think it's a close call. Obviously, I'm here because I'm trying to pull out all the stops, and I want to emphasize the extraordinary moment we had today when the four Presidents were all strongly endorsing fast track. President Ford, President Bush have spoken out on this; President Carter has actually made a number of phone calls. It is close, but the policy is not close, and I am convinced that a substantial majority of the Congress knows the policy is not close, that it is clearly in America's interest to do this.

Iraq

Q. Mr. President, the Iraqis in a letter today threatened again to shoot down the next U.S. spy flight. There is apparently no give on their side at all. Are you becoming more concerned?

The President. Well, it would be a mistake for them to shoot down a plane. But we have a team there working for the United Nations, and our policy is clear—and I don't mean American policy—world policy. What they need to do is to resume the inspections. And the team is coming home this weekend, and we'll see where we are then and where we go from there.

Yes.

Fast-Track Trade Legislation

Q. What deals have you cut and are you planning to cut in order to get fast-track trade through, and does that include Congressman Smith's language on abortion?

The President. What we've tried to do is to resolve—if there are any issues, economic issues, that affect congressional districts or States that we can resolve honorably, we've worked hard to resolve those in ways that I think are consistent with what we're trying to do on fast track. If there are other issues that we can resolve that permit the business of the Congress to go forward, we're trying to resolve them. But there has been no agreement of the kind you just mentioned.

Q. Mr. President, can I ask you about your statement that if this were a secret ballot, this would pass by a 3-to-4 margin? Is that a fairly damning assessment of Members of Congress? It suggests they're so strongly in the grip of special interests that they won't vote their conscience on an issue that directly affects U.S. standing in the world.

The President. Well, they're under a lot of pressure. And you know, we see a lot of evidence that from time to time in these elections, that if one side is funded and another is not, that they can be very—that they can be in trouble. And there are other issues there for them to consider. All I'm saying is, I believe if there were a secret ballot, it would pass overwhelmingly.

And what I'm trying to do is to bring the vote tomorrow evening in line with where I think everybody's understanding is. I think the most important thing to do is to heighten the public awareness of this. The level of—though we've been talking about it now for months, I think because this is the authority for the President to continue to negotiate trade agreements rather than a specific agreement with a lot of specifics in it, there's not as much public interest, public awareness, or public involvement in this, and that has made the issue more difficult to lift the level of the national interest on. But I feel I must say I'm encouraged by the developments of the last few days, and we're just going to continue to do it.

Let me just mention one other thing that we've done in this, because I think I should have been talking more about this, but I think it's quite important. In order to address some of the concerns of Congress with regard to labor and the environment and congressional input, we establish in this trade bill a panel of advisers on labor issues, a panel of advisers on environment issues, parallel to that which existed in previous bills of advisers on business issues. That's never been done before. In addition to that, we're going to have a congressional observer group for every one of these trade negotiations the way we have congressional observer groups for NATO expansion, for example, or for the chemical weapons treaty.

Now, those of you who followed this and have been on our trips, for example, like when the congressional observer group went with me on the NATO trip to Madrid, know that this is a critical part of securing congressional approval because the NATO observers are involved in the early negotiations. They know what's going on. Their voices are heard. They are not just confronted with a fait accompli at the end of the day.

All these things have been changed for this particular fast-track bill, so one of the things I'm trying to hammer home to a lot of individual Members is that they—or their representatives, whether they're Democrats or Republicans, and—will have an involvement in how these specific trade agreements are negotiated, far greater than their predecessors have had in my administration and in previous administrations going back 20 years. And I think that's a big plus. One more.

Q. With the outcome still in doubt, have you and Speaker Gingrich considered delaying tomorrow's vote to give you more time to round up support?

The President. We find that the deadline concentrates our attention markedly, and so we're working hard. We think we can get there by tomorrow night, and that's what we're working to do.

Q. Mr. President, is it tomorrow night now?

The President. I'm sorry. I don't know. I haven't talked to the Speaker today. We think we can get there tomorrow, and that is what we are trying to do. I have not received any information. You probably have better information than I about when it is scheduled.

Iraq

Q. A question again about Iraq. What do your intelligence people say are motivating Saddam Hussein? Why is he doing this? Why is he pushing this again to the brink?

The President. Well, we learned, you know, back during the Desert Shield/Desert Storm period that his motivations are somewhat complex and difficult to fathom from time to time. All I can say is that the reason that we have the inspection regime and the reason we are determined to resume it is that, whatever else happens and however long he stays there, the international community has decided that he mustn't be allowed to resume the production of weapons of mass destruction. So he can have whatever motive he wants.

We have tried to work with the United Nations to deal with the humanitarian concerns of the Iraqi people. We are very concerned about those. But we can't permit a man with

his record, the regime with their policies, to get into the weapons of mass destruction business if we can stop it. And that is what the inspection regime is designed to do, and there is a lot of evidence, you know, that it has been quite successful. So all I know is that whatever his motives are, I just want to start the inspections again.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:32 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq.

Remarks on Fast-Track Trade Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters
November 7, 1997

The President. Good morning. Today we received more good news for America's workers and their families: real wages continue to rise, the American economy added another 280,000 jobs in October alone, and unemployment dropped to 4.7 percent. The American economy has now added 13½ million new jobs since 1993, while inflation has remained low and stable. All this proves further evidence that our economy is the strongest it's been in a generation. This also shows we have to move forward with the strategy that is working, the strategy of balancing the budget, investing in our people, and expanding American exports. That has brought us to this place of prosperity.

The choice before Congress is clear. I think it is imperative that we understand that a key reason more people are working and that wages are rising and that unemployment is down to the lowest level in more than two decades is that we have opened new markets and won new customers for American goods and services. The vote by the House of Representatives on fast track will determine whether we continue to move ahead confidently with the strategy that has brought us 13½ million new jobs and the lowest unemployment rate in nearly 25 years.

Every time there is a trade agreement, we hear dire predictions of the consequences for American workers. The opponents of fast track would have you believe that if we hadn't done these trade agreements in the last 5 years, we'd still have all the good new jobs we have, and we wouldn't have lost any jobs. That is simply not true. We wouldn't have nearly as many of these good new jobs, and most of our job losses are due to changes in technology and consumer buying choices.

Today, with 4.7 percent unemployment, we see that America's trade policy creates good new jobs, it does not lose them; it boosts incomes, rather than undercutting them. It would be a folly to turn back now.

The right answer is to give us the authority to break down more trade barriers and to do more, more quickly, to help those who are displaced by economic changes and to do more to raise labor and environmental standards in other nations. That is our policy.

If America is restricted in its ability to make trade agreements, then our national interest in creating good jobs, protecting the environment, advancing worker rights will be restricted as well. We must not give other nations a boost in the global economic competition so vital to our own economic strength. The question is not whether we are going to have a system of world trade but whether we have one that works for America, whether we have a level playing field or one tilted against us.

Let me just give you one example. Now that Canada has negotiated a trade agreement with Chile, every major economy in the hemisphere has duty-free access to Chile's markets but one, the United States. And just yesterday Canada signed a comprehensive agreement with Argentina, Brazil, and other nations, ahead of the United States. That's a strategy of "America last." It is unacceptable.

Again I say, the choice before Congress is clear: We can rise to the challenge of the future, write the trade rules on our terms, spur further economic growth and more jobs; or we can turn our back on the world and fail to compete for new markets, new contracts, new jobs. More than ever, our economic security is also the

foundation of our national security. Our strength depends upon our economic allies, our trading partners, and our economy. It affects our ability to get other nations to cooperate with us militarily and against the new threats of terrorism and drugs, organized crime and weapons proliferation.

If we want to keep our leadership strong and our economy on the right track, Congress simply must give our Nation the power to negotiate pro-growth, pro-jobs, pro-American trade agreements, to maintain the momentum and confidence our economy enjoys. A Member of Congress who votes for fast track is doing the right thing for America.

Iraq

Q. Mr. President, given the statement of Chairman Butler this morning that he got nothing out of Saddam Hussein and given that Saddam Hussein hasn't responded to the international community positively unless military action has been taken, are you going to recommend either U.N.-sponsored or unilateral military action that would involve in some way, shape, or form U.S. forces? And when would that be?

The President. Well, first of all, the delegation that was in Iraq is on its way home now, and they will report, and then the international community must decide what to do. I think it is important that we be resolute, and I think it would be a mistake to rule in or out any particular course of action at this moment.

Q. How long will you be willing to wait——

The President. Wait, go ahead, Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press] and then——

Q. Actually, I was just going to ask you, Mr. President, do you think that—do you see any sign that Saddam Hussein is anything but defiant, that he is willing to give at all? He is still threatening to shoot down the U–2 spy planes, and he's refusing to let the Americans be part of the inspection teams. Do you see any reason for hope here?

The President. No. I don't. But we have to be resolute and firm. Keep in mind what is at stake here. The international community has made a decision embodied in the United Nations resolution that Saddam Hussein must not be permitted to resume producing weapons of mass destruction. The advisers in UNSCOM, the inspectors there, they are the eyes and ears of the international community. They have been very successful, as you know, in doing their job. That is the issue.

And whether he's firm or weak, in the end, the international community has to be firm to make sure that his regime does not resume its capacity to develop weapons of mass destruction.

Q. Mr. President you seem willing to wait until the U.N. diplomats come back. How much longer are you willing to wait for compliance?

The President. Well, let me say, I think we have to wait until the U.N. diplomats come back. We have to counsel with our allies. We have to give them a chance to be heard and see what we're going to do. But I have seen no indication that any of our allies are weakening on this. Everyone seems to be united in their determination to restore the inspections on terms that the United Nations decides, not on Saddam Hussein's terms.

Q. Mr. President, will you give a visa to Tariq Aziz? And also, will you recommend to the Security Council or to the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. that they do take military action in the Security Council? That is one of the options.

The President. Well, on the Tariq Aziz question, we normally give anybody a visa to come to the United Nations, and that has been our policy. However, I don't think it ought to be used for stonewalling or foot-dragging, and we have that under review.

On the second issue, I can only say what I said before: I think we have to be firm and resolute. At this moment, in my view, it would be a mistake to rule in or out any option.

Fast-Track Trade Legislation

Q. On fast track, Mr. President, what's wrong with leaving the policy as it is now—you negotiate the deal, let Congress tinker with it?

The President. First of all, the main thing that's wrong with it is that other countries aren't interested in negotiating with us this way. No other country has to face that. Every country recognizes that a nation's parliamentary body has the right to vote up or down on the action by the executive. But no one—these deals are very complicated to negotiate; there are always lots of different aspects to it. And you can't say, "Well, we're going to negotiate it and then subject it to a thousand amendments." Even within this framework there are ways to deal with major concerns.

But I asked Ambassador Barshefsky last night, I said, "Just tell me one more time, do you

really think we can negotiate seriously with any country without this authority?" And she said, "No. Unambiguously no."

Let me emphasize, however, something we have done in this. Because I think it's very important, and it's been completely lost in the debate. We have agreed to have congressional observer groups in every single trade negotiation the way we have congressional observer groups now on NATO expansion, the way we have a congressional observer group on the chemical weapons treaty. Any Member of Congress who has ever been on one of those observer groups will tell you that that dramatically increases the effective input of the Congress into the process on the front end. And we have agreed to very specific stages of involvement for the Congress here. And presumably, the observer group in the trade issues would be just like the observer group in NATO. It would include people who are strongly for what we are doing, people who are skeptical, people who may be opposed. All of them get their input.

You know, I took a number of the congressional observers with me to Madrid, to the NATO conference. I would expect that to be done on all these trade issues. So we have offered Congress, including those who have reservations about certain trade agreements, an unprecedented amount of input on the front end into this process.

I strongly support it, by the way. I think it is a good idea, but it ought to be recognized for what it is. The question that Congress should ask themselves is, are we going to have more or less influence over trade policy if this bill passes? Are we going to have more or less input in labor and environmental issues and more advance of that if this bill passes or if it fails? The answer is, more influence in other countries on labor and environmental issues, more input for Congress if the bill passes.

No fast-track legislation has ever proposed this before. I support it. My policy is to push the labor and environmental issues. My policy is to push congressional involvement. And my policy is to do more at home to help people who are dislocated from their jobs for whatever reason. But that is not an excuse to send a signal to the world that we just don't expect to do trade agreements anymore with other countries and we don't expect to be partners.

And other countries do not understand—what is America afraid of? No other country has 13½ million jobs in the last 5 years. No other country has a 4.7 percent unemployment rate, except for Japan, which has a different system, as you know. This country has outperformed every other country in the world, and the 220 trade agreements that we negotiated had a lot to do with that.

Our barriers are lower on average than virtually every other country in the world. We have more to gain from this economically. What they want is the sort of long-term, stable political relationships that will stabilize democracy and guarantee long-term economic growth for them and give them access to high-quality products. This is a no-brainer on the merits. This is clear on the merits. And it is in the interest of working people, and it is especially in the interest of working people who either have or want to get higher wage jobs, because they are the jobs that are created by the expansion of trade.

One of the reasons you've got these income figures going up now is not only that unemployment is low and therefore the labor markets are tighter but we are slowly changing the job mix in America because as we get into more trade, trade-related jobs pay higher wages. So this is clearly the right thing to do, and I'm determined to keep working until we convince a majority of the House of Representatives that it is.

Thank you.

Q. How close are you?

The President. Close.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Saddam Hussein and Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz of Iraq. A reporter referred to Richard Butler, Executive Chairman, United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) charged with dismantling Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Cyprus
November 7, 1997

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Chairman:)

In accordance with Public Law 95–384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous submission covered progress through May 31, 1997. The current submission covers the period June 1, 1997, through July 31, 1997.

The reporting period was marked by two important developments. The first was my appointment on June 4 of Ambassador Richard C. Holbrooke as the new Special Presidential Emissary for Cyprus. This appointment of one of our most capable negotiators demonstrates our commitment to help promote a final political settlement for Cyprus.

The second key development was U.N. Secretary General Annan's June 9 invitation to the leaders of the two communities in Cyprus, President Glafcos Clerides and Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash, to engage in direct talks under U.N. auspices. These were the first face-to-face meetings of the two leaders since October 1994. Two rounds of direct talks were held, the first from July 9 to July 13 in Troutbeck, New York (which is treated in this report), and the second from August 11 to August 15 in Switzerland (which will be covered in the next report). United Nations Special Advisor for Cyprus Cordovez noted that the cordial atmosphere between the parties at Troutbeck was a good beginning for subsequent negotiating sessions. A U.S. diplomatic effort for the U.N. settlement process was led by Ambassador Holbrooke, who met with Messrs. Clerides and Denktash before and after the talks.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 7, 1997

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Jesse Helms, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The letter referred to United Nations Special Advisor for Cyprus Diego Cordovez.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Agreement Establishing the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme With Documentation
November 7, 1997

To the Senate of the United States:

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

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

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

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

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

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 7, 1997.

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

November 7, 1997

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

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

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

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

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

The President's Radio Address

November 8, 1997

Good morning. This weekend the United States House of Representatives will decide whether America will continue to move forward with confidence on the road to continued prosperity or give in to fear and fail to seize all

the opportunities of the 21st century. There's a lot at stake.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks for listening.

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

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

November 8, 1997

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

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

Second, to deepen our understanding of why Gulf war veterans might have gotten sick, we will dedicate $13.2 million for new research on low-level exposure to chemical agents and other possible causes of illness.

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

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

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

Remarks at the Human Rights Campaign Dinner
November 8, 1997

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

Audience member. We love you, Bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

A little more than 6 years ago, I had this crazy idea that I ought to run for President. [*Laughter*] Only my mother thought I could win. [*Laughter*] And at the time, I was so obsessed with what I thought had to be done I thought winning would take care of itself. What bothered me was that our country seemed to be drifting and divided as we moved into a new and exciting and challenging area where we were living differently, working differently, relating to each other and the rest of the world in very different ways on the edge of a new century.

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

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

For more than two centuries now, our country has had to meet challenge after challenge after

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

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

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

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

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

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

For generations, the American dream has represented a fundamental compact among our people. If you take responsibility and work hard, you have the right to achieve a better life for yourself and a better future for your family. Equal opportunity for all, special privileges for none, a fate shared by Americans regardless of political views. We believe, or we all say we believe, that all citizens should have the chance to rise as far as their God-given talents will take them. What counts is energy and honesty and talent. No arbitrary distinctions should bar the way. So when we deny opportunity because of ancestry or religion, race or gender, disability or sexual orientation, we break the compact. It is wrong, and it should be illegal.

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

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

Audience member. People with AIDS are dying!

Audience members. Sit down!

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

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

Audience member. [*Inaudible*]

Audience members. Boo-o-o!

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

Now, I want to ask you for a favor. You want us to pass the "Employment Non-Discrimination

Act." You know when we do—and I believe it will pass—you know when we do it will have to be enforced. A law on the books only works if it is also a law in the life of America.

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

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

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

Audience members. We love you, Bill!

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

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

When I say I believe all Americans means all Americans, I see the faces of the friends of 35 years. When I say all Americans means all Americans, I see the faces of the people who stood up when I asked the people who are part of our administration to stand tonight. When I say all Americans means all Americans, I see kind, unbelievably generous, giving people back in my home State who helped my family and my friends when they were in need. It is a different story when you know what you are seeing.

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

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

Thank you, and God bless you.

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

Interview With Tim Russert of "Meet the Press"

November 9, 1997

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

The President. Glad to be here, Tim.

Situation in Iraq

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

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

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

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

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

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

So what they're doing is terribly important. And he needs to let them go back and do their job. None of us are going to be bullied by him.

Mr. Russert. Have you ever met him?

The President. Never.

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

The President. No.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The President. That may be. He may be trying to divide the coalition as well, with the promise that he'll sell oil at good prices and make money for other countries. But so far, I have to tell you, I've been impressed with the unity of the world community. I think that he picked a peculiar way to try to divide the coalition. He seems

to be frustrated that the sanctions haven't been lifted. But all he has to do is to allow the inspectors to do their job and quit trying to stockpile the ability to make these weapons of mass destruction. That's all he's got to do.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Russert. And he will comply eventually?

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

China and Cuba

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

The President. Oh, yes, I think there are plainly some. For one thing, the Chinese have shown a willingness to not only engage us but to open up and to work with us. Of course, we have differences with both China and Cuba on human rights and on their political system.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fast-Track Trade Legislation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The President. No.

Mr. Russert. Not at all?

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

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

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

Taxes

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

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

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

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

Combating Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation

Mr. Russert. Let me turn to a cultural issue. Tonight you will be attending a gay rights dinner, the first sitting President in the history of the country to do so. What statement are you trying to make?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

My experience in life—all I can tell you is what my experience is—and I'm not talking about as President, I'm talking about as a citizen

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

Administration Accomplishments

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

And let me show it to you on the screen and I'm going to read from there: protecting Medicare and education, 30 percent; improving economy and creating jobs, 23; keeping the U.S. at peace, 13; balancing the budget, 13. Would you agree with that list?

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

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

Stock Market

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

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

Ethics/Social Security and Medicare

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

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

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

Mr. Russert. About $3 million.

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

Now, however, I generally disagree with that. I think that this administration, when the history books are written and people look back at it, the public will have a very different opinion when they read the history about the ethical performance of this administration. In the moment, once you're accused and hearings are held, a certain percentage will think that you must have done something wrong personally or

tolerated people doing something wrong, and I don't believe that's the case.

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

Campaign Financing

Mr. Russert. Let me get to Social Security in one second, but ask a followup on the campaign finance. People like Johnny Chung, Charlie Trie, John Huang have become household names in many ways. Do you think that they should come back to the United States and not take the fifth amendment and voluntarily tell you and the country everything they know so we can be certain, and particularly you as Commander in Chief, that our national security was not compromised?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

elevate the level of the debate in a way that I think would increase voter turnout and confidence in the system.

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

1996 Campaign

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

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

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

Democratic Party

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

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

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

Mr. Russert. Fair enough.

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

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

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

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

Medicare and Social Security

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

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

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

Mr. Russert. Many believe that Richard Nixon went to China—he was the fervent anti-Communist who could make that deal. It's going to take Democrat Bill Clinton to really make

tough decisions and say, "We have to raise retirement age. We have to raise premiums. We have to reduce benefits for the next generation." Are you willing to do that?

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

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

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

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

Investigations

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

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

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

The President and the Press

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I think it's one of the best things about this country. And how it should be done and whether it's being done in the most responsible and effective way can only be determined by members of the press themselves in our system, because that's the only way you can keep it free.

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

President's Place in History

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

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

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

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

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

President's Future Plans

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

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

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

The President. I don't think so.

Mr. Russert. How about the Supreme Court?

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

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

The President. He did.

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

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

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

Mr. Russert. But you might run for office?

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

Popular Perception of the President

Mr. Russert. Let me show one last graphic up here, and this is a fun one. We asked, what is the image you have of Bill Clinton? Forty-two percent said playing the saxophone; 40 percent, running in jogging shorts; 7 percent, playing golf; 6 percent, eating at McDonald's.

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

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

The President. One now.

Mr. Russert. One mulligan?

The President. Yes.

Mr. Russert. And what's your handicap?

The President. Twelve, thirteen, something like that. I'm playing—it's better than it was

when I became President, mostly because I've gotten to play with a lot of good golfers, and they've taught me a lot.

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

[*Following a commercial break, a videotape of highlights from the first 50 years of "Meet the Press" was shown.*]

Running for the Presidency

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

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

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

The President. What did I say?

[*The following videotape excerpt of the May 1991 broadcast was shown:*

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

"Governor Clinton. No.

"Q. Not a chance but a good chance.

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

The President. That's a good brief answer.

Mr. Russert. You won.

The President. I did.

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

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

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

The President. Oh, no.

Mr. Russert. You really thought you could win?

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

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

The President. Great.

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

The President. Thank you.

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

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

Mr. Russert. Oh, no.

The President. The new book on the Buffalo Bills.

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

The President. Signed by the author.

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

The President. You'll still look very young.

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

The President. Thank you.

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

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Major Narcotics Producing and Transit Countries

November 9, 1997

Dear Mr. Chairman: (Dear Ranking Member:)

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

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

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

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

Turkey and other Balkan Route Countries. Although I remain concerned over the large volume of Southwest Asian heroin moving through Turkey and neighboring countries to Western Europe along the Balkan Route, there is no clear evidence that this heroin significantly affects the United States—as required for a country to be designated a major transit country. In the event that I determine that heroin transiting Turkey, Bulgaria, Greece, the former Republic of Yugoslavia, Bosnia, Croatia, the Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia, or other European countries on the Balkan Route significantly affects the United States, I will add the relevant countries to the majors list.

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

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

Major Cannabis Producers. While Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, the Philippines, and South Africa are important cannabis producers, they do not appear on this list since I have determined, pursuant to FAA section 481(e)(2), that

in all cases the illicit cannabis is either consumed locally or exported to countries other than the United States, and thus such illicit cannabis production does not significantly affect the United States.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

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

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

November 10, 1997

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

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

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

Had we been able to resolve that, I think we could have gotten enough votes on the Republican side to go with the Democrats' votes we had to pass the bill. Clearly, I think we could have. But we simply were not able to do that. And I say that without undue criticism of anyone. The people who took the position that they could not give their votes to the fast-track legislation believe very deeply in principle that we should change our family planning funding. I, on the other hand, believe that it would have been wrong for me to mix the two issues and to compromise what I believe in principle. And in the end, this matter could not go forward because of that disagreement.

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

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

basis will lower barriers more in other countries than they will in our country.

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

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

Situation in Iraq

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

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

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

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

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

Fast-Track Trade Authority

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

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

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

What I think we have to do is try to let the temperature go down here and unpack this and go back to what is actually at stake. The Democratic Party, insofar as it is saying that we ought to inject labor issues and environmental issues into our international negotiations

as part of our strategy to expand trade and economic partnerships, that is a positive thing. We can disagree about how we should do that, but I think that's a positive contribution of our party.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q. When? In the spring?

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

Opening Remarks at the White House Conference on Hate Crimes
November 10, 1997

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The second thing we have to do is to make sure our civil rights laws are consistently and vigorously enforced. Under Attorney General Reno's leadership, the Justice Department has taken aim at hate crimes with more prosecutions and tougher punishments. Starting today, every United States attorney in our country will establish or expand working groups to develop enforcement strategies, share best practices, and

educate the public about hate crimes. This national hate crimes network will marshal the resources of Federal, State, and local enforcement, community groups, educators, antiviolence advocates to give us another powerful tool in the struggle against hate crimes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So as important as it is to enforce the law, to punish people, to do all this—all this is very

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

Thank you.

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

Remarks During the White House Conference on Hate Crimes
November 10, 1997

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

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

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

Let me ask you all something. We've heard from people who work in enforcement, whether it's an attorney general or a police chief. We've heard from people who work in writing the laws. We've heard from an educator who's trying to systematically keep these things from happening in the first place and deal with it. We've heard from a minister who has given his whole life dealing with these matters. We've heard from a remarkable citizen here who changed the whole psychology of a community. We've heard from a young man who had an opportunity to have a remarkable experience, and he made, I thought, a very interesting point, which he deftly went by, but I don't think we should miss it. He said that he went to a very diverse school where there was a lot of continuing social segregation. And he had an opportunity to escape that on his project where he went to Israel.

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

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

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

Anyway, I ask you that to make this point—I announced a series of measures that we would take in my opening remarks, but you're in all these things. What advice do you have for me, for the Attorney General, for the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Agriculture—who deals, interestingly enough, with some important aspects of this—and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation—I think I've mentioned them all—and the Members of Congress; what is the most important thing the Nation can do through the National Government? What should we be focusing on? If you could give me advice—you've

been very good to talk about your own experience and what you're trying to do—if you could give me advice in a sentence about what you think we ought to do to move the ball down the road to help deal with this, what advice would you give us? What advice would you give to Senator Kennedy and the House Members that are here? What should we be doing at the national level?

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

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

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

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

The President. Anybody else want to answer that question?

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

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

[*Raymond Delos Reyes, student at Franklin High School, Seattle, WA, noted that outside the classroom, students tended to associate with people of their own race. He then suggested that this issue should be addressed by group rather than individual efforts.*]

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

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

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

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

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

[*Tammie Schnitzer, of the Billings, MT, Coalition for Human Rights Foundation, responded that the attitudes of not only children but of adults, institutions, and the media need to be*

changed. Police Chief Arturo Venegas of Sacramento, CA, stated that leaders must present a united front and that recent progress should not be taken for granted. Rev. Samuel Billy Kyles, pastor of the Monumental Baptist Church, Memphis, TN, praised efforts of the religious community and the President's visit to a rebuilt Tennessee church for focusing attention on the problem of church burnings. Ms. Kuehl emphasized that legislation concerning hate crimes should not exclude hatred based on sexual orientation or gender.]

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

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

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

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

The President. Thank you.

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

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

The President. Thank you very much.

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

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

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

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

November 10, 1997

Thank you very much. Please be seated. Welcome to the White House. To Ken and to his daughters; Dayton Duncan and his family; Harry Pierce, the vice chair of GM; Elizabeth Campbell, founder of WETA; Michael Jandreau, the chairman of the Lower Brule Sioux tribe; and of course, a special word of welcome to Stephen Ambrose, whose magnificent book inspired this

great film that Ken has done. To all the historians and actors who brought this story to life, you're all welcome here.

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

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

Over dinner, Jefferson tutored his protege in geography and the natural sciences, broadening his horizons so that Lewis and Clark eventually could broaden the Nation's. It's not hard to see why Ken Burns embraced the Lewis and Clark story. The journey of learning he embarks on with each new subject is really quite like Lewis' journey of discovery.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Remarks at a Veterans Day Ceremony in Arlington, Virginia
November 11, 1997

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

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

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

In this century alone, more than 142,000 Americans were held in prison camps or interned; 17,000 died during the ordeal. The many ex-POW's here today know better than anyone the precious value of freedom because they have paid the price of losing their freedom. Let us never forget their very special sacrifice. And let us never waver for a moment in our common efforts to make a full accounting for all our MIA's.

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

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

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

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

And in the Persian Gulf, our pilots are patrolling the no-fly zones in Iraq, making it clear to Saddam Hussein that another move against

Kuwait or Saudi Arabia would be a big mistake and helping to enforce the international community's sanctions against Iraq. Saddam's efforts to rebuild his weapons of mass destruction and his interference with the United Nations inspectors who are keeping him from doing so are unacceptable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Remarks at a Memorial Service for Representative Walter H. Capps
November 12, 1997

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

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

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

I say this to make a point you have already heard from every previous speaker. The things I taught him were superficial things; the things that he taught us were deep and enduring things. And he seemed to naturally be upbeat, harmonious, uniting. I try to do that, but some days it's a real effort for me. I think it came out of the depths of his soul. I think he was at ease with the consequences of whatever could happen to him. Most people in politics are full of anxiety with the consequences of whatever could happen to them.

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

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

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

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

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

That will be his great and enduring gift, not only to us but to the United States.

May God bless his memory and his family.

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

Statement on the United Nations Security Council Resolution on Iraq
November 12, 1997

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

Message to the Congress on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction
November 12, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

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

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

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

Chemical and Biological Weapons

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

Chemical weapons continue to pose a very serious threat to our security and that of countries friendly to us. On April 29, 1997, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (the "Chemical Weapons Convention" or (CWC)) entered into force with 87 of the CWC's 165 signatories as original States Parties. The United States was among their number, having deposited its instrument of ratification on April 25. As of November 5, 104 countries had become States Parties.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The United States also continues to play a leading role in the international effort to reduce the threat from biological weapons. We are an active participant in the Ad Hoc Group striving to create a legally binding protocol to strengthen and enhance compliance with the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (the "Biological Weapons Convention" or (BWC)). This Ad Hoc Group was mandated by the September 1994 BWC Special Conference. The Fourth BWC Review Conference, held in November 1996, commended the work done by the Ad Hoc Group and urged it to complete

the protocol as soon as possible but not later than the next Review Conference to be held in 2001. A draft rolling text was introduced by the Chairman at the July Ad Hoc Group session. Work is progressing on insertion of national views and clarification of existing text, largely drawn from the consultative phase of Ad Hoc Group work since 1994. Three-week sessions are scheduled for January, July, and September of 1998. Another 2-week session will be scheduled for either March or December of 1998. Early completion of an effective BWC protocol is high on our list of nonproliferation goals.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Missiles for Weapons of Mass Destruction Delivery

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

During this reporting period, MTCR Partners continued to share information about proliferation problems with each other and with other potential supplier, consumer, and transshipment states. Partners also emphasized the need for

implementing effective export control systems. This cooperation has resulted in the interdiction of missile-related materials intended for use in missile programs of concern.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nuclear Weapons

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

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

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

Formal preparations for the year 2000 Review Conference for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) began in 1997 with the first of three annual Preparatory Committee meetings of the Parties to the Treaty. The United States is committed to working to ensure that the 2000 NPT review Conference will further strengthen the NPT and reinforce global nuclear nonproliferation objectives. Since the 1995 NPT Conference, eight additional states have joined the NPT, leaving only five states worldwide currently outside the NPT regime. The NPT Exporters (Zangger) Committee added China to its membership in 1997.

The Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) continued its efforts to upgrade control lists and export control procedures. NSG members confirmed

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

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

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

Expenses

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 12, 1997.

NOTE: The notice is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks at a Democratic Governors' Association Reception
November 12, 1997

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

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

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

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

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

When I came to Washington, I would read editorials from the prominent newspapers saying that if you cared about the deficit and crime

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

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

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

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

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

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

You can put more money into education, but the Governors have to decide how it's going to be spent. We won a huge battle, which we're going to be really highlighting in the next couple of days when we sign the appropriations bills, to get the Congress, after months and months of contentious fighting, to embrace the notion that we ought to have national standards of academic excellence and national exams in reading and math for elementary students and eighth graders. But what happens afterwards? Education is the primary province of the States. The Federal Government can facilitate national excellence in education; the Governors have to ensure it.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner

November 12, 1997

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

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

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

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

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

All these eulogies today were talking about how Walter Capps was always in a good humor and always basically felt relaxed and at peace and was so unpolitical in the Washington sense of the term, and also, that even though he was in his early sixties, how utterly completely devoid of any kind of cynicism he was, which I think is an admirable thing.

Well, anyway, I got myself in the right frame of mind. And then right before I left to start my rounds this evening, I spent an hour and a half with my political director, Craig Smith, who is here with me, and we sat around a

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

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

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

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

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

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

I doubt very seriously that it would have had the Medicare reforms we had and the Medicaid reforms we had. The American Diabetes Association said that the diabetes changes were the most important things since the discovery of insulin 70 years ago. We added 12 years to the Medicare Trust Fund and covered more women for mammographies; did a lot more work in testing prostate cancer, which is I think the most underresearched and undertreated major form of cancer in America today, now, now that we've more than doubled the efforts that we're making in breast cancer. And I'm very grateful for that, and the country will be stronger because of it.

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

And we're heading into Thanksgiving with—tomorrow, I believe, I'm going to sign the appropriations bill which finally, finally secures a victory I've been working for since the State of the Union; Congress has agreed to let us proceed to establish national academic standards, not Federal Government standards but national academic standards, and have voluntary tests in reading and mathematics for the fourth and the eighth grades. So I'm very, very happy about that. They also fund our America Reads

program, which is now in 800 colleges around America. We have tens of thousands of college kids going out into schools every single week now, more than once a week, teaching young people to read. So it's a good thing, and I feel very good about it.

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

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

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

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

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

One of the reasons we had as much trouble with the fast track as we did—and I still believe we'll succeed in getting some fast-track authority in this Congress—but one of the reasons we had the trouble we did is that people feel—you know, it might have nothing to do with trade—they pick up the paper 3 days before the vote and see that Levi Strauss is laying 10,000 people off. And then today they see Eastman Kodak is laying 10,000 people off. And one man in Louisiana who said, "I'm an ardent free trader," had to deal with the fact that one company laid 2,400 people off in his congressional district right before he got ready to vote on this.

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

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

of excellence at critical points than sometimes it does today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And we have been able to do that in no small measure because there was a core of people in our party—not just in the Congress but among the Governors and mayors—who believed that we could be faithful to our values and still embrace new policies for the new

times, and that it would work. And I don't think anyone can seriously argue that we're not better off today than we were 5 years ago. And you'd have to be pretty disingenuous to say that the policies of our administration had nothing to do with it. So I feel good about it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

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

November 13, 1997

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

First, we are taking historic steps to make sure that every child in America can meet the high national standards of academic achievement that the Israels spoke about so that every children can master the basics. This bill represents a genuine breakthrough in what is now quite a long effort by many people to achieve national academic standards in the United States. For the first time, we will have workable and generally agreed-upon standards in math and reading. And for the very first time, Congress has voted to support the development of voluntary national tests to measure performance in fourth grade reading and eighth grade math. The tests will be created by an independent, bipartisan organization and will be piloted in schools next October.

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

This legislation also takes concrete steps to help our children meet the standards and, indeed, to achieve all our national education goals. It will help every 8-year-old in America read on his or her own by funding the America Reads challenge and expanding national service so that our AmeriCorps members can recruit trained literacy tutors for our schools. Already, over 800 colleges and universities and numerous other organizations are providing tens of thousands of volunteer tutors that are going into our schools

every week to help make sure our children can read. We can give our children the extra attention and practice they need so that we can assure that they'll be able to read independently by the end of the third grade if we continue to pursue this.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope now we will use this momentum in education to take some new steps, to pass finally a "GI bill" for America's workers that would enable us to give a certificate to any American who needs it to take to the nearest educational institution to learn new skills to reenter the

workplace, and to meet the quiet crisis of crumbling and crowded school buildings across America. We have more children in our schools than at any time in our history, with serious overcrowding problems and serious building deterioration problems, which I believe we should help to address.

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

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:29 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to fifth grade student Philip Israel, who introduced the President, and his mother, Tina; Kikuyu Shaw, a junior at Howard University; and Norma Udall, wife of former Representative Morris K. Udall. H.R. 2264, approved November 13, was assigned Public Law No. 105–78.

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

November 13, 1997

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

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

The Act provides $29.6 billion for the Department of Education, which will allow us to prepare tomorrow's leaders for the challenges of the future. I am very pleased to see such strong support for Education programs by the Congress, support I hope will only grow stronger in the coming years. First, I am pleased that the Congress has voted to fund the development of voluntary national tests linked to high academic standards in reading and math. I am also

very pleased that the Act increases the maximum Pell grant award to my request of $3,000. This increase, in conjunction with a $1.4 billion increase in funding, will ease the burden of increasing college costs for low- and middle-income families. Finally, I am very pleased that the Act nearly doubles the Federal investment in educational technology and funds 500 new Charter Schools. I am concerned, however, about the inadequate funding provided for my America Reads Challenge literacy initiative in FY 1998. I am committed to working with the Congress to enact authorizing legislation for a child literacy initiative that will use the $210 million contingently provided in the bill for FY 1999.

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

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 13, 1997.

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

Statement on Congressional Action on Adoption Legislation

November 13, 1997

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

This legislation makes clear that children's health and safety are the paramount concerns of the public child welfare system. I am particularly pleased that the bill incorporates my administration's recommendations to provide States with financial incentives to increase the number of children who are adopted and to make other changes in Federal law that will make adoption easier and move children more rapidly out of foster care and into permanent homes. The legislation also strengthens support to States for services that help families stay together when that is possible and promote adoption when it is not. Most important, this legislation will help us meet the goal of doubling, by the year 2002, the number of children who are adopted or permanently placed each year.

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

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

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

November 13, 1997

To the House of Representatives:

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

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

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

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 13, 1997.

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

November 13, 1997

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

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

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

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

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

November 14, 1997

Iraq

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

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

The world has got to understand that he had a weapons of mass destruction program, that

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

President Clinton. Buenos dias.

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

President Clinton. I'm fine, thank you.

Mexico-U.S. Cooperative Drug Efforts

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

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

I do believe that, as least for our administration, we have been very clear that the reduction of demand and dealing with the infrastructure

of drugs in the United States has to be a key part of our strategy, and we intend to implement that. I think the real issue, what we should be focusing on is how we can work together in our mutual interest, because drugs present a threat both to the United States and to Mexico.

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

Fast-Track Trade Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

But I also have made it clear to Congress that I think they're two separate issues.

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

Mexican Economy and Democracy

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

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

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

That's the most important thing, is to have a good economy for ordinary people.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—economy? In Mexico?

President Clinton. Where?

Q. In Mexico or the developing economies?

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

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

Q. You don't see any obstacles——

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

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

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

November 14, 1997

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

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

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

Last May in Mexico, President Zedillo and I pledged to work together for a hemispherewide agreement to curb the illegal arms trade. I thank President Zedillo for Mexico's leadership. Mr. Secretary General, I thank you and the OAS member states for concluding this agreement in record time. We understand the magnitude of the problem. In the last year alone, thousands of handguns and rifles, hundreds of thousands of rounds of ammunition destined for illegal export have been seized in our nations.

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

This convention will neither discourage nor diminish the lawful sale, ownership, or use of

guns, but it will help us to fight the unlawful trade in guns that contributes to the violence associated here in America with drugs and gangs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Declaration of President Clinton and President Zedillo
November 14, 1997

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

Since our meeting six months ago:

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

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

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

- We have agreed on appropriate procedures at the border and inside the US for the orderly and safe repatriation of Mexican nationals with full regard for their dignity and human rights and the principle of family unity.
- We have enhanced the capacities of the eight liaison mechanisms at border cities to promote protection of migrants and safety along our common border.
- We have taken actions between Mexican Consuls and Immigration and Naturalization Service Directors to improve consular protection in pursuance of the agreements signed by both governments.
- We agreed to a new cooperative agenda which will explore and respond to the linkage between migration and development in both countries.
- We instructed our officials to work with the conclusions of our binational study on migration to involve communities on both sides of the border in a consultative process designed to produce innovative approaches to common challenges and opportunities for development to our mutual benefit, and to report back to us within a year.
- Finally, we call on the academic communities of both countries to join us in this effort.

On *the border,* we will continue to work toward a new vision of cooperation in this dynamic and challenging region, in order to make it safer, more promising for families and communities

and enriching for both countries. Through the identification of model-projects in the areas of public safety, environmental protection, urban infrastructure, and cultural life, we endeavor to promote economic, social, and cultural development for the benefit of our communities. Among others, we welcomed projects such as the one currently taking place in the San Diego/Tijuana area for the comprehensive management of solid waste; and initiatives for the facilitation of border crossings, like the upcoming construction of the Rio Grande bridge at Eagle Pass/Piedras Negras.

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

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

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

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

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

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

On *environment,* we confirmed agreement to promote sustainable development in the border area and to seek the support of our border communities and the private sector in reaching the goals of Border XXI. We also confirmed agreement on indicators to assess and advance progress on water, solid and hazardous waste, air and natural resources along the border. We welcomed steps taken by the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission (BECC) and by the North American Development Bank (NADBank) to address the need for new wastewater treatment facilities in Tijuana and Ciudad Juarez.

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

of common but differentiated responsibility. We have instructed our representatives to consult closely on this issue as we approach the Kyoto conference.

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

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

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

Remarks on the Situation in Iraq
November 14, 1997

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

Statement on Congressional Action on Immigration Legislation
November 14, 1997

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

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

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

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

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

Statement on Signing the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998
November 14, 1997

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

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

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

the low level of funding for these agencies that provide important cultural, education, and artistic programs for communities across America.

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

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

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

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

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

The Congress also continues to interfere with the Administration's efforts to promote ecosystem management and a greater understanding of the natural resource management issues affecting areas like the interior Columbia River Basin—an area characterized by forest health, watershed, and endangered species problems. Cumbersome requirements to delay a science-based plan for the Basin could potentially shut

down every forest in that region, hurting communities and families dependent on these forests for their livelihood. This action may benefit a few special interests, but it injures both the environment and the economy.

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

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

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

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

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

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 14, 1997.

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

Remarks to the Women's Leadership Forum in Las Vegas, Nevada
November 14, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you all for being here, for being in such a good humor. [*Laughter*] You know why they're sitting down now? Because they think I'm going to talk a lot longer than previous speakers. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Senator Reid and Senator Bryan and Governor Miller for being here, for their service, and for their remarkable friendship to me. I'd like to thank the national chair of the Women's Leadership Forum, Cynthia Friedman, who is also up here on the stage with

us. And we have other people here from the national Democratic Party—I see Carol Pensky out there—I thank all of them. But I want to say a special word of thanks to Shelly Berkeley and to Cassandra Williams, and to you, Mayor Jones, all of you who made this night possible.

This is an event sponsored by the Women's Leadership Forum, but I see there are a few lucky men out here in the audience—[*laughter*]—and I thank you for showing up, too. I'd be lonely if you weren't here.

I got tickled when the mayor was telling that story about my mother, which is a true story. That's not one of those things you make up because it sounds good on the podium. My mother spent the last weekend of her life in Las Vegas. [*Laughter*] And she had been quite ill for a long time. And the night she passed away she called me, and we had a long and perfectly normal conversation. And I thought to myself that in her own mind she got to go to heaven 4 days early. She looked at it that way. [*Laughter*] So whenever I land at the airport here, I always imagine that my mother is landing with me because she loved to come here so much and had so many friends here.

Let me say very briefly to all of you, this is a very exciting, interesting, and good time for America. Congress just went home. We had a very good year. We passed an historic balanced budget agreement. It had the largest investment for children's health that your National Government has made since 1965. It has a huge effort to improve research and care in the area of diabetes, an illness that affects 16 million Americans. The diabetes foundation said it's the most important thing done in diabetes since the discovery of insulin 70 years ago.

It has a major, major investment, the largest investment in education since 1965, everything from more Pell grants to more work-study positions to more funds to put computers in every classroom in this country by the year 2000. It, for the first time, puts us on record as favoring national academic standards and a voluntary testing system to see how all our children are doing. This was a great budget, and it is going to make a huge difference in America. Yesterday I signed the last big piece of it, dealing with the health care and the education initiatives.

The Senate ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention that will make all of you young people here and your children less likely to be exposed to deadly chemicals from terrorists and organized criminals, a terribly important thing.

The Congress passed landmark reform of the Food and Drug Administration which will enable us to continue to test medicines to make sure they're safe for the American people but will move them to the market a lot quicker, so that people who have serious illnesses in America and want to know they're going to get access to the medicine that's the best in the world as quickly as possible will know that we're doing the best job in the world of both protecting their safety and getting them medicines that can save their lives. This is a huge issue.

The Senate and the House passed a landmark reform of our adoption system in America to give massive new incentives and speed up the system by which families can adopt children, which is a terribly important issue. Just last year we passed a $5,000 adoption tax credit, and in a few days, when Hillary comes home from her trip—she worked hard on this—we're going to have a nice little signing ceremony and describe to the world what this adoption initiative does. But it is very important, and I'm proud of it, and every woman in America should be proud of it.

So this was a good year, a historic year. And it was another step along the way in trying to implement the vision that I ran for President 6 years ago to try to implement, one that, thank goodness, has received the support of a substantial majority of America's women and has helped us to build a party for the future.

But it's pretty simple. I know that we are moving into a very different time. We are dramatically changing the basis of economic activity. We are seeing dramatic changes in the way people live as well as the way they work and the way we relate to each other. Our own country is changing dramatically; we're getting more and more diverse in every conceivable way but especially in racial and ethnic and religious terms. The way we relate to the world is different. We are the world's strongest military power and have the world's strongest economy, but we are still only 4 percent of the world's population, with about 20 percent of its income, so that increasingly our ability to succeed in ensuring our own future depends on our willingness to get involved in issues beyond our border and our willingness to recognize that we are interdependent with others and that we have to work in partnership with others.

What are the big security problems of the future? Terrorism, weapons of mass destruction proliferation, organized crime, international drug dealing, international environmental crises, the spread of new diseases across national borders—none of these can be dealt with unless we're willing to work as partners. We can lead, but we have to lead in a world increasingly interdependent.

In Bosnia, we are there with soldiers from more than two dozen other countries, including Russian soldiers, working side by side. That is a metaphor for what we'll have to do in the future.

And what I want to do is to have an America in which every person, without regard to his or her circumstances in life, has a chance to live out his or her dreams if they're responsible enough to work for it and to be a good citizen; a country in which we're coming together, instead of being driven apart as so many other societies are; and a nation still strong enough to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity. We've been working at it for 6 years now.

The economy is stronger; we have the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years; we have the lowest inflation rate in 30 years. We had another big drop in the crime rate last year. The murder rate in America has dropped 22 percent in just 3 years, 10 percent last year alone. We've had the biggest drop in welfare rolls in the country's history. And even though we've had two decades of immigration, lots and lots of poor people coming to our shores to work and find their way, we have the smallest percentage of our population on welfare in almost 30 years. This country is working again. We're coming together; we're moving into the future again.

And I guess what I want to say to all of you, since you invested in this to come here, is you've got to do a better job of telling people that this did not happen by accident. When I started running for President, with my rather earthy friend James Carville from Louisiana helping me—[*laughter*]—a brilliant young man by the name of—James is from Louisiana; Paul Begala, his partner, was from Texas; and I was from Arkansas. And a brilliant young man by the name of Gene Sperling who is now my national economic counselor, from Michigan, came to work for us. And he called his mother after working for us for about a week, and he said, "Mom, if I'm going to survive down here with all these guys from the South, I'm going to have to learn a lot more animal stories"—[*laughter*]—because we would all say things like our opponents were squealing like a pig under a gate—[*laughter*]—or you never know how far a frog will jump till you punch it. [*Laughter*] But one of the things I was taught as a child is that if you see a turtle on a fencepost, the chances are it didn't get there by accident. [*Laughter*]

And so, all these things that are going on in America didn't just happen. We had a different political philosophy—not different values for the Democratic Party, the same values—but we believed we needed a new politics for a new era.

And I must say, I've been deeply grateful for the support of both your Senators and your Governor in every critical step along the way, because it was basically what people were doing as mayors and Governors and State legislators throughout America anyway.

But I thought, on the economy, we had to bring down the deficit and invest more in education and our future. I thought we had to trade more around the world. I don't believe it's right to say we can walk away from the obligation to sell more American products around the world. This is not rocket science. If you're 4 percent of the world's population and you have 20 percent of the income and you'd like to keep it, you've got to sell something to the other 96 percent. If your markets are open and other people's markets are closed, in order to make a trade agreement with them, you have to lower your trade barriers a little bit so they'll lower theirs a lot. That's probably a pretty good deal.

On the other hand, we can't afford to say that's all we're interested in because the economy is churning so much today, most people who are dislocated from work lose their jobs because of technological changes that will occur in every country whether there's more trade or not. But because we're Democrats, we have an obligation to worry about those people, to give people a better, quicker, more comprehensive system if they are dislocated from their jobs for whatever reason to move back into the work force more quickly, and to contribute with us to our future.

I believe on welfare we should require people to go to work, but we ought to recognize that their most important work, like everybody else's, is raising their children. So when they said in

the other party, "Oh, by the way, we want to require people to go to work and take away from the children the fundamental right of nutrition and the fundamental right of health care, and by the way, we don't want to come up with any more money for child care," I vetoed the bill twice, because I thought it was wrong. Now, but once we got it right, I changed. I signed the bill because it was consistent with what we've been working on for 3 years. But a lot of people don't get it. I still read in the paper, some journalist will say, "The President signed the Republicans' welfare bill." Bull! [*Laughter*] What planet were they—it's like in Washington, it's amazing, if an issue has a certain label on it, a lot of people in old-think say, "Well, that label belongs to one party." The Democrats weren't supposed to be interested in crime and welfare and growing the economy. Don't be involved in people's lives. How many elections will you win?

In crime, I read the other day that someone said, "Well, some people in the House of Representatives were mad at the President for adopting a Republican position on crime." I said, hello—[*laughter*]—what planet was this person on? In 1994 the Democrats, over the bitterest, fiercest opposition of the Republican leaders and a bitter attempt in a last-ditch filibuster in the United States Senate by my distinguished opponent in the last election, passed a crime bill that they were against and we were for. It put 100,000 police on the street and took assault weapons off the street. And I think it was right.

We were for the Brady bill; their leadership was against it. And it played a role—65,000 police officers in 3 years have been approved under the crime bill to be put out on the streets. And if you go to any community in the country where the crime rate is coming down, they'll tell you the central reason is there has been a change in the philosophy of policing in this country, to get kids and keep them out of trouble in the first place, to walk the blocks and to build ties to neighbors, and to catch people when they do commit crimes more quickly. And that, plus the generally improving circumstances in America, is plummeting the crime rate in this country. And that is a good thing. But it did not happen by accident.

I say that because we need people to understand that we still have big challenges out there. And we need the support, and we need to build an infrastructure of Americans who understand that the politics of this country have changed.

In the environment, 1995, one of the most troubling things about the new Republican majority in Congress was their contract on America said the only way we could have a good America is to grow the economy and forget about the environment: "We're going to break down all these terrible regulations for clean air and clean water, and it's just choking business." And I said, "Well, if we Democrats were trying to choke business by cleaning the air, cleaning the water, and cleaning up the toxic waste, we've done a sorry job because we've had more new businesses start in every year since I've been President than in any year in American history." So we're not very good at killing business with environmental regulation. We're not very good at that.

We believe you have to protect the environment and grow the economy. Shelly had that little passing line about the nuclear waste disposal—I thought you'd never mention it. [*Laughter*] I hope that everyone in Nevada remembers that there's been pretty much of a partisan divide on that, too, although some of our Democrats have strayed over to the other side. But that's just because it's a big problem in their States, and they want to dump it somewhere, and they've never been here. [*Laughter*]

My position has never been to come here and pander to you; it's just to tell the truth. This is a serious issue, and we should not make a decision to do this anywhere until we're sure that it is safe and we're absolutely certain that our predecessors didn't pick a site for political reasons, because you don't have many electoral votes. That's all I've ever said.

And I can honestly say that neither of your Senators nor your Governor ever asked me to promise that under no circumstances ever would I say that I didn't care what the evidence was, I would never think about this. All they said was, "Make sure that we're doing the right thing by our children and make sure that we haven't been singled out because we're a big State with still a fairly small population and not many electoral votes." That's all they asked. And that was the right thing to do. I thought it was right then; I think it's right now. And I appreciated it.

Again let me say, the reason this is important is not so Shelly can win an election—I'm not

running anymore, so I can say all this—[*laughter*]—this is not just about an election for Congress; it's about how you're going to live.

We still have a lot of other issues. Let me just give you some issues that I think would be quite important to you. We still have to pass through Congress legislation which implements our initiative to reduce teenage smoking in America and saves lives. It's going to be a huge thing, and we have to do it in a way that improves the public health and protects our children. That's a big issue for next year.

Next year—a couple years ago we passed a bill that stopped insurance companies from kicking women out of the hospital in 48 hours after they had had a baby, whether they were ready to leave or not. And we now find that a lot of the same things are happening with mastectomies, when the women are leaving, and I think we ought to have the same standard for that. I think that's an important thing.

But in a larger sense, we believe strongly that there ought to be a patients' bill of rights for quality health care that doctors and patients have worked on. And if we're going to have more managed care and we're going to have more HMO's, people have the right to know that—that's a good thing if somebody is taking your health care money and making it go as far as possible so we don't have inflation, as long as you're not giving up quality.

Now, right before this Congress broke up, there was huge news back East about how the leaders of the other party had called the health insurance companies and others and told them to get up off their backsides and go to work to kill our attempts to protect the quality of health care for patients in this country. That's a big issue. That is a choice.

I believe we can moderate health care costs and guarantee quality. I believe it is part of the Nation's responsibility to do that. If you believe that, in 1997 terms that makes you a Democrat, because that's our party's position. And that is not their position.

You have got to help us go out and clarify these choices for people. We passed that economic program in 1993. They told me, the people in the other party said I was going to bankrupt the country; we'd increase the deficit; and the economy would go into the tank. Well, that's what they said. They actually won a congressional race partly on that, that and telling everybody we were going to take their guns away and all the stuff they said in '94.

Well, sooner or later, people should be held accountable. Are our ideas right? Were they implemented? Have they made a difference? Were their ideas right? Were they implemented? Have they made a difference? I've done everything I could to work in a responsible, bipartisan way, but where there are still clear differences, I think the evidence is, we were right.

Today I took action again to try to deal with this assault weapons problem because, now that we've banned them in America, you've got all these foreign gun manufacturers who are trying to modify their assault weapons to get them in under the sport weapon definition. So I said, for 120 days we're not going to take any more of these weapons until we study it. I am not going to let people overseas turn our streets into battle zones where gangs are armed like they were guerrilla warriors halfway around the world if I can stop it. But you've got to decide.

So I thank you for being here. I thank you for your contributions. But let's go out and have a little debate here—1998 is an election year—and ask people to think about whether they really believe what has happened in America has happened by accident. Ask them to think about what they believe the Nation should do.

The Democrats of 1997 are not out there defending big Government and big regulations and all this. We've reduced the size of Government by 300,000—more than any previous Republican administration in modern times. We have reduced more Government regulations. We have given more authority to State and local government. We have privatized more operations than previous Republican administrations.

But we have not given up the fundamental responsibility to define the national interest when it comes to protecting families and children and communities and futures. That's what we haven't done, and that's why this country is moving forward and moving forward together.

I want you to be a part of it. I thank you for being here tonight. I hope you'll help us in all these elections. But talk to people about what is going to affect our children's lives. We're making a difference, and you can make a bigger one.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:50 p.m. in the New Country Club Building at the Sheraton

Desert Inn. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Bob Miller of Nevada; Carol Pensky, treasurer, Democratic National Committee; Shelly Berkeley, candidate for Nevada's First Congressional District, who introduced the President; Cassandra Williams, reception chair, Women's Leadership Forum; and Mayor Jan Laverty Jones of Las Vegas.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Las Vegas
November 14, 1997

Thank you. Thank you very much. We've had such a nice evening, it seems a shame to spoil it with a speech—[*laughter*]—but I'd like to say a few words. First of all, I want to thank Brian and Myra for once again welcoming me into their homes and for being my friends, and for being my friends when I was the fifth-best known candidate for President in the New Hampshire primary. When the only person in America who thought I could be elected was my mother—[*laughter*]—they were my friends.

I also want to thank them because we share something else in common. In addition to the fact that Brian and I went to college together, our family and theirs, we're both parents of only daughters who are reasonably important to us. And I had Amy with me for a long time, and I miss her terribly, so I'm glad to see her here tonight. It was wonderful having her in the White House for the years that we had her.

I'd like to thank Governor and Mrs. Miller and Senator and Mrs. Bryan and Senator and Mrs. Reid for being here tonight. And I'd like to thank the people of Nevada for voting for Bill Clinton and Al Gore twice.

When we ran, I was told that there were all these States that I could never carry, among which were any between the Mississippi River and California. And that seemed to be an irrational thing to me, to give them all up. And most of them we did lose, both times—[*laughter*]—but Nevada was here for us both times. And I never will forget that, and I'm very grateful.

I would like to tonight just ask you to think about where we are as a country on our journey, what we're going through as a people, and what we should be doing about it together.

If you look at—now that I have been President for 5 years, I tend to have a little bit of detachment and see a lot of the specific struggles and contests and efforts we're making as part of the broad sweep of American history and as sort of human drama of our generation, in terms of how people work and live and relate to each other, relate to the rest of the world. And one thing I've learned from studying our history and from living it for the last 5 years is that whenever we go through a period of real sweeping change where our working patterns change, communications patterns change, living patterns change, and in our case the very composition of our population is changing—we're becoming much, much more diverse with these new waves of immigration—and then our relationships after the cold war to the rest of the world is changing—whenever something like that happens and all the balls get thrown up in the air, there is not only the need that individuals feel to know what the deal is—how am I going to constitute my life; how am I going to constitute a stable family life; how are we going to keep our community together; what's our future like?—we also engage in redefining the Nation.

You know, when we started as a country, we basically defined ourselves as a bunch of people that didn't want to be under British control anymore. So then we had years where we really argued about what ought to be in our Constitution and, once we had a Constitution, what did it mean—what did it mean to be one Nation of associated States.

And we pretty well worked it out, and then things rocked along fine for a while. And then finally we had to come to grips with slavery, and whether slavery would be extended or restricted or done away with altogether; and how were we going to accommodate that within the Constitution; and could we do it and keep the country together. And half the country said no, half the country said yes, and we fought the bloodiest war in our history with each other. The casualties in the Civil War were slightly

greater than the casualties in World War II with a much, much smaller population. But we once again wound up defining the Nation. We fought a war to do it, and then we had to pass a bunch of constitutional amendments. But essentially America, by 1870, was what Abraham Lincoln said it ought to be in the Gettysburg Address.

Then we became a great industrial country, and we had to do this all over again. Wasn't it wonderful? We had all these factory jobs. But wasn't it terrible that 9-year-old kids were working 9 hours a day, 6 days a week in some of these factories? What were we going to do about that? And so through the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, we did it all over again. We defined what the Nation was. And we found a way to get the benefits of a new era and still meet its challenges and kind of come together as one people. Then we had to do it again during the Depression and the Second World War. And we had to do it all over again for the cold war.

Now we have to do it again, because we're moving into a truly global society, bound together more than anything else by shared technology and communications, where the movement of money and ideas and people is more rapid than ever before; where the security threats we will most likely face for the next 20 or 30 years are not animosities between two nations, although there may be some of that—we see that in the press today; there may be some of that—but far more likely it will be terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction into the hands of organized crime or drug dealers, shared international environmental problems, or new diseases crossing national borders—new problems we share with people who are living in different countries because they cross national borders and require a much higher level of cooperation than before.

So there's a lot of change in the air. And when I ran in 1992, I attempted to address that and what I thought the Nation was. I said, "Look, I want to build a country in the 21st century where everybody who's responsible enough to work for it has the opportunity to live out his or her dreams. I want to build a country that's still the strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity in a new world. And I want to build a country where, in spite of all of our differences, we're still coming together as one America."

It wasn't the end of the debate; it was the beginning of the debate. In '94, the Republicans won the Congress. They said, "We've got a different idea. We think Government is the problem, and we will be a nation if we just say we believe in the same things and we get the Government out of the way, and the international market is a wonderful thing, and so vote for us and we'll drastically diminish the role of the Government, and that's the real problem." And people liked it when they heard it. But then when they saw it in action in 1995 and 1996, they didn't like it so well. And we fought them over that.

But you need to see all this not just as an isolated political event. All of you are present at another moment of creation for America. We are in the process of once again redefining what it means to be an American and what we want our country to do. And my idea is that we have to be faithful to our oldest values and then be highly pragmatic and aggressive about what the challenges are.

What are the challenges we face in this country today? First of all, you can't do very well in this world unless you've got a decent education. So it's more important than ever before to give a world-class education to every child in the country.

Secondly, with more and more people in the work force, men and women—over half the children in this country under one have mothers in the work force—way over half. We have to recognize that even for upper income people and certainly for lower income working people, we have to work very hard to enable people to balance the demands of work and family, because if we have a society where you have to choose whether you're going to be a good parent or successful in the workplace, we are defeated before we begin. The most important work of any society is raising children. There is no more important job. It is the most significant work we ever do. But if people who want to be—and indeed we need to be—in the work force can't be successful parents and get the kind of supports they need and still succeed at work, we're in deep trouble.

And so that's what the—when you see a specific issue like family and medical leave, or we cut taxes more for lower income working people with a lot of kids, or we're working on trying to broaden the child care system of the country, or I wouldn't sign welfare reform until we put

$4 billion in it so Governor Miller and his colleagues could figure out how to give these lower income parents who go from welfare to the workplace adequate child care for their kids—all of that is really part of a big issue, which is that a decent, good America will reconcile the conflicts of work and family. That's what Harry Reid and Dick Bryan have to deal with every week in some form or fashion.

We have to prove that we can make our streets safe, and we have to prove we can make our communities coherent. We have to have a system that brings the benefits of free enterprise to places that it hasn't reached yet. We have to prove we can grow the economy and preserve the environment, a huge issue.

A big difference between us and the Republicans in '95 and '96 was whether you could actually increase environmental protection and increase economic growth at the same time. I always believed if you did it right, you'd make more jobs with the proper kind of environmental protection, because that would be the new technology of the future and there will be more demand for it in the future. And I think the evidence is on our side. I believe that's exactly what we've done. The air and water is cleaner. We're making our food safer. We're cleaning up toxic waste dumps. And we're creating jobs like crazy in all those areas. And it's very good.

But when you strip it down, what we believe is that in order to be bound together as a nation, we must do certain things as a nation: to create opportunity, demand responsibility, bring us together as a community, and preserve our leadership. And if it works, America will once again be, in effect, reborn as the strongest country in the world and a beacon of hope to people.

And so far the evidence is pretty encouraging. We've got the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years, the lowest inflation rate in 30 years. The crime rate has been dropping for 5 years. We've got the lowest—biggest drop in welfare rolls in history. We're moving in the right direction. We have average incomes that are rising now. And our environment is significantly improved. We are moving in the right direction.

This year we had a good year. We passed the balanced budget law, with the biggest increase in investment in education since '65, the biggest increase in investment for children's health since '65. The American Diabetes Association says what we've done for families with diabetes is the best thing since insulin was discovered 70 years ago.

And the most important thing, I believe, over the long run is, I think with the latest tax credits, scholarships, work-study funds, we can honestly say we have now opened the doors of college to every American who is willing to work for it. This year we had the biggest increase in assistance to people to go to college since the GI bill was passed 50 years ago. This was a good year for America.

Are there problems? Of course there are. You read about them in the paper every day. But I just want you to feel good about this because when I started this little odyssey 6 years ago, when I spent my first night at this house, I would go from place to place in America, and I would really meet a lot of people who weren't sure that we could—this country worked anymore. They didn't know if we could get the economy going again. They didn't know if we could bring the crime rate down again by working together. They didn't know if we could ever really kind of break the culture of poverty again. They weren't quite sure how we were going to relate to the rest of the world again.

We're in better shape than we were then. And all we need to do is to remember this. We just are fortunate to be living in a time of truly breathtaking change. It makes it more interesting. But it also imposes on all of us as citizens higher responsibilities because you have to figure out how are you going to make the economy work for everybody again, how are you going to keep the society together again, how are you going to help families again.

We also have a lot of new challenges, particularly in the environmental area, that no one has ever had before. And finally, we have to figure out how to relate to all these other countries around the world when we're not all divided up into Communist and non-Communist camps, and we have to figure out how to build new alliances for cooperation all the time. It's almost as if you abolished the two-party system in the world and now nations were just trying to figure out where they're going to organize themselves issue by issue. So it's fascinating; it's endlessly complex; but in the end, it's pretty simple. If you're expanding opportunity, if citizens are being more responsible, and if we're pulling people together instead of driving them apart, this country is going to be fine.

And I am gratified beyond measure, but I can also tell you this: We have a lot left to do. When the baby boomers like me retire, we have to have reformed Medicare and Social Security enough so it will be there for our children and so that we're not going to bankrupt our children as they raise our grandchildren to pay for our retirement.

We still have to work through the big tobacco settlement issue next year to guarantee that we protect the health of our children. It's still the number one public health problem in America. Illegal smoking among children will lead to bigger health care bills and more problems than anything else.

We have a number of exciting issues to deal with in the environment and on climate change. But the general thing is people now believe that we get it in America. You should all have a very high level of confidence that our country can function, that it can succeed, that we can meet any challenge.

And I just am so grateful to have been given the chance to serve and to play a role in once again proving that America will always be a young nation if at every time of challenge it can redefine what it means to be an American. That's what you're doing, and I hope you're very proud of it. And I hope, so far, you're very pleased with the results.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:32 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Brian and Myra Greenspun, dinner hosts, and their daughter, Amy; Gov. Bob Miller of Nevada and his wife, Sandy; Bonnie Bryan, wife of Senator Richard H. Bryan; and Landra Reid, wife of Senator Harry Reid.

Memorandum on Importation of Modified Semiautomatic Assault-Type Rifles

November 14, 1997

Memorandum for the Secretary of the Treasury

Subject: Importation of Modified Semiautomatic Assault-Type Rifles

The Gun Control Act of 1968 restricts the importation of firearms unless they are determined to be particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes. In 1989, the Department of the Treasury (the Department) conducted a review of existing criteria for applying the statutory test based on changing patterns of gun use. As a result of that review, 43 assault-type rifles were specifically banned from importation. However, manufacturers have modified many of those weapons banned in 1989 to remove certain military features without changing their essential operational mechanism. Examples of such weapons are the Galil and the Uzi.

In recent weeks Members of Congress have strongly urged that it is again necessary to review the manner in which the Department is applying the sporting purposes test, in order to ensure that the agency's practice is consistent with the statute and current patterns of gun use. A letter signed by 30 Senators strongly urged that modified assault-type weapons are not properly importable under the statute and that I should use my authority to suspend temporarily their importation while the Department conducts an intensive, expedited review. A recent letter from Senator Dianne Feinstein emphasized again that weapons of this type are designed not for sporting purposes but for the commission of crime. In addition, 34 Members of the House of Representatives signed a letter to Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu requesting that he intervene to stop all sales of Galils and Uzis into the United States. These concerns have caused the Government of Israel to announce a temporary moratorium on the exportation of Galils and Uzis so that the United States can review the importability of these weapons under the Gun Control Act.

The number of weapons at issue underscores the potential threat to the public health and safety that necessitates immediate action. Firearms importers have obtained permits to import nearly 600,000 modified assault-type rifles. In addition, there are pending before the Department applications to import more than 1 million

additional such weapons. The number of rifles covered by outstanding permits is comparable to that which existed in 1989 when the Bush Administration temporarily suspended import permits for assault-type rifles. The number of weapons for which permits for importation are being sought through pending applications is approximately 10 times greater than in 1989. The number of such firearms for which import applications have been filed has skyrocketed from 10,000 on October 9, 1997, to more than 1 million today.

My Administration is committed to enforcing the statutory restrictions on importation of firearms that do not meet the sporting purposes test. It is necessary that we ensure that the statute is being correctly applied and that the current use of these modified weapons is consistent with the statute's criteria for importability. This review should be conducted at once on an expedited basis. The review is directed to weapons such as the Uzi and Galil that failed to meet the sporting purposes test in 1989, but were later found importable when certain military features were removed. The results of this review should be applied to all pending and future applications.

The existence of outstanding permits for nearly 600,000 modified assault-type rifles threatens to defeat the purpose of the expedited review unless, as in 1989, the Department temporarily suspends such permits. Importers typically obtain authorization to import firearms in far greater numbers than are actually imported into the United States. However, gun importers could effectively negate the impact of any Department determination by simply importing weapons to the maximum amount allowed by their permits. The public health and safety require that the only firearms allowed into the United States are those that meet the criteria of the statute.

Accordingly, as we discussed, you will:

1) Conduct an immediate expedited review not to exceed 120 days in length to determine whether modified semiautomatic assault-type rifles are properly importable under the statutory sporting purposes test. The results of this review will govern action on pending and future applications for import permits, which shall not be acted upon until the completion of this review.

2) Suspend outstanding permits for importation of modified semiautomatic assault-type rifles for the duration of the 120-day review period. The temporary suspension does not constitute a permanent revocation of any license. Permits will be revoked only if and to the extent that you determine that a particular weapon does not satisfy the statutory test for importation, and only after an affected importer has an opportunity to make its case to the Department.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: This memorandum was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 14 but was embargoed for release until 10:06 a.m. on November 15.

The President's Radio Address
November 15, 1997

Good morning. Today I want to talk about the progress we're making in our fight against crime and the steps we're taking to build on that progress. All over our country, crime is dropping. Responsibility and respect for the law are on the rise. But the true measure of our progress is whether our children can play in their front yards, whether they can walk to school in safety, whether our parents can unlock their front doors, whether our grandparents can walk down the streets with confidence, free from the fear of violence.

To give our families that security, we've put in place a comprehensive plan to bring the crime rate down with 100,000 new community police officers, tougher punishment, stronger antigang prevention, the Brady bill. And we've led an unprecedented effort to join the forces of national, State, and local law enforcement to fight crime in every community in America.

In the 3 years since I signed the crime bill into law, we know our strategy is having a real, measurable impact. Crime has dropped now for a record 5 years in a row. Today we have even

more dramatic proof of our progress, the Annual National Crime Victimization Survey. It says that in 1996, crime rates fell to their lowest recorded level in nearly 25 years. Property crime is down. Violent crime is down. Since 1993, murder has dropped by 22 percent, 10 percent in 1996 alone. This remarkable drop in the crime rate is no accident. The hard work of people from Washington to every community in the country made it happen.

Community policing is at the center of this success. In only 3 years, we've already funded 65,000 new police officers under the crime bill, and we're close to meeting our goal of putting 100,000 new police officers on our streets.

Our Nation's police officers will tell you that our ongoing effort to ban lethal assault weapons has also been critical to their ability to do a better job. We've banned these guns because you don't need an Uzi to go deer hunting, and everyone knows it.

But as effective as the assault weapons ban has been, we know that some foreign gun manufacturers are getting around the ban by making minor modifications to their weapons that amount to nothing more than cosmetic surgery. Well, we didn't fight as hard as we have to pass the assault weapons in the first place only to let a few gun manufacturers sidestep our laws and undermine our progress. Assault weapons in the hands of civilians exist for no reason but to inspire fear and wreak deadly havoc on our streets. They don't belong on our streets or in our schoolyards, and they shouldn't be aimed at our children. That's why we banned them 3 years ago and why we're taking action today.

Effective immediately, the Secretary of the Treasury is suspending the importation of all modified assault weapons for 120 days while we study whether they can be permanently blocked from our borders and banned from our streets. We must continue to do everything we can to crack down on illegal firearms and the organized criminals, terrorists, and drug lords who seek them. Yesterday President Zedillo of Mexico and I signed an unprecedented international convention to help fight illegal gun trafficking in our own hemisphere and to strengthen law enforcement's ability to combat this deadly trade.

Working together over the last 5 years, we've proven that we can drive down the crime rate. Now we have to press on, confident that we can take our streets back from crime, take assault weapons and illegal firearms out of the hands of criminals, enact a tough but smart juvenile justice bill, and eventually give our families and our children the real security they deserve.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 7:30 p.m. on November 14 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on November 15.

Remarks on Arrival in Sacramento, California

November 15, 1997

Good morning. Two years ago, I approved a BRAC recommendation to close McClellan Air Force Base, but only after I was convinced it was feasible for McClellan to privatize and that the prospects of success were strong. Since then, I've had to fight at every turn with the Members of Congress who have resisted our efforts to give the Department of Defense the tools it needs to privatize more of its operations more easily.

This year, the so-called Depot Caucus tried to block the ongoing competition for the Kelly and McClellan workload altogether. I said if they did that, I would veto the entire defense bill. Eventually Congress reached a compromise to allow the competitions for this important work to go forward. The Secretary of Defense has assured me that although the language in the bill is not ideal, I quote, "the Department of Defense has flexibility to proceed with the remaining public-private competitions at Kelly and McClellan bases in a way that is fair to both sides." For this reason, I have decided to sign the defense bill.

We will continue to do everything we can to help McClellan make the transition. The Vice President and I have met with business and community officials. We have listened to your

concerns. Today I am pleased to announce seven steps we are taking.

First, by December 31st, the Air Force will transfer McClellan to Sacramento County at a significantly discounted price to encourage rapid economic development and job creation.

Second, the Coast Guard will remain at McClellan through at least 2004, contributing $2 million a year to support private airfield operations.

Third, the Defense Department will retain liability for the eventual shutdown of McClellan's nuclear reactor, making it possible to support scientific and commercial research here for the next 30 years.

Fourth, the Department recently announced that it will provide an additional $7.2 million to retrain 1,700 civilian workers who face layoffs over the next 2 years.

Fifth, our EPA Administrator, Carol Browner, will visit McClellan early next month to discuss with community leaders a schedule for environmental cleanup to promote redevelopment and job creation.

Sixth, the Defense Department will provide an additional $11.3 million to complete funding of the casting emission reduction program at McClellan to develop environmentally friendly technology for manufacturing.

Finally, we will give high priority to capital improvements at McClellan to promote economic development and job creation.

Today we're also announcing a series of actions we're taking to help San Antonio redevelop the Kelly Air Force Base.

This is the third base conversion challenge this community has taken on. You've done a tremendous job. Your efforts are a model for the Nation. And I will continue to work with McClellan to make this third story a very successful one for this remarkable community.

Thank you very much. And I'm sorry for the weather inconvenience.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:20 a.m. at McClellan Air Force Base. In his remarks, he referred to the Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC).

Remarks at the Yolo Basin Wetlands in Davis, California

November 15, 1997

Thank you very much. You can't imagine how much I wanted to get out of cold, rainy, windy Washington, DC, to come to California. [*Laughter*] But after all, this is a wetlands event.

I want to, first of all, thank Sarah for her introduction. Didn't she speak well? [*Applause*] She was terrific, I thought. And listening to her recount the experiences of the last several years of her life I think was as good a statement as any as could be made about so many of you who are here and the work you have done to make this day come to pass. I want to thank all of you very much.

I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to your secretary of natural resources, Doug Wheeler, and two people who came from Washington with me, our Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, Rich Rominger, who is from Yolo County; and he's already been mentioned, but our Deputy Secretary of the Interior, John Garamendi, who grew up not far from here, and they've both done a terrific job for you back there.

I thank John Walker for his statement. We were dedicating a wetland in Arkansas once a few years ago, on a much warmer day, and I was a Governor, and he was a president. But after all, I'm term-limited, and he can go on forever. [*Laughter*]

I'm very glad to be here with all of you. I want to thank Robin and Greg for showing me around the area and giving me a chance to look at some of the birds and just see what you've done here. I asked him how many ducks and geese there were going to be here and whether you had any eagles or ospreys or egrets, and I got a pretty good rundown on it.

And I have to say that I have been, as you have heard already, a big supporter of these kinds of endeavors. I thank the people here from the California Waterfowl Association, and I do want to say a special word of thanks to two groups with which I have been associated,

first, the folks from the Corps of Engineers. They have not only changed their image, they've changed their reality. They're working hard not only to give us water projects but to give us the kind of environmental conservation that we need for the long run. And I thank you very much, Colonel, and I thank all the people from the Corps for what you've done.

And let me just echo what was said earlier. I'm very proud of my very long association with Ducks Unlimited. They've done a wonderful job in helping us to bring waterfowl back to our State, and they do a great job in this country.

Finally, I'd like to say a word of appreciation to Vic Fazio, who is clearly one of the most outstanding Members of the United States Congress in either party. If we had 100 more people like him, America would have no problem. He is a very good man. I want to thank Vic not only for his work here but for the general efforts he's made, along with Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein and John Garamendi, for our efforts in the Bay Delta area and the work that we are doing to try to guarantee the long-term needs of California for water supply, as well as water quality, habitat preservation, and environmental progress. And that's very, very good.

Let me say, I wanted to be here today because to me this project is the embodiment of not only what we should be doing as Americans on the edge of a new century but how we should be doing it. We worked very hard to create a country where things were working for ordinary Americans, where we were coming together across the lines that divide us, and where we can be strong enough to continue to lead the world in the right direction. And that bridge that I talked about all the time I'm trying to build to the 21st century is going pretty well. We've got the strongest economy in a generation; crime and welfare are dropping; and our water quality, our air quality, our food safety, they're all improving. We are moving in the right direction.

One of the biggest challenges we will have to continue to face during the entire lifetime of all the children that are here is the challenge of trying to grow our economy and lift our standard of living while improving, not diminishing, our environment. That is critical. A great deal of the history of 20th century California is a story of this battle. And the truth is, for most of the 20th century, not only in California but throughout America, whenever people thought about this, they either thought, "I'm going to develop the economy; the environment will take care of itself," or they felt for a long time, "It's unfortunate that we have to give up so much of our environment, but it's a necessary price we have to pay to continue to raise our living standards." Now we know that is a false choice. And indeed, we understand that over the long run, if we want to preserve our ability to increase our standard of living, we have to preserve our national environment and all the things that go with it.

Just for example, Greg Schmid and I were talking about this project and how the more you do these projects, the more you're going not only to have what you came here for today but what you cannot see; you will lose less water in rain runoff, and you will over time rebuild the aquifers that are below the land, that no one sees and most people don't think about. But that will enable you to sustain your population and to sustain your economic activity.

So again I say, I wanted to come here today because this is a huge success. You're doing the right thing, and you're doing it in the right way. And that's the second point I want to make. If we haven't learned anything in our country in the last few years, I hope we have learned we do not get very far when we just stand off and shout at each other and fight and argue all the time. But we can do anything if we roll up our sleeves and get down to work and honestly listen to people who have different experiences, different perspectives, and different genuine interests. That's what you've done here. You've been able to bring everybody together, and I really feel good about that.

Here we are in the shadow of Sacramento. We see the farmlands here, and I promise you, when I crossed that levee today, I thought I was back home in eastern Arkansas, and I kept waiting for somebody to give me my waders and a gun to go duck hunting. [*Laughter*]

What you have done today was based on the cooperation of State, Federal, and local governments, based on public—[*inaudible*]. That's how we ought to be dealing with all America's problems. You can't name a single problem we've got in this country that we could not make the kind of progress on we're celebrating today if we didn't approach it the way you have approached this.

And I would implore you to think about what you can do and what you can say to people

in this State, and your friends and family members and neighbors all around America, to take this attitude and this approach, not only to our environmental problems but to all others.

You've been working on this since the late eighties. You ought to be very proud of it. But you ought to also draw confidence from this that there is no challenge facing this country that we cannot meet if we will just do what you have done here. I am so proud of you—I know that you believe in it or you wouldn't be standing out here in the cold and rain listening to me talk.

I've just got to make one other point that I think is very important to you here in California. Three years ago we helped to launch the historic Cal-Fed partnership to try to end the water wars and restore the environment and ensure clean and reliable water for generations to come. I just signed legislation, as Vic Fazio said, that makes $85 million in downpayments to match funds that the California voters approved to restore their rivers and marshes in the valleys. In 2 months the Cal-Fed program will recommend a blueprint for moving forward with all of our partners in the way I said. We'll be working on habitat restoration, flood protection, integrated from the beginning into all projects designed to meet the other needs of the area. We're going to do it right. And again I say I'm very grateful to Vic Fazio and to Senator Boxer, Senator Feinstein, and of course, to John Garamendi for their work in this whole process.

And let me also say that—I want to say a word of thanks to the Corps of Engineers and others who have done all the work in rebuilding after last year's floods. Within the next few weeks, the Corps will finish all remaining repairs. It's the most extensive flood reparation ever done in this short of time and another reason we should thank the Corps of Engineers for what they've done here.

We're working hard across America on projects like this. We're making progress in reclaiming the Florida Everglades, in restoring Lake Tahoe, in saving Yellowstone. We have funds in this latest bill, in our balanced budget plan, to continue this work. But I now can go around the country and talk to other people about what you've done here and tell them you believe in it so much you all showed up and stayed in the wind and the rain in sunny California. [*Laughter*]

Well, I've seen the wetlands here today, and some of you may have seen more than you wanted to see. But I'll tell you what else I've seen: I've seen a glimpse of America's future, and I like it.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. at the Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area. In his remarks, he referred to Douglas P. Wheeler, California secretary for resources; John Walker, chairman of the board, Ducks Unlimited; Sarah Jullian, volunteer, Robin Kulakow, executive director, and Greg Schmid, farmer, Yolo Basin Foundation; and Col. Dorothy F. Klasse, USA, District Engineer, Sacramento District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Luncheon in Sacramento
November 15, 1997

Thank you very much. Eleni, thank you very much for your remarks and for the hard work that you have done. Thank you, Angelo and Sophia. Congressman Matsui, when he stood up and said that he was speaking on behalf of the Tsakapoulous family, I thought we were taking ethnic diversity a little far there. [*Laughter*] But you know me; as far as I'm concerned, it should have no limits. So I liked it.

I want to thank Bob Matsui and Vic Fazio for the wonderful work that they do in Congress. I have wished on many days—privately, so I might as well say publicly—that a higher percentage of people in both parties were more like Bob Matsui and Vic Fazio. They always try to find common ground, and they're always willing to stand tough and fight if necessary. They get a lot done, and they're always looking to the future. And I'm very grateful to them.

I'm also glad to be back in Sacramento and back here with your mayor, who has been a good friend of mine and a good leader. And I thank him for that. And Phil Angeledes, good luck to you in your endeavor this year. Most people should trust you to handle the money. [*Laughter*] You've had a lot of experience at it. [*Applause*] Thank you. I'd also like to thank my good friend Dan Dutko for coming all the way from Washington, DC, to be part of the Democratic Party's efforts today. And let me thank all of you.

Congress has just gone home, and this was a remarkably good year. It's a 2-year congressional session—we have a lot to do next year—but we did pass the first balanced budget in a generation. We ratified the chemical weapons treaty, which will help to protect our children and our grandchildren and involves a lot of what is at stake in Iraq today. We made progress on expanding NATO in ways that will give us a chance to have a 21st century where Europe is a source of peace and prosperity, not a cause for war that involves Americans. We passed a wonderful adoption bill that I will sign in the next few days to facilitate adoptions in many ways in America. We passed a huge increase in medical research in all kinds of areas and the best package to help families with diabetes, according to the American Diabetes Association, since the discovery of insulin 70 years ago. So it was a very good year for the American people in the Congress.

What I'd like to talk to you about a little bit today is how that year is a part of what we've been doing for the last 5 years and what I hope to be doing for the next 3, how it fits in with what we celebrated just a few moments ago when I went out, literally, to the wetlands area today—[*laughter*]—to celebrate this joint partnership to try to restore wetlands and to preserve some of your precious environmental heritage, even as you permit the economy to grow and the uses of water to proliferate.

When I started running for President about 6 years ago, our country was not in very good shape. California was in terrible shape economically. But times come and go. In every person's life, in every country's life, there are times that are better than other times. There will never be a period where we have complete, unbounded, uninterrupted good news. I used to have a set of rules of public life I kept with me, and one of them said, "You're always most vulnerable when you think you're invulnerable. Something is always going to happen. It's endemic to the human condition."

But what a free people must always have is a vision of where they're going, a strategy to get there, and the concentration and discipline to pursue the strategy through the tough times. That's what I didn't think we had in 1991 and why I ran for President. And my goal as a Democrat was basically to take the mainstream values of our party and our country and marry them to modern ideas and policies that would move the country forward and that would take us into the 21st century with the American dream alive for everybody responsible enough to work for it. It would help us to create a country where we were coming together, across all the lines that divide us, into one America and would keep us strong enough to continue to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity.

As you see from the events of the last week, I think it is clear that at the end of the cold war not all of the dangers of the world have gone away. And it is very important that the United States be strong enough to do what is necessary to stick up not only for our own interests and our own security but for the kind of world we are trying to create. And that's what we have been doing for the last 5 years.

And what I want you to understand that is so often overlooked is that there is a direct connection between your presence at this lunch here today and what we have been doing and what we will be able to do because, in the end, the people who make decisions are those that are put there by the American people. They are put there after elections. And if you don't have the capacity to communicate your message, to be heard, and to answer the charges against you in this world today, you'll be in a lot of trouble.

So every time you hear—if you've been out here helping us all these years—every time you hear of a new breakthrough, a new movement forward for the United States, you should feel that you are a part of that. And you should be under no illusion that if there were not people like you around to help us, that all these ideas, all these policies, and all these people would be around anyway; it's not so. I've seen elections conducted in an atmosphere of unilateral disarmament, and I wasn't very satisfied with the results. It doesn't work very well in politics, and it doesn't work very well in other

areas of human endeavor. So I'm glad you're here.

What is it that's changed in the last 5 years? Well, the first thing we had to do was to make up our mind in Washington what the Government's job was. What's the President supposed to do every day when he gets up? What's the Congress supposed to do? What is our job? What is the role of Government, and what must our priorities be?

The old debate seemed to me to be a little bit artificial, where some people said, "Well, the Government has to try to do everything when there's a problem," and others would say, "The Government is the problem and should do nothing, and we hope everybody will come out all right." Neither one of those was consistent with the way I saw people living in my State and my hometown or everything I knew about how you build an economy or a society.

So I tried to reformulate what I believe the mission of Government is, and I think it is—and I hope it is—the philosophy of the Democratic Party on the edge of a new century. We believe the role of Government is not to do everything or to sit on the sidelines but to give people the tools and conditions they need to make the most of their own lives. If you think about it in that way, it tells you what to do and what to stop doing.

Now, that doesn't answer the question, so what should your economic policy be? We believe that there was a false choice put before the American people: Should we cut taxes and run a huge deficit, or don't cut them and spend a little more money and run a slightly smaller deficit? Our country's debt quadrupled in the 1980's, and it was wrong. We said, "We're going to cut the deficit. We're going to cut spending, but we're going to spend more on education, on technology, on medical research, on the things that are key to our future. We're going to make choices."

The strategy worked. Before the balanced budget kicks in, the economic plan adopted by Democrats only, including the two Members of Congress in this room, had reduced the deficit by 92 percent—92 percent—from where it was the day I took office.

What was our crime policy? I was amazed when I got to Washington, there were people who actually wrote in newspapers and respectable journals that if I talked about crime, I was trying to get a Republican issue. And I was not aware that Democrats were pro-crime. [*Laughter*] Nor was I aware that the Republicans had done such a great job, since the crime rate was—had gone up quite a lot.

Now, most anticrime work is done at the community level—in the city of Sacramento, in this county—but it was obvious there were things the National Government could do that would make a difference. And I went all across the country looking at things that were working, talking to people. And I said our crime policy is not going to be caught in the old debate: Lock them up and throw away the key; or hope things get better, and when things get better, the crime rate will go down. Neither one was, I thought, particularly accurate. I thought we ought to be tough and smart and do what works: Put 100,000 more police on the street; take assault weapons off the street; keep handguns out of the hands of crooks; give kids something to say yes to so they don't get in trouble in the first place; and punish people who are really bad. That's what I thought our policy ought to be. And the crime rate has dropped now for 5 years in a row, and we played a role in it, and I feel good about that.

Our welfare policy—the old policy was, encourage people to do better, or cut them off, and who cares. That was the old debate. Our theory was, require people who can go to work to go to work, but don't ask them to give up their most important job, which is raising their kids. And we started working with States from the day I got there on moving people from welfare to work. The Republicans said, when they got a majority in Congress, they wanted to pass a welfare reform bill. I said, "Fine, we'll work with you on it." They passed two bills that I vetoed. Why? Because they were more than happy to be tough in cutting people off of welfare, but they did not want to give them the tools they needed to get in the work force, and they were willing to hurt their kids by taking away the guarantee of food and medical care.

So I vetoed those two bills; they put the guarantees of food and medical care back in, gave me some money for job training and child care; we're off to the races. The result? Welfare rolls have dropped by 3 million people. And it's working; it's working.

What I want you to understand is there's a direct connection between you being here at this lunch and that happening. And I thank you

for it. We are changing the nature of politics in this country.

We had a big reaction to a lot of what we did in '93 and '94, and the benefits of it weren't apparent. The Republicans won the Congress in '94. The American people got to see what they wanted to do in '95 and '96. We beat back the contract on America. It didn't happen by accident. It was a lot of hard, disciplined work, putting our message out against their message. And it's a good thing for the country that we did.

What we celebrated today at that wetlands project was people who want to grow the economy and people who want to preserve the environment working together to do something at the grassroots level. That's how we ought to be doing this. Their idea on the environment was, it was a nice thing if you could get it, but it was really an irritant that shouldn't get in the way of people going about their daily lives.

I think that's wrong. I think we have proved conclusively—you have cleaner air today, cleaner water, more toxic waste dumps cleaned up, a safer food supply, all through major initiatives of this administration, and a stronger economy. We have got to do it in the right way. We don't want to do things that are stupid. We don't want to shoot ourselves in the foot, but we know we have got to preserve public health and the environment and grow the economy. That is the policy of our party. And we are determined to do it, and we are making progress on it, and your presence here today contributes to the triumph of that idea. And you should be proud of that, and you should talk about it, and you should help us to refine it.

I don't mean there aren't tough decisions out there. This climate change issue, for example, is a very difficult, challenging issue that will occupy us for the rest of my term in office. But I know that the technology, the know-how, the creativity is out there in the American people to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and grow the economy. We've already done it in two other areas. You know these chlorofluorocarbons, the CFC's that were in all the spray cans—they said, "Oh, there will be terrible damage to the economy if we get rid of them." Well, we got rid of them, and the American economy is doing just fine. They said we'd do terrible damage to the economy if we took sulfur dioxide out of the atmosphere. We found a pro-business, market-oriented way to do it; we're getting it out of the atmosphere at less than half the cost I was told it would cost, and we're doing just fine.

And we'll solve this problem, and we'll do just fine if we'll all work together and realize that we cannot be forced into a position where somebody says, "If you want to save the environment, you have to tank the economy," or, "If you want a good economy, you just have to turn your back on the environment." That is wrong. And it's one of two big choices that I think we can't afford to make.

The other one, and the last issue I want to emphasize domestically, is the choice that I alluded to earlier, welfare. That's the choice between work and family. When I signed the family leave law, a lot of people said, "You're going to hurt a lot of small businesses," even though we exempted people with under 50 employees. For 5 years we've had a record number of new small businesses formed in every single year. It is a good thing to allow people who go to work every day not to have to worry themselves sick about their children at home or at school. It is a decent thing to do that.

I will say again, every society's most important job is raising healthy, good, strong children with good values. There is no more important work. More than half of the children in this country under the age of one have mothers in the work force. And since I have had a wife, a mother, and a grandmother in the work force—as long as I have been alive, that is what I have known—I do not think that is a bad thing. But I think it is a very bad thing when people who are working are worried sick about their children.

And so as we look ahead to the future, our party has to find a way to provide more affordable child care. Our party has to find a way to provide health insurance for these children, all of them—we're going to cover half of them with this balanced budget this year—all these children who live in families where their parents are working in lower income jobs and they can't afford health insurance. Our party has to find a way to help the American people balance the demands of raising their kids and going to work every day. And if we have the same approach that we've had for the last 5 years, we can do that as well.

Lastly, let me just say very briefly, because I think you can understand that I don't want

to talk about this in any detail, we've got all kinds of other challenges. We've got to make sure that Medicare and Social Security are there for the baby boom generation and for their children and their children's children. And we have to do it in a way that doesn't—where people my age, of the baby boom generation, don't ask the smaller generation of our children to bankrupt themselves and not take care of their kids to preserve these institutions. We can do all that.

We also, though, have to have a framework in our mind for what it means for America to be secure in the 21st century. National security during the cold war was pretty straightforward. We wanted to keep a big strong military and plenty of nuclear weapons, and we wanted to have a system that existed between ourselves and the Soviet Union so that either side thought that, if they launched nuclear weapons, the other side would be destroyed, so no one would ever do it. And then we'd fight around the edges in various places around the world, to try to keep them from getting much of a toehold.

With the decline of the cold war, with the Russians becoming our partners and our soldiers standing side by side in Bosnia, we now know that national security has to be defined somewhat in different terms. To be sure, there's a lot of problems still with nuclear weapons. We're doing our best to continue to work with the Russians to get rid of more and more nuclear weapons and actually destroy them and make sure that the nuclear materials don't fall into the wrong hands. And we've gotten a wonderful amount of support around the world for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

We're working hard to deal with the aftereffects of these civil wars, the worst of which is landmines. And while I do not agree with all the terms of the Ottawa convention on landmines, it is encouraging that over 100 nations are willing to say that they will never build, buy, or use any kind of landmines. The United States has destroyed a million and a half such mines; we're going to destroy another million and a half while I'm President. And this year we'll spend slightly more than half the money spent in the entire world to go get those landmines out of the ground so kids don't walk on them and blow their lives away in the years ahead. This is a good thing.

But the most likely problems—there are a couple little babies in this audience, or there were today, and some children—the most likely problems these children will face when they come of age will be problems that cross national borders: terrorism, organized crime and drug running, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological weapons and maybe small-scale nuclear weapons—this much nuclear cake put in a bomb would do 10 times as much damage as the Oklahoma City bomb did—the spread of environmental problems or diseases across national lines. We are going to have to, in other words, find ways to cooperate, to keep the organized forces of destruction that are taking advantage of the Internet, the technological revolution, the freedom of travel and the freedom of movement, access to computers, and moving money around and all that—there will always be organized forces of destruction.

That is fundamentally what is at stake in the standoff we're having in Iraq today. I don't want you to look at this backward through the prism of the Gulf war and think it's a replay. I want you to look at it forward and think about it in terms of the innocent Japanese people that died in the subway when the sarin gas was released, and how important it is for every responsible government in the world to do everything that can possibly be done not to let big stores of chemical or biological weapons fall into the wrong hands, not to let irresponsible people develop the capacity to put them in warheads on missiles or put them in briefcases that could be exploded in small rooms.

And I say this not to frighten you. The world will always have challenges. I think the chances are quite good that we can organize ourselves for this challenge and deal with it very effectively. I personally believe that the next 50 years will be far more peaceful and less dangerous for our children and our grandchildren than the last 50 years were. I also believe they will be the most prosperous and interesting time in all of human history, but only if we do the right things.

And so I say again to you, this is an exciting time to be alive. There have only been maybe four periods like this in American history, over our 220-year history, where we are really being called upon to rethink what we want of our Government, rethink what we want of our Nation, meet a whole set of new challenges, and in effect recreate the American dream. It can only happen once every generation, sometimes once every two or three generations. You are

living in that kind of America. In that kind of time, political participation is more important; the integrity and validity and strength of your ideas are more important; and your passionate willingness to stand up and defend what you believe in is more important.

So I thank you for being here today because I believe that what you are doing is helping to build an America that your children and your grandchildren will be very proud of and will thank you for.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:15 p.m. at the Sacramento Capital Club. In his remarks, he referred to luncheon organizer Eleni Tsakapoulous and her parents, Angelo and Sophia; Mayor Joseph Serna, Jr., of Sacramento; Phil Angeledes, candidate for State treasurer; and Dan Dutko, chair, Victory Fund.

Remarks at a Rock the Vote Reception in Beverly Hills, California

November 16, 1997

Thank you very much. I love Rock the Vote. [*Laughter*] I liked it the first time I heard about it. I pledged to support the motor voter bill when I ran for President in 1992, and I was thrilled when it passed. And we had a great signing ceremony on the South Lawn of the White House, a real tribute to the efforts of all those who started Rock the Vote and were so involved in it.

And I want to thank Dan for those fine remarks. I want to thank Dan and Jenna and Jeff and Hilary and my great friend Ricki Seidman, for all the work they've done for Rock the Vote over the years. Good luck, Donna. You gave a good speech up here; that's a good start.

Let me say that—oh, I also want to thank Wolfgang and Barbara for having us here at this wonderful place. We should probably be sitting down and eating instead of standing up and talking, but I'm delighted to be here.

Let me say to all of you, when I ran for President, I did so out of an urge, a compassion, almost a compulsion to try to change this country, to give it back to the people and to make it work again, to basically reclaim the future for your generation and for the young children who are here. And I've tried to continue to always think every day about how whatever I do will affect not just the moment, not just a month or a year from now, but what will be the impact 10 or 20 or 30 years from now.

Most of what we do today will become only clear in its impact when I'm long out of the White House. Part of that is a function of the time in which we're living when things are changing so dramatically. But I've tried to stay in touch with young people and their concerns throughout my Presidency. As a matter of fact, the last meeting I had before I left for the west coast, at the White House, was one of my regular roundtables. We don't call them coffees anymore—[*laughter*]—although we can—now I insist that we have a reporter in every one; I wish we'd had one in all the others—but anyway, with a lot of young people. And these young people came, and they talked to me about a number of different things. And then a young man who used to work for me, who now works for MTV, reported on a survey that had been done by MTV about the attitudes of young people and how basically optimistic they were about their prospects and how well things were going in the country. And they had some concerns, and they were the ones you would expect.

But there was one sort of dark spot in this survey I want to bring up, because it seems to me to undercut everything that Rock the Vote stands for, and I say it to throw it down as a challenge tonight and to thank the people who have organized this event and to thank all of you who have come here. Basically, young people were upbeat about the country, skeptical about the political system, skeptical about whether it was really working for them, skeptical about whether they could make a difference. And what I would like to say to you is, no serious student of the last 5 years could possibly believe that. Therefore, we have a lot of work

to do if you expect your generation to completely fulfill its promise and if you expect to have this democracy work for you.

Just consider where we started in '92. I said that I wanted to be President because I wanted to reverse trickle-down economics; it wasn't working for America. I wanted to go to a strategy I called invest-and-grow. I said that I wanted to replace welfare dependency with a system that emphasized work and childrearing. I said that I wanted to change our crime policies away from hot air and tough talk toward a strategy based on police, prevention, and punishment. I said that I wanted to try to find a way so that we could support families both in raising their children and in succeeding at work, because nearly every family I know, even upper income people, find conflicts repeatedly between their obligations they feel to their children and the obligations they feel at work.

I said that we ought to have a world-class education system for all Americans; we ought to reform health care to expand coverage and quality, to control costs. I said that we had to do more for poor people in isolated communities in our urban and rural areas. I said that I thought we had to build one America out of all of our diversity, across the racial and religious, the gender, the sexual orientation, even the political divides. We had to find some way to define ourselves by what we had in common, because we were growing ever more diverse, and if we didn't find a way to do that, then our efforts would be undermined. And finally, I said, I thought it was terribly important that America not withdraw from the world at the end of the cold war. We had to continue to push for the world to enjoy more peace and prosperity and freedom.

Now, some people said, including me on occasion, that that was a new Democratic approach. For me, it was our oldest ideals with new ideas for a new era. But you be the judge. Is it different now than it was 5 years ago? We have the best economy in a generation. We have the lowest crime rate in 24 years. We have the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history. We have cleaner air, cleaner water, fewer toxic waste dumps, and safer food. All of that has happened, and it is directly related to the work the American people have done, most of all, but also to the changed direction of this country in the last 5 years. And it happened because people participated in the political process and it got a result they were seeking and the result changed the lives and the framework within which we live in America. That is terribly important.

We have the family leave law. We have the law that says you can't lose your health insurance if you change jobs or somebody in your family gets sick. We're about to cover 5 million more children in poor working families who don't have health insurance today. We passed tax credits to open the doors of college to all Americans and to give families credits for their kids and credits when they adopt children who need homes. This has made a difference. And I believe we're moving closer to one America.

In 1994 we had an election, and the Republicans won the majority in Congress. And they had a contract on America, and that election had consequences, too. We know it was a very low turnout election, and we know that more than anything else, it was younger voters and single women workers who stayed home. And I spent a year contrasting my vision of America with theirs and telling them that if—we could work together for positive change, but that I was determined to beat back a vision of this country that said that Government is always the problem, there were no responsibilities we had in common, and who cares if we became more unequal and more unfair. And I'm proud that we defeated that vision. And that, too, had consequences as a direct result of the electoral process, and I think you have to acknowledge that.

Now, more importantly, there are a lot of things to do. Can we grow the economy and clean up the environment? Can we meet America's responsibilities to avoid global warming and reduce greenhouse gas emissions? I think we can. How are we going to continue to create this vision of one America? We still have problems. A distinguished Chinese-American who grew up in New York City can't get voted out of the Senate Judiciary Committee because he believes in what his President believes in on affirmative action, even though he has promised to faithfully enforce the law, whatever it is—in the Civil Rights Division. Bill Lee ought to be confirmed. That is wrong. That is wrong.

But how did it happen? A whole bunch of people voted, and a whole bunch of other people stayed home, and certain people got elected. There are consequences to active citizenship and consequences to sitting on the sidelines. That's

why I love Rock the Vote. Yes, it's been fun. Yes, the events are exuberant. Yes, they feature young people. But I think the work of citizenship can be fun, too.

We have 800 colleges, tens of thousands of young college students going all across America today, every week, going into inner-city schools to teach children to read, to give them a chance because that was one of the things that I promised in the campaign of '96, and that's one of the things that we started since then in 1997. These efforts have consequences. Citizens matter.

And I just want you to think about that. Whatever the headlines in the daily paper are—"The President is Trying to Contain the Spread of Biological and Chemical Weapons Today"—a very important issue—whatever the consequences are, remember, in a democracy the people making the decisions were elected by people who voted and by people who stayed home. That's why Rock the Vote is important. Remember, almost everybody in this room has a lot more future ahead of you than I do. Most of what we're doing, you will live with the consequences of, you will reap the benefits of, you will bear the burdens of.

And this country is in good shape today, in no small measure, because our Constitution has permitted us to recreate America based on our oldest values in every new time of challenge and change. That's what we're doing now. You should be glad you're alive now. If we do it right, the next 50 years will be the most exciting and yet peaceful time in all human history—if we do it right. But it requires that people neither be lackadaisical or cynical.

If you believe, as I do, that every person can make a difference and that every person is obliged to make a difference, then it necessarily follows that anyone who doesn't try is shirking his or her duty as a citizen. That's really what Rock the Vote is all about.

I'll just close with—I had an interesting meeting at the White House with Senator Dole after that election. And we were sitting around, relaxing, talking like old friends, forgetting about all the things that were said that probably shouldn't have been. [*Laughter*] And I said, "You know, you've been in Washington a lot longer than I have." He said, "That's what I tried to convince the voters of at the election." [*Laughter*] And I said, "Now, do you think that public life is more honest or less honest today than it was 30 years ago or 35 years ago?" He said, "It's not even close, not even remotely close. It is much, much more honest today than 30 or 35 years ago."

Now, if young Americans don't believe that, if they don't believe that their vote makes a difference, and if they don't believe there are consequences to what they do after the titanic struggles of the last 2 years, we have, all of us who believe that, have somehow failed in our responsibilities as citizens, and we have to redouble our effort to do better. That's why I always try to do a lot of town meetings. That's why I've insisted in the two Presidential elections that we have one debate each election that involved ordinary citizens who could ask the candidates directly what their concerns are.

But we have to do more. There is more for Rock the Vote to do. There is more to do to involve ordinary citizens. We have now tried for 5 years in a row, so far unsuccessfully, to reform the campaign finance laws. But I will remind you, we have not only to control the cost of campaigns, we have to increase the access of the people to the candidates through free or reduced air time so that we can have more positive, constructive interactions so that people will get excited by the debates at election and participate.

But whether that happens or not, no one has an excuse to sit on the sidelines. You have only to look at the differences in America now compared to 5 years ago to say, yes, it makes a difference. Yes, we made a difference in Rock the Vote. Yes, motor voter made a difference. Yes, every time we tell young people they have to take some time to be good citizens, it makes a difference.

I will always try to be here for Rock the Vote, even when I am in a rocking chair and out of office. [*Laughter*] But I want you to remember that. And those of us who have done well in this country and in our lives have a special responsibility to reach out to try to help those who have not done so well and to tell them that at election time their vote counts just as much as ours and can make the kind of America we want to leave to our children.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:30 p.m. at Spago's Restaurant. In his remarks, he referred to the following Rock the Vote officials: Dan Adler, chairperson and reception host, and his wife, Jenna;

Jeff Ayeroff, founder; Hilary Rosen, board member; Ricki Seidman, former executive director; and Donna Frisbee, acting executive director. He also referred to Wolfgang and Barbara Puck, owners of the restaurant.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Los Angeles, California

November 16, 1997

Well, thank you, *chaver* [friend]. [*Laughter*] Actually, I learned how to do that—you know, that's just the way we say it in Arkansas; what can I say? [*Laughter*] Walk into any redneck bar on the weekend—[*laughter*]—that's the way we talk.

Thank you, Haim. Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for being here. I'm, first of all, delighted to see you all, and I want to thank you for your presence here and for your support. And I want to thank you for having us in your beautiful home and your beautiful tent. [*Laughter*] I used to say, when I was on the stump running for President, I wanted to create a big tent in America that we could keep everybody in. And I think we've almost achieved it tonight. [*Laughter*]

You mentioned Yitzhak Rabin, who was my great friend, and we sadly observed the second anniversary of his death just a few days ago. And I've only been through this twice, but the two anniversaries of his death that I have observed, both times I remember exactly where I was and exactly what I was doing when I heard that he had been shot, and I remember exactly what I did waiting for the news of whether he lived or not. So I've thought a lot about what it was to me that made him so special, because we had a relationship that was one of the most important things that ever happened to me in my life. The thing I liked about Rabin was that he was tough as nails, but he had a great heart and a great imagination. And he understood that the status quo would not work for Israel, and therefore he was prepared to make changes, even though they carried risks.

In a less dire way entirely, that is the general choice that has faced America for the last few years, because when things begin to change in a society, if you want to hold on to your basic values—you can't hold on to your basic values by holding on to old conditions. In order to hold on to your basic values, you have to change conditions; you have to change your approach; you have to be open to new things and even open to taking risks.

Six years ago, when I decided to run for President, I did it basically because I thought that we were not changing fast enough and that we didn't have a strategy about how we were going to get into the 21st century. We were talking about the revolution in telecommunications and software and other things around the table tonight—they are really metaphors for the breathtaking changes that are going on in the way Americans work and live and relate to the rest of the world. And if we want to preserve what is best about America, therefore, we have to be the most aggressive change agents in the world. That is the premise on which I began to seek the Presidency 6 years ago.

I thought the only way to restore opportunity and responsibility and a sense of community in this country was to basically have new ideas that were relevant to a new time. And so we set about doing that. And the people of California were kind enough to vote for Vice President Gore and me and to give us a chance to serve, and we changed the economic policy of the country. We went from trickle-down economics to invest-and-grow economics. We changed the National Government's approach to crime and focused on police, prevention, as well as punishment. We changed our approach to welfare and focused on requiring work but also supporting children. We aggressively embraced the environmental policy designed to facilitate economic growth by improving the environment.

And we did a lot of other things. We tried to take on what I think is a central challenge for almost every family in America today, even quite well-to-do families, even though it's tougher for poor families, and that is, nearly every person I know with young children can cite at

least one example where they have felt a conflict between their obligations at work and their obligations to their children. And our society is not sufficiently organized to enable people to succeed at work and at what is everybody's most important job, which is raising good children. It is still the most important work of every society, and we have given no thought, really, or very little thought as a country to what our national approach ought to be to making sure that no one had to give up being a good parent in order to be successful at work.

So these were some of the challenges we tried to take on. I also have been concerned all my life, but particularly in the last few years, about how we could bridge our old divides of race and deal with all the incredible manifold new diversity coming into our society, respecting that diversity, even celebrating it, but still saying, these are the things which unite us as Americans. We can have one America, no matter how kaleidoscopic we get. As a matter of fact, the richer, the more diverse we get, we can even be stronger as one country.

And finally, I was quite concerned that the temptation would be very great at the end of the cold war for the United States to lay down the responsibilities of world leadership, and I was worried that there would be a vacuum at the very time when we had enormous opportunities in terms of trade and the economy to bring people together and to reinforce democracy, and we had enormous new responsibility. Just because there is no cold war and the threat of two great countries annihilating each other and half the rest of the world with nuclear bombs is receding, we see a whole new set of threats from terrorists and weapons of mass destruction, from international criminal cartels and drug traffickers, and potentially over the next few decades, from more international diseases, infections traversing national borders. Particularly, it will become more pronounced if we have dramatic changes in the global environment. So we needed a new approach there, and so we set about trying to change all these things and a number of others I haven't mentioned.

Five years later, thanks largely to the work of the American people but not unrelated to these changes, we've got the strongest economy in a generation, the lowest crime rate in 24 years, the biggest drop in welfare in history; the air is cleaner; the water is cleaner; there are fewer toxic waste dumps; and our food is safer.

We have made a beginning on trying to deal with the conflicts of work and family by passing the family leave law and by providing special tax breaks for people to finance college education, for parents with young children, and for adoption, which is a very important issue to a number of you in this room and also to me.

We're about to expand health care coverage to 5 million more children in working families who don't have it. We're moving the country forward. We have fought back our worst impulses to divide the country over immigrants and over race, and I hope we'll be able to take on a whole range of other issues as I continue this initiative of racial dialog that I started here in California a few months ago.

The nuclear threat has been reduced. We've been a positive force for peace in Bosnia and Haiti and Northern Ireland and in the Middle East, troubled though the peace process is today. And we have begun to bring the world together, I think, around a shared approach not only to our common opportunities through trade and economic cooperation and dealing with common concerns over human rights but also in dealing with these terrorist problems and other related problems.

So I think it's a very different country today than it was 5 years ago, and I am very gratified for all the people who have helped. So the first and most important thing I'd like to say tonight to all of you is, thank you. I think it is very important that you understand there is a direct connection between the decisions people make in elections, the policies that are put in, and the consequences that flow. And the system we have today requires us to be able to raise funds so that we can communicate.

I would very much like to see campaign finance reform passed. I've worked hard on it. We've tried for 5 years. The forces that benefit from the present system keep trying to keep it, but I will say this, too—and a lot of you—I'm sure that Lew Wasserman has probably been contributing to campaigns as long as anybody in this room—would say the escalating costs of campaigns is like the escalating costs of making movies or the escalating costs of anything else. You don't raise the money and then look for something to throw it at. The costs go up, and you raise the money to meet them.

So if we're going to have meaningful campaign finance reform, we also have to have a meaningful way to lower the cost of candidates communicating with the electorate, through free or reduced air time for people who accept spending limits and other things like that.

But you ought to be proud tonight that you have played a role in moving your country to a better place over the last 5 years. You also ought to know that we are nowhere near done, for two reasons. One is that a lot of things still need to be done. The second is that the American people are almost evenly divided, or they go first one way and then another, between what I think are the two dominant governing philosophies today, represented by the two parties.

My philosophy is that the Government should be smaller and less bureaucratic but should be strong enough to create the conditions and give people the tools to make the most of their own lives, and that there are things that are very important for us to do as one America. Even though we often agree on things, the Republican philosophy is that Government is basically the source of our problems and it would be better if there were less of it, even if there is more inequality and more unfairness. And I don't agree with that. I've done everything I could to lift the burdens of Government from the American people but to bring the benefits of our common endeavors to moving the country forward. And as you see in all these elections that are genuinely contested, it's a near-run thing. The American people are still trying to work this through as we define what it means to be an American and what America means as we move into a new era.

I can only say this, in addition to thank you: You should all be very excited to be alive now, and grateful, because we have the chance—the chance—to give not just our country but the world the 50 best years in all of human history, in terms of freedom from genuine fear of extinction, elevation in material conditions, resolution of a lot of our most difficult problems, if we work together and we really work at it.

And in terms of the difficulties, they always attend this level of change. And every time this country has gone through a change, we've had a big debate about what America means. We had a big debate in the beginning about what America means. A lot of people in the beginning thought America meant a bunch of States that basically had to put up with a National Government so we could have a common currency and some trade rules and we could raise an army if anybody ever threatened us; otherwise, go away and leave us alone.

Then, because our Constitution said all people were created equal, but slaves were three-fifths people, we had another debate about what America means that led to the great Civil War. And we said, no, America means all people are created equal. And it changed the politics of America for another 40 or 50 years.

Then the industrial revolution came on, and we had another debate about it. And Theodore Roosevelt first, then Woodrow Wilson, said this can't be America—to say, "Yes, we want to have these great factories rising up, but we don't want 9-year-olds working 12-hour days and 6 days a week in factories; that's wrong. It's a good thing to get all the resources we can out of the land, but we ought to save our national parks; we ought to save our natural resources. We owe something to our grandchildren and to their grandchildren."

When Franklin Roosevelt came in and one in four Americans was out of work and he had to face the threat of Hitler, we had to redefine again what the role of America was. The same thing happened in the civil rights crisis. That's what's going on today, and you should be very excited to be a part of it.

You know, when I became President, the Internet was still the province of physicists. It is now the fastest growing human organism in all of history. While we've been having dinner, there are probably a million new sites on the Net. Things are happening at a pace and in a way, in dimensions we could never imagine before. This is good. It's basically a good time.

But there are challenges we have to face. I'll just mention a few of them. We've got the budget balanced. We've reformed Medicare for the next 10 or 12 years; it's going to be fine. We have not fully come to grips with the implications of the retirement of the baby boomers on Social Security and Medicare. How are we going to do that? I personally think it's very important to preserve them because of the large number of Americans who would be in a world of hurt if they weren't there. But we have to do it in a way that does not bankrupt our own children as they attempt to raise their children. Can we do it? Of course we can. But we have to do it.

In the area of criminal justice, the crime rate has been coming down for 5 years, but it's not coming down so much among children between the ages of 12 and 18. Most crime by juveniles is committed between 3 in the afternoon and 7 at night, when the parents are still at work or coming home. We haven't thought about how our schools, our community centers, and other things—how should they be organized? If we know that this is when it occurs and we don't really want to jail a lot more kids and we'd like to keep them out of trouble in the first place, we need a national commitment to give these kids the future they need.

We finally got a vote out of Congress for the first time to establish national academic standards and voluntary exams to see whether kids were meeting them, but we still haven't implemented it, and I'll have to fight it every step of the way for the next 3 years. But I'm telling you, it is wrong to let children get out of school without the basic educational skills they need to do well in this modern economy, and we will never overcome our economic and racial problems until we do it.

If you look at the economic changes that are going on and the big argument we had over fast track—which I still think will be resolved in a positive way, for my position, some time next year—when a plant closes, you see it. When trade adds jobs, it's one here, 10 there, 50 the other place. People are traumatized by the churning of the economy even when the unemployment rate is low. Does that mean that we should run away from trade? It's ridiculous. You know, we could try, and it would still happen; we just wouldn't benefit from it. But it is true that no society, no wealthy country in the world has figured out how to get all the benefits of all this economic change and still help the people that are temporarily dislocated to start their lives anew, to be on an equal or better footing and to do it in a hurry.

So the answer is trade more. Get rid of more trade barriers, but do more and do it more quickly to help people that aren't very well suited for this modern economy, in terms of their skills, move into the mainstream again. And we don't have a system to do that. No other country has a very good system either. But we ought to have the best, and we're nowhere near the best. And we can do better, and we must.

In 1994 a lot of people didn't like what I proposed in health care. But I said if we didn't do something, the percentage of uninsured people would go up and, sure enough, it has. So here we are with the world's best medical care and more and more people without any health insurance. We've got to find a way to make health insurance affordable and to emphasize quality care at the same time. Can we do it? Of course we can. But we can't do it by having bogus debates about the things that don't have anything to do with this. We have to have a practical as well as passionate and compassionate approach to this.

And let me just mention one or two other things. I'm convinced this challenge of climate change is real. I have reviewed every document I can get my hands on. I am convinced the climate of the Earth is warming at a rapid rate that is unsustainable. I am also absolutely convinced that the technology is there, or right over the horizon, to enable us to continue to grow like crazy and drastically change the basis of energy consumption in this country to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Every one of us should be concerned about that. That's something we owe to our children and our grandchildren.

Most of us in this room won't live to see a terrible adverse circumstance, in all probability. But turning 6 billion people around cannot be done on a dime. It's going to take 20 or 30 years of hard work. It's the sort of thing democracies aren't very well suited to do. But we've got to be visionary enough and disciplined enough to say, this is a gift we're going to give our grandchildren, and we're going to start now.

The last point I want to make—I don't want to get into the details on this so much—but it is very important that we recognize that our security problems in the future, in all probability, will not be the United States against some other big country. I hope to goodness we can reach a constructive accommodation and partnership with all the major nations of the world. I hope we can build a trading network in the Americas and one with the Asia-Pacific and that we can continue to advance democracy and human rights throughout the world. But there will always be organized forces of destruction that will seek to profit from opportunities in whatever situation exists. The more society becomes integrated around the globe, the more open our borders are; the more we move money and technology and people around rapidly, the more vulnerable we will be to organized crime,

to drug syndicates, to terrorists, and to people who can take advantage of small-scale weapons of mass destruction.

That's why I'm working so hard on this biological and chemical issue. We have got to be firm in making sure that we've done everything we possibly can to set up a system which protects the world from the worst aspects of the new security threats in the same way we worked hard during the cold war to keep the world from being blown up. It is the same sort of challenge; it just will happen in a lot of different places. Can we do it? Of course we can, if we have the vision and the determination to do it.

So I guess what I want to say to you is, this is a great time to be alive, and it is a great time to be a citizen of the United States. It is a great time to be involved in the political process, but don't ever think it doesn't matter. It has serious consequences what you do or don't do, what you're committed to or what you withdraw from. And your presence here tonight I hope at least gives you the satisfaction that you've helped to make America a better, stronger, more unified country than it otherwise would have been. And I hope it will redouble your determination to make sure that when we finish our business here, that this country will be in great shape for the best 50 years in all of human history.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:34 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Haim Saban, chairman and chief executive officer of Saban Entertainment, and his wife, Cheryl; and Lew Wasserman, chairman emeritus, MCA, Inc.

Remarks to Cessna Employees in Wichita, Kansas

November 17, 1997

I think we should give them another hand. They were fabulous, weren't they? [*Applause*] Thank you, Tanya and Jodee. Thank you, Russ Meyer; thank my friend Eli Segal for doing such a great job in getting other companies into this endeavor. Thank you, Michael Starnes, for the incredible support that the United States Chamber of Commerce is giving to this effort.

I thank Secretary Glickman and Secretary Herman and Secretary Cuomo, who is not here, for the work they have done in supporting this endeavor and others like it around America. I'd also like to thank the large number, the unusually large number of public officials who are here today, proving that we come to celebrate a victory for America, a victory of people, not party or politics but an old-fashioned victory for American dignity and possibility, for people succeeding at work and succeeding in raising their children, an old-fashioned reaffirmation that our American dream is still very much alive and well if we all pitch in and do our part. So thank you, Governor Graves, and thank you, Senator Roberts and Senator Brownback, Congressman Tiahrt, Congressman Ryun, Mayor Knight, and the other State officials and legislative leaders and council members who are here. I am very grateful to all of you for being here.

The sign says it's all about people, and I would like to suggest that you consider renaming the 21st Street Campus to the 21st Century Campus, because you really are an embodiment of the future America has to make.

Ladies and gentlemen, before I make the few remarks I'd like to make on this issue, I think it is appropriate, since it's my first appearance of the week, to just give you a brief update on the situation in Iraq. Even when I was walking through here, a number of people asked me about it.

First, it's important that you understand what is at stake here. Since the end of the Gulf war, for 6 years, inspectors, under the authority of the United Nations, have been trying to find and destroy Saddam Hussein's capacity to threaten his neighbors and potentially others around the world with nuclear or biological or chemical weapons. They have found and destroyed more weapons of mass destruction potential in the last 6 years—these quiet inspectors whom no one knows—they have destroyed more

of this potential than was destroyed in the entire Gulf war with all of the air attacks.

What they are doing matters. It matters to you, to your children, and to the future, because this is a challenge we must face not just in Iraq but throughout the world. We must not allow the 21st century to go forward under a cloud of fear that terrorists, organized criminals, drug traffickers will terrorize people with chemical and biological weapons the way the nuclear threat hung over the heads of the whole world through the last half of this century. That is what is at issue.

In his defiance of the international community, Saddam Hussein has forced the withdrawal of the inspectors. Now, I am trying to settle this issue peacefully, but our diplomatic efforts must be backed by our strong military capability. We cannot rule out any options. But the bottom line is, we have to understand this, it is essential that those inspectors go back to work. The safety of the children of the world depends upon it. And I ask for your support.

I told Russ Meyer this morning that before I got my present job, I spent a lot of time flying around the farmland and the mountains of Arkansas in Cessna airplanes. And it occurs to me that for a long time now, Cessna has helped a lot of people take to the air in your planes. Today we come to celebrate Cessna's efforts to help people fly higher all by themselves, and it is a truly remarkable thing.

This program, the partnership between Cessna and HUD, the Labor Department, the city of Wichita, the State of Kansas, provides training because people need it to get good jobs, provides child care—and by the way, I got to visit the child care facility today, so in addition to my model airplane, I have a Lego-constructed giraffe. [*Laughter*] And I think if it's all the same to you, I'll put them both up in the Oval Office so people can see what's going on here. It provides temporary housing, recognizing that a lot of people who have been poor and who have children and don't have transportation to go a long way to work. And most important, it provides a job. Every company in America ought to take notice of what Cessna is doing. It's a model for the Nation. It proves once again that the best social program ever devised is a job, a good job with dignity that allows people to support their children.

Six years ago when I ran for President, I wanted to restore what I always thought was the basic bargain in America that everybody had a right to an opportunity in life if they exercised the personal responsibility that goes along with it. That is the only way we can keep the American dream alive in the 21st century for everyone, and it's the only way we can continue to lead the world for peace and freedom. In the end, it's the only way we can come together across all the differences in our increasingly diverse Nation.

In the last 5 years, as Secretary Glickman said, the American people have made a lot of progress toward restoring that basic bargain. Unemployment is the lowest in 24 years. The deficit has been cut by 92 percent, and now that the balanced budget law is triggering in, it will be even-balanced soon, for the first time in a generation. We see the lowest crime rate in 24 years, the biggest drop in welfare rolls ever, incomes rising and poverty dropping, the environment improving as the economy advances, something a lot of people didn't think was possible. And families are getting more support not only in work but in raising their children and educating them and in meeting all their obligations.

So there is a sense of confidence in this country that you can feel in this room today that we really can make America work for everybody again. You have earned that confidence—you and all the American people—through hard work, a vision for the future, and a willingness to embrace new ideas for new times.

But I will say again, as many on the program have said before, if we're going to make America everything that we want it to be, everybody has got to have the chance at the brass ring in life. And we know that if our free enterprise system is going to work, we're going to have to be able to train people for the areas where there are job shortages, which, by and large, there are areas that pay more.

You already heard our chamber president talk about the shortage of truck drivers. Whatever it's worth, when I was Governor, I paid to train a bunch of them, and I'm proud of it. And we're going to get on that and see what we can do.

We have literally hundreds of thousands of openings in computer-related jobs in America—literally. You've got people out here dying to go to work and jobs over here and a mix-match between them because they haven't done what Cessna has done. Either the training is not there

or the child care is not there or the transportation is not there. There's something keeping people, who are dying to do their part, from getting there.

So that's why we're here to celebrate. The main reason I showed up, apart from the sheer satisfaction of it and the joy, is that sometimes when I show up it gets enough publicity that people find out what you're doing. I don't care if they hear what I say; I want them to see what you're doing so other people will do it.

Now, when I took office I had already been involved with this whole issue of welfare reform for a long time. I became seriously concerned about this in 1980 when I realized what a problem it was. And over the years I served as Governor of my State, I spent quite a bit of time in welfare offices. I spent a lot of time talking to people who had been on public assistance. I spent a lot of time talking to employers who tried to hire people, and when it didn't work out, to try to find out why it didn't work out. And I think that I have learned a fair amount about it, and every good thing I've learned was confirmed here today.

It was obvious to me that if we were going to ever break the cycle of dependence in America, we had to change our approach and we had to change our idea about what the role of Government is. Some people thought that it was inevitable that a certain number of people are always going to be poor and in difficult circumstances. That may be true. Misfortune happens to a certain number of people, and nearly for all of us misfortune will happen to us in some way or another over the course of our lives. But that doesn't mean that the answer was just to keep the status quo, because the status quo wasn't working; giving people a check that didn't even keep up with inflation was not working. Neither was neglect an option. So our governing philosophy has been to try to create the conditions for good economy and then give people the tools to make the most of their own lives and, whenever possible, to work in partnership with the private sector.

In the first couple of years I was in office, we did that by giving over 40 States permission to try their own hand at moving people from welfare to work. Eventually, we were able to agree—the Republicans and the Democrats together by an overwhelming majority in the Congress—to reform the present welfare system, saying that everybody who can work, must work, but also providing support for employers who are willing to hire welfare recipients, maintaining Government support for children's health care and nutrition where necessary, providing extra help to communities with very high unemployment rates, and I think probably most important of all, giving the States some more help to provide adequate child care when people are working for employers that are much smaller than Cessna and perhaps not able to provide that on their own.

The budget I signed into law last summer includes $3 billion for welfare-to-work programs, increased tax incentives for businesses to hire people off welfare. So we changed the role of Government. But that's only the first step. We also have to change the role of the private sector. And again, I cannot say enough about your CEO and all the leaders of this company, all up and down, everybody who has been involved in this program, because you have shown what has to be done.

We know that almost all the jobs in America are in the private sector. I'm very proud of the fact that way over 90 percent of the new jobs created in America in the last 5 years have been in the private sector. The capacity to train people for the jobs that are needed in a given place is in the private sector. But most of all, the necessary vision, mind, and heart to do the job are here. That's why we started the Welfare to Work Partnership. And I asked my friend Eli Segal, who left a very successful business career first of all to help us start our national service program, AmeriCorps, to head up this Welfare to Work Partnership.

Last May, we started with 105 companies at the White House who said they would be a part of this. They pledged to enlist 1,000 companies between May and November. It's November. Now, how have they done? In 6 months, more than 2,500 companies in America have pledged to hire welfare recipients. These companies have over 5 million employees. Some of them are big, like Cessna; 100 of them—or, excuse me, 24 of them are in the biggest 100 companies in America. But 75 percent of them are small businesses. We need all of these companies.

In addition to that, Eli's got an advisory board of Governors which includes 10 Democratic Governors, 10 Republican Governors. Again, this is not about politics or party; this is about people. This has to be an American crusade. More

and more businesses are realizing that this can be a good thing not only for our families and our country but for businesses as well.

And again, let me say, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce launching a campaign to convince every chamber in the country to join the effort is the big next step, because you heard Russ say, we've got 2,500 companies; when we get 10,000, we'll really be talking turkey, and we'll be doing something that will make a big dent in this nationwide.

I am delighted that we've had almost 2 million people move off the welfare rolls since the welfare reform law passed, almost 4 million people in the last 5 years. But, you know, there are a lot more folks out there, and we have to do it. We are going to strengthen the work requirements of welfare reform, but we need to strengthen the support we give to people to meet those work requirements.

Let me just say in closing that I think it was obvious to anybody who was here today that the most popular speakers were Tanya and Jodee. What I want to say to you is, I've been all over the country, and I've met a lot of people who had a setback in life—many of them have terribly abusive situations at home, almost every one of them passionately devoted to the welfare of their children—who thought they would be stuck on welfare forever, and somehow they made it out. And the real idea behind all of this is, if some people can make it but everybody wants to make it, it's up to those of us who have made it, as Russ said, to create a system where everybody who wants to has a shot. Because it's important that we understand, while Tanya and Jodee are remarkable people—and I might add, such good speakers that they might consider public office as a career option in the future—[*laughter*]—they are not alone. Their stories are mirrored by—there is a story in every one of these graduates who stood up here today. When they all stood up and we clapped, every one of them has got a story like their two stories. And what you have to know is, every person out there in America who is in a difficult situation has also got a story and a heart and a mind. And most of them aren't in a program like this now and aren't even close to it.

That's why we're here. If you liked what you saw when they spoke, you would love it if everybody with that story could be standing before a microphone in the community in which they live making the same speech. That is what we're here to ensure. And thanks to Cessna, we've got a lot better chance than we had before.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:20 p.m. at the Cessna Campus Building. In his remarks, he referred to Tanya Oden and Jodee Bradley, graduates of the Cessna welfare-to-work program; Russ Meyer, chief executive officer, Cessna; Eli Segal, president and chief executive officer, Welfare to Work Partnership; Michael Starnes, president, U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Gov. William Graves of Kansas; and Mayor Bob Knight of Wichita.

Statement on the Terrorist Attack in Luxor, Egypt

November 17, 1997

Earlier today, I called President Mubarak of Egypt to offer our Nation's condolences to the families of those killed in the terrorist assault at Luxor this morning. The United States deplores and condemns this attack against innocent tourists. Once again, we are reminded of a painful truth: Terrorism is a global threat. No nation is immune. That is why all nations must redouble our commitment to fight this scourge together.

Statement on Representative Ronald V. Dellums' Decision Not To Seek Reelection

November 17, 1997

Representative Ron Dellums has been an indefatigable advocate in the Congress for the interests of ordinary Americans, in Oakland and throughout the Nation. He has worked hard to secure policies and programs that respond to the needs of poor and middle income families. I have appreciated his strong voice and his effective work for justice and reconciliation, not only here but around the world. He has been a highly forceful leader for our national security, making sure that the vital work of national defense is conducted with a watchful eye on taxpayer dollars.

I thank Ron for his long and effective years of commitment and service to America. The people of Oakland and the Nation owe him a debt of gratitude.

Statement on Representative Vic Fazio's Decision Not To Seek Reelection

November 17, 1997

Representative Vic Fazio has been a strong leader for the American people, a strong advocate for his district, and a good friend to me and my administration. He has served with an unswerving devotion to the national interest. He has been a champion for the environment, for our national defense, for fiscal discipline, and for ensuring that changes in our defense structure after the cold war take into consideration the interest of the communities, like his own Sacramento, that have supported our military. I especially appreciate the work he has done to make sure that America seizes the opportunities of trade and to make sure that the growing global economy benefits all Americans.

Vic Fazio has also been a tireless leader of the Democratic Party in Congress, and a tireless advocate of our party's beliefs. On a personal note, I have greatly benefited from his warmth, his idealism, and his honesty. On behalf of the Nation, I thank him for his dedicated service.

Remarks at a Reception for Senatorial Candidate Jay Nixon in St. Louis, Missouri

November 17, 1997

Thank you very, very much. Thank you for the wonderful welcome. Thank you for letting me listen to Team Eleven—weren't they great? [*Applause*] I wonder if they could come to Washington tomorrow? If they could cheer me up once a day, I'd stay in a better frame of mind as President. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Mayor Harmon for the fine job he's doing and the leadership he's showing and for making me feel so welcome. Thank you, Lieutenant Governor Wilson, for being here; and Missouri Democratic Party Chair Joe Carmichael; St. Louis County Executive Buzz Westfall; all the other officials who are here. And I want to thank Jay Nixon for running for the United States Senate.

I want to thank the people of Missouri for voting for Bill Clinton and Al Gore in 1992 and in 1996. And I want to thank Jay Nixon for getting such a big vote; I could kind of ride in on his coattails. [*Laughter*] I enjoyed that.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a very important election for you. And you should know it's also a very important election for the United States, because policies that are good for the people

of Missouri are also good for the people of America. And when I ran for President—just remember what it was like—unemployment was high; the country was becoming more divided; we seemed to be sort of drifting and stumbling into the future. And I ran to reclaim the basic American values of opportunity and responsibility and community and to reclaim the future for the young people here and throughout our country.

And almost every step of the way, the changes that I wanted to make, new policies and new ideas for new times, were fought bitterly by the members of the opposition party. Even when we finally wound up reaching agreement, it was only after a fight. In 1993, I had an economic plan that I said would bring the deficit down and get the economy going again. They said it would bring a recession, and they all voted against it, every single one of them. And then in '94, they went out and told the country that we'd raised everybody's taxes unconscionably. It wasn't true, but a lot of people didn't know it, and a lot of people hadn't felt the benefits of the economy, so they got a bunch of gains in the Congress. But in 1997, we see that under that plan, before the balanced budget takes effect, the deficit is 92 percent lower than it was when I took office, and we've got the best economy in a generation. Our approach was right, and they were wrong.

You heard Jay Nixon say that he supported us on putting 100,000 police on the street and banning assault weapons and establishing gun-free school zones. Now in 1994, we had a bitter debate in the United States Senate—bitter—on the crime bill. And I was ridiculed by the Republicans because I had signed the Brady bill, because I wanted to ban assault weapons—they said it would do no good; because I wanted to put 100,000 police on the street—they said it would do no good; because I thought we ought to have more prevention programs in our neighborhoods to keep more kids out of trouble in the first place—they said it would do no good. And we had to work and work to break a filibuster led by the members of the opposition party. All I did was listen to police chiefs and prosecutors around the country. The crime bill was a reflection of what people on the street in law enforcement said they wanted. That's all I did.

Oh, in '94, they went all around the country telling people we were going to take their guns away, and they picked up a few seats in Congress for telling people that. We lost a Congressman in New Hampshire; I'll never forget it. In '96, I went back running for President in New Hampshire and I faced all these people. Every one of them, just like my folks in Arkansas, had a hunting license. And I said, "You beat a guy in Congress here in '94 because they told you that we were going to take your guns away, and you voted against him." And I said, "Everybody that lost their guns, I want you to vote against me, too. But if you didn't, you know all we did was try to keep them out of the hands of criminals. They didn't tell you the truth, and you ought to vote for us and send them a message." That's what you ought to do for Jay Nixon, too. They were wrong, and we were right.

And you just take all the other fights. On welfare reform, I wanted to require people who could work to work. Missouri has been a leader in welfare reform. What I did not want to do is to ask people who are poor to go into the work force and do something I don't want you to have to do, which is to sacrifice being good parents. Don't forget, our first and most important job in this country is taking care of our kids. If we all did a better job of that, we wouldn't have half the problems we've got in America today.

So twice I had to veto their welfare reform bill because they wouldn't guarantee health care and nutrition to children, wouldn't put enough money in to give to mayors like your mayor for the very high unemployment areas where there may not be jobs for people, and wouldn't put enough money in for child care. We finally got it right.

Now, what is the result of all this? You now have 5 years—you don't have to vote for this guy blind. You know what his record is, and you know what he's advocating, and you know what his opponent has done. And you just make a simple judgment about what you think is right.

But consider the evidence: They opposed our economic philosophy, and we've got the best economy and the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years. They opposed our crime policy; we've got the lowest crime rate in 24 years. They opposed what we were trying to do in welfare, and I said we would still be able to dramatically lower welfare rolls and put people to work if we took care of children. We've had the biggest

drop in welfare rolls—3.8 million since I took office—in the history of the United States.

And we had to fight to preserve the environmental protections in this country. The air is cleaner, the water is cleaner, the food is safer, and there are fewer toxic waste dumps than there were 5 years ago, but we have had to fight to preserve an approach that says we can grow the economy and improve the environment. And that's what we owe our children. We cannot abandon our commitment to clean up the environment. You have a clear choice.

So I'm asking you to help Jay Nixon, not just tonight with your funds but tomorrow with your voice and for another year. I think it's a pretty gutsy thing for a guy to give a year to run a campaign to try to unseat an incumbent, when we know historically our party has been badly outspent in these kinds of races. You can give him your contributions. You can give him your voice. You can give him a year in which every time you walk into a coffee shop, every time you've got a break at work, every time you're sitting around talking with your friends, you can ask people: What do you want for this State? What do you want for this country? What are the real consequences? What difference does it make who the Senator is? I can tell you, it makes a big difference. He's a good man. I'm glad you're here for him tonight.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8 p.m. in the lobby of the Fox Theater. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Clarence Harmon of St. Louis; Lt. Gov. Roger Wilson of Missouri; and St. Louis County Executive George (Buzz) Westfall.

Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Dinner in St. Louis

November 17, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Jay. Thank you for running. Thank you for being a good attorney general. Thanks for inviting me to dinner. [*Laughter*] Maybe I will come back next Monday. [*Laughter*] I'd also like to thank the owners of this magnificent theater for allowing us to be here tonight and for doing such a wonderful job in restoring it.

I think that when we come here and you see all this beauty and—sort of—your eyes normally just sort of go up, don't they?—and you feel elevated, that's the way you ought to feel about your country. That's the way you ought to feel about your political system. That's the way you ought to feel about your choices as citizens to support people in campaigns.

So the first thing I want to do is just to thank you for being here tonight and for being proud to have the freedom to come here, to contribute to this man's campaign and to what he's trying to do for our country, to take a stand, and to be a part. I hope that when you think about it over the next year, you will be constant in trying to help him get elected and that you will go beyond financial support to talking to your friends and neighbors and doing whatever you can to help prevail. And I hope you will always try to remember how you felt when you walked into this theater tonight. If you can create that kind of spirit among the people of Missouri, I think you'll win the election. And I think you can do it.

Let me say that, as all of you know just from reading the press, this is a rather challenging time for our country, and I don't have anything else to add about what I'm trying to deal with in Iraq than what I've already said. But it has made me a little more reflective even than normal, and I'd like to try to put this race for the Senate in some sort of larger context for you so you can see how I see it and why I came here.

When I ran for President, when I decided to run for President about 6 years ago and I was the Governor of your neighboring State to the south, I was really concerned about the country, not because I was worried about Americans or I didn't think that we could deal with any problem but because we were going through this period of sweeping change with no unifying vision about how we were going to go into the 21st century together, and because we had been

dealing with the impacts of the global economy and increasing technology and changes in the way we work and live for 20 years. Even by the time I ran for President, it had been nearly 20 years since it had become apparent to everyone that there were big changes going on. The average wages of Americans had been stagnant for 20 years. Unemployment was going up, and we were beginning to see tensions, racial tensions, rekindled in America. The economic anxieties, I'm convinced, were the primary driving force in the movements that I faced, that we all faced as Americans to try to restrict opportunity to minorities and to immigrants. And it seemed to me that Washington was making it worse by having the same old debates over and over and over again.

What I wanted to do was to take the values that I was raised with, which I think are the values of the Democratic Party and I hope are the values of America, and tie them to new ideas and new policies for new times, so that we could not just reclaim the White House but reclaim the future for our children; so that we could challenge every American to be responsible and give opportunity to every responsible American; so that we could bring this country together, across all the lines that divide us, into one community; and so that we could continue to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity.

Now, when I went to Washington, thanks to the votes of the people in Missouri and a number of other places, I encountered an atmosphere very different than any I had ever seen as a Governor. I had always had opposition, and we had fought hard, and I welcomed my opposition to the debate. We fought hard over issues. I had never been to a place where they said no before they heard what you were for, a place so dominated by partisanship and old categories and old thoughts and old behavior that I could see that breaking the paralysis was not going to be easy.

But I ask you to consider the decisions that we have made in the last 5 years and the consequences of those decisions and the decisions that still have to be made, and think about how it's going to affect you and your children and your grandchildren, and then you can decide how hard you want to work on this Senate race.

The first thing we had to do was to scrap trickle-down economics. It was a failure. It quadrupled the debt of the country in 12 years. The country was drifting apart. And we put in a new economic policy that I called invest-and-grow. I said, give me a shot; I believe I can reduce the deficit and still have more money to invest in education and technology and our future. And we got our shot by one vote in both Houses. It was the Vice President's incentive; as Al Gore never tires of saying, whenever he votes, I win—[*laughter*]—by the narrowest of margins. Why? Not because the Democrats didn't support me—I received more support from my party than my three previous Democratic predecessors—because every single member of the other party voted against my economic program and railed to high heaven and talked about how it was going to bring a recession, how it was going to be a total failure, told all the American people we were putting these huge tax burdens on them, when they knew that 98.5 percent of the American people were not going to have an increase in their income tax. They knew that we were cutting taxes for more people than we were raising taxes for—mostly hard-working people. Now a family of four with an income of under $30,000 is paying $1,000 less income tax than they would have paid under the system that existed before our economic plan passed.

They knew all that, but they hoped that the people couldn't figure it out by 1994's election and that they wouldn't feel a better economic climate. And they were right about that, and they won a lot of seats in Congress over it.

But now it's 5 years later, and we're in a position to make a judgment. Every single one of them, including Mr. Nixon's opponent, voted no on our '93 economic plan. What did it do? Well, before one dollar kicks in from this balanced budget amendment, we've reduced the deficit by 92 percent, produced 13½ million jobs—a record for this period of time—and we now have the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years. So you have a clear choice there, and you should bring that choice to bear on this race.

On the area of crime, Jay Nixon, as attorney general, supported our efforts to put 100,000 police on the street, to have gun-free school zones, to ban assault weapons. Now, consider what happened: In 1994, I brought the crime bill up. I was an attorney general; I have been working on criminal justice matters for 20 years now. That crime bill was not written by me or by bureaucrats in Washington; it was written

by police officers and prosecutors and community workers who work with young people in trouble all across this country. And all I did was reflect what was already working in many communities to bring the crime rate down.

So I said, "You know, violent crime has tripled, but we only have 10 percent more police officers. Let's put 100,000 police on the street." Our friends on the other side said, "Oh, if you do that, it won't make a lick of difference; it's just a waste of Federal money." I suggested that it was time to pass the Brady bill and not let people who had criminal histories buy handguns. They said, "Oh, it's unenforceable, and it won't do any good." I said, "You know, I come from a big hunting State, but I just don't think the NRA is right on these assault weapons. I never saw a single deer killed with an assault weapon." [*Laughter*] And they said when we passed that, we were going to go out and take everybody's guns away.

We had this bitter fight over this crime bill—pure politics. The whole law enforcement community in the country was on our side. But they were good politicians, and they did everything they could do in the Senate to beat it, everything they could do. A bitter, bitter, bitter filibuster—the awfullest things said you ever heard. And we broke the filibuster, finally, because there were five brave Republicans who stood up and said, "Enough is enough; we're going to go out and vote with the Democrats and try to give our kids a better, safer life."

And so we put 100,000 police on the street. That's what we're doing. We're 3 years ahead—we're 3 years into it; we're two-thirds of the way done; we're ahead of schedule and under budget. And we banned the assault weapons, and we kept over a quarter of a million people with criminal histories or mental health histories or people who were stalkers from buying handguns, who shouldn't have done it. And the crime rate is the lowest it's been in 24 years.

Now, he took one position; his opponent took another position. You have evidence; you know. Make a judgment, and tell the people who live in Missouri to make a judgment. But don't pretend that there are no consequences to this vote. There are consequences. And we could have used another vote or two in 1994 when we were trying to save the lives of the children in this country. This is a safer, better country today because we won that fight and they lost it. And I'd like to have some more help when we deal with the issues that are still ahead of us.

Juvenile crime hasn't dropped as much as crime among adults. Most juveniles commit crime between 3 and 7 in the afternoon. We have to do some creative things to keep those kids out of trouble in the first place, and we don't need any more speeches on the floor of the Congress about how it's a waste of money to try to keep kids out of trouble in the first place. I'd rather keep a kid out of trouble than send another kid to jail, if we can do that. And I think we ought to do it. So we were right, and they were wrong.

In 1994, they picked up a lot of seats in the Congress. They went out there and told people in rural areas and all over America, "You know, President Clinton and the Democrats are coming to get your guns." I told the group earlier, I said I went back to New Hampshire, where I won in '92—unusual for a Democrat—and I went to this crowd of people, and every one of them had a hunting license, and they were looking at me kind of funny. [*Laughter*] And I said, "You know, in 1994 you people beat a Congressman up here because he voted to ban assault weapons. And they told you that you were going to lose your gun. And now it's 1996, and if you lost your gun I want you to vote against me, too. But if you didn't lose your gun, they didn't tell you the truth, and you need to get even." [*Laughter*] My vote in New Hampshire in 1996 was 12 percent higher than it was in 1992. [*Laughter*] And they got even.

I say that not for personal reasons but because there are consequences to this. There are a lot of voters out there that think, oh, it's all politics; it doesn't make any difference. That's bull. It does make a difference, and it makes a huge difference. If we had lost that economic fight in 1993, the deficit would not have gone down by over 90 percent and the economy wouldn't have produced 13½ million jobs and interest rates wouldn't have gone down. If we had lost that crime bill in 1994, we would not have as much success with crime as we've had today, the lowest crime rate in 24 years.

Or look at an area where we've worked together on. We got a big bipartisan majority for welfare reform finally, and I'm grateful for that and I appreciate the fact that the members of the other party worked with us on it. I tried every time I could to get a bipartisan resolution. But I had to veto two bills first because they

said, "If you want to require people on welfare to work, we also want you to take away from their children the guarantee that you want to leave them with, of nutrition and health care. And we don't want to give you a lot more money for child care, even though these women are going to get minimum-wage jobs and they can't afford child care. And we're not going to give you very much money to help people in big cities, where there aren't any private sector jobs, find jobs." So I vetoed the bill twice. Finally, we got it. But it would have been a tragedy if we hadn't passed the right kind of welfare reform.

We've now seen the welfare rolls drop by 3.8 million in America, the biggest drop in American history. But I think our side was right on that. The Democratic position was, yes, require able-bodied people to work, but do not require them to abandon their children. The most important job anybody ever has is being a good parent. And if everybody did a better job of that, we wouldn't have half the problems we've got in this country. You can't ask people to go to work and forget about their responsibilities at home. The trick is to allow people to fulfill both those responsibilities. And the parties had different positions on that.

There are huge differences in our attitude toward the environment. Look, we have gotten rid of more regulations than the two previous Republican Presidents have. We have given more authority to the States and local governments. We've even privatized more Government operations. I do not like Federal bureaucracies. The Federal Government is 300,000 people smaller than it was the day I took the oath of office. It's the size it was when John Kennedy was President.

But the air is cleaner; the water is purer; the food is safer; there are fewer toxic waste dumps. And I think we have established the fact that on the environment, our philosophy is right and theirs is wrong. Their philosophy is, we hope somebody will clean up the environment, but nothing should be allowed to get in the way of short-term economic gain. My philosophy is, we owe it to our children and our grandchildren to keep the environment and improve it. And we have proved that you can grow the economy faster with new technologies if you're committed to cleaning up the environment. It's a clear choice, and let's not pretend that there is no choice there. There is a choice there.

So I've enjoyed these fights enormously. [*Laughter*] I like to debate; I like to argue. But I am impatient with those who think it doesn't make a difference. It makes a difference. And when I think about how far this country has come in the last 5 years and what we still have to do to build our bridge to the 21st century, when I think about the honest differences—I don't want to get into condemnation here, I'm talking about the honest differences in the parties—I know that a person like Jay Nixon could make a positive contribution to the people of Missouri and the people of this country. And I know that it would help in the fights we've still got ahead of us.

We finally—finally—succeeded, against intense opposition, in convincing a bipartisan majority of the Congress to embrace the elemental notions that it's high time in America we had some national standards of academic excellence and we quit putting kids out of school that can't read, write, and count; and instead, we give the schools of our country the trained teachers, the technology, the support they need, but there has to be, first, high expectations, high standards, and high measurements to see if they're being met. Every child in this country is capable of learning, but I'll guarantee you, a child in difficult circumstances with low expectations won't. And it's to the poorest children that we have the highest obligation to give a world-class education.

Now, I'm not trying to have the Federal Government take over education. Their argument was that the Federal Government should keep its mouth shut about education, maybe write a check. My argument is, we put more money into education in this last budget than any Presidency and any administration in 35 years, but it's not a question of money. It's money plus standards. It's a big issue. And I could give you—if we had all night, I could talk to you all night about the differences between our parties. It makes a difference. A Senator's vote makes a difference.

Last year they held all these judges hostage, in an election year, hoping against hope I'd get beat and they wouldn't have to appoint them at all. This year, I had a 4-year term; they still only confirmed 35 judges—slow walk and everything. It's like pulling teeth.

One of the finest people you ever met, this man, Bill Lee, that I've nominated to head the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, a Chinese immigrant raised in Harlem, devoted his entire life to the civil rights of people of all colors in this country. The Senate Judiciary Committee says they don't really think they should confirm him, even though he has sworn to uphold the letter of the law, even though he is unquestionably qualified—intellectually, in terms of experience and moral character—because he agrees with me that we shouldn't just throw out all affirmative action.

This is an unusual position they're taking: The President must appoint someone to the Civil Rights Division who is not committed to civil rights in the way the President is. Now, if the Democrats had felt that way, you wouldn't have half the people on the Supreme Court that are on there today. If the Democratic majority in the Senate had done a Republican President that way, you wouldn't have that.

There are differences in terms of what we do and how we do it. That's why I'm here tonight. I'm telling you, the next 50 years can be the best years this country ever had. If I told you 5 years ago, come back in 5 years and we'll have the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years, the lowest crime rate in 24 years, the biggest drop in welfare in history, and the environment will be improving even though the economy is growing, you would have said, "I'll take that bet." And you'd be darn proud of it. And if I said, "Oh, and by the way, we'll have passed the family and medical leave law, we'll give families tax cuts for their children and for their children's education, and if they'll adopt other children that need a home, we'll cut their taxes," you would like that. All that has happened because of choices that have been made. And I believe the direction that our party has taken has led the way toward building an American future where we can go forward together.

That's the last thing I'll say. Just look around the theater on your way out. How do you want to feel about America? How do want to feel about American politics? Do you want to make it lift your eyes and you feel big and you want to take a deep breath? Or do you want it to be a mean-spirited, divisive, demeaning, diminishing experience? I have tried to give this country a unifying vision. I have tried to heal the divisions of the country. I have tried to minimize the sharpness of the partisan debate. But I am prouder tonight to be a Democrat than I was 5 years ago. And I am prouder tonight because I know things I could never have known before I became President about the importance of every single solitary vote in the United States Senate.

He is a good man, and if you will work for a year, you'll make him a Senator.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 p.m. on the stage at the Fox Theater. In his remarks, he referred to Leon and Mary Strauss, owners of the theater; and Mr. Nixon's opponent, incumbent Senator Christopher S. Bond.

Joint Statement on U.S.-Kazakhstan Relations

November 18, 1997

During their November 18, 1997 meeting in Washington, D.C., Presidents Clinton and Nazarbayev underscored the special importance they attach to the close and productive relationship between the United States and Kazakhstan.

Deepening this partnership is key to promoting Kazakhstan's security, independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and democratic development, as well as the stability and economic prosperity of the region as a whole.

The two Presidents restated their strong commitment to the goals set forth in the "Charter on Democratic Partnership Between the United States of America and the Republic of Kazakhstan," signed by the two Presidents in February 1994. Recognizing the growing economic and commercial ties between the two nations, the two Presidents expressed their strong support for the "Action Program on Economic Partnership," signed in Washington, November 18, 1997, by President Nazarbayev and Vice

President Gore, in their capacity as co-chairmen of the U.S.-Kazakhstan Joint Commission. Kazakhstan's commitment to accelerate reform, as outlined in the Action Program, will advance the development of a free market economy and underscores the great potential benefits of investment in the country's natural resources and industrial infrastructure. The United States is committed to support economic reform in Kazakhstan through a robust program of technical assistance and cooperation.

The two Presidents noted the important role played by U.S. commercial firms in Kazakhstan's economy since 1991. Extensive U.S. investment in the development and transport of Kazakhstan's energy resources has particularly contributed to the mutual goal of rapid energy development in the Caspian region.

Presidents Clinton and Nazarbayev agreed on the need to adopt a Caspian Sea legal regime that establishes a clear division of property rights based on the division of seabed resources. The construction of multiple pipeline routes to export hydrocarbons to world markets, including pipelines across the Caspian Sea, will advance economic development in Kazakhstan and promote regional stability and security.

The two Presidents agreed on the need to strengthen regional cooperation, including through the establishment of an east-west Eurasian transport corridor and stronger efforts to resolve the environmental crisis in the Aral Sea basin.

President Clinton welcomed Kazakhstan's efforts to integrate itself into the global economy and pledged continued U.S. support for Kazakhstani accession to the World Trade Organization, on commercial terms generally applied to newly acceding members.

The two Presidents reviewed Kazakhstan's progress towards creating a society based on democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights. President Clinton expressed strong support for the holding of free and fair parliamentary elections in 1999 and presidential elections in 2000, which will serve as a demonstration of Kazakhstan's commitment to democratic principles.

Presidents Clinton and Nazarbayev noted the positive evolution of defense cooperation between the United States and Kazakhstan, as well as the continuing progress in Kazakhstan's integration into emerging European security structures, including NATO's Partnership for Peace and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. The successful CENTRASBAT–97 peacekeeping exercise that took place in September 1997 is a concrete example of cooperation aimed at promoting regional stability. The two Presidents renewed their commitment to regional security cooperation, including enhanced bilateral military-to-military cooperation, as reflected in the Defense Cooperation and Military Contact Plans for 1998, signed during President Nazarbayev's visit.

The two Presidents praised the extensive U.S.-Kazakhstani cooperation on issues related to non-proliferation of nuclear and non-nuclear weapons. During President Nazarbayev's visit to Washington, agreements were signed on Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation, Defense Cooperation on Counter-Proliferation, and Long-term Disposition of Aktau BN–350 Nuclear Material, among other agreements.

President Clinton welcomed President Nazarbayev's firm commitment to prevent the transfer of technology and materials associated with weapons of mass destruction, and sophisticated military technologies, to countries that pose a threat to regional and global security. The United States and Kazakhstan agreed to establish a regular experts' dialogue on non-proliferation issues.

The two Presidents also discussed the serious threats posed by international terrorism, narcotics trafficking, and international criminal activity and committed their governments to expand cooperation in combating them.

NOTE: The related memorandum of November 17 on the Kazakhstan-U.S. agreement on peaceful nuclear cooperation is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Statement on Signing the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

November 18, 1997

I am pleased to have signed into law today H.R. 2160, the "Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998."

The Act provides $13.6 billion in discretionary budget authority for programs of the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration. These programs include the Special Supplemental Feeding Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); food safety programs; efforts to reduce children's access to tobacco products; and various programs to protect and support rural communities.

The Act provides a total of $35.3 billion for the Food Stamp program, the Child Nutrition program, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and other mandatory programs.

I am disappointed that the Congress failed to provide the full amount of my requested increase for the WIC program in order to reach a full participation level of 7.5 million women, infants, and children. Full participation in WIC is one of my highest priorities, and the funding level that this Act provides does not assure that we can achieve this goal in FY 1998.

I am concerned about the provision of this bill that alters the administration and funding for research on nutrition programs serving the poor and disadvantaged. The research needs of these important programs should continue to be addressed in the context of the programs' administration. I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture to look into this matter and to work with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on the most effective approach to address my concerns.

I am pleased, however, that the Act includes nearly all of my request for the Food Safety and Inspection Service. The funding provided for meat and poultry inspection will ensure adequate inspection coverage and allow the agency to further implement the modernization of the inspection system that I announced on July 6, 1996. I am also pleased that the Act provides almost all of the requested level for my Administration's food safety initiative and the requested level for our efforts to reduce children's access to tobacco products.

In addition, the Act provides significant increases in rural development programs to improve the quality of life in rural America and help diversify the rural economy. The Act also includes a portion of my proposal to create a Rural Development Performance Partnership, which will provide greater flexibility to tailor Federal assistance to local needs, reflecting my Administration's belief that there is no "one-size-fits-all" solution to the economic challenges facing rural areas. I will continue to seek authority to utilize the full flexibility that was authorized for these programs in the 1996 Farm Bill.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 18, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2160, approved November 18, was assigned Public Law 105–86.

Teleconference Remarks to the Council of Jewish Federations

November 18, 1997

Thank you. And ladies and gentlemen, I have been told that because I was a few moments late, that Dore Gold filled in for me, and that's a pretty good substitute. I want to thank him as well.

It's an honor for me to be able to speak to the Council of Jewish Federations General Assembly and to all of you who are watching your local federations over the CJF satellite network. I'm pleased to know that Connie Giles, Joel Tauber, Billie Gold have convened this general assembly to further the proud tradition of the Jewish federation system, and I trust that

my good friend Jeff Smulyan is being a gracious host in his hometown of Indianapolis.

Six years ago, when I announced my candidacy for President, I said that I had a vision for America in the 21st century—a vision that would put us on a mission to keep the American dream alive for every person who is responsible enough to work for it, to continue to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity, and to bring our own people together, across all the lines that divide us, into one America.

We've worked hard to advance this vision here at home, thanks in great measure to the volunteer efforts of groups like CJF and Jewish federations all across our Nation. I share with you the deep belief that the strength of our society is the product of our active commitment to one another. Volunteer organizations are the glue that hold our communities together, and I've worked hard to make sure the National Government sticks by you as your steadfast partner. If not for Government support, Jewish federations and other groups would have to drastically scale back their health and human service efforts. We must never let this happen.

We also know we can't allow Congress to deny charities and other not-for-profit groups the right to take a stand on public issues. It would lessen our democracy if you were deprived of your voice, for your voice has given strength and support to millions of other Americans. For example, as we worked to enact a balanced budget, you made sure we did it in the right way. You spoke out on behalf of legal immigrants; together, we restored critical health and disability benefits that had been taken from these groups unfairly. You spoke out on behalf of older Americans, and together we protected and strengthened Medicare and Medicaid. And I'm very grateful for your voice and your support.

I would also like to thank you for your support of our administration's effort to expand peace and stability in the Middle East and around the world. We must never give in to the forces of destruction and terror. We must never give up on promoting peace. Our law enforcement officials went halfway around the world to bring to justice the man responsible for the cold-blooded murder of Americans outside the CIA Headquarters. The World Trade Center bombers are going to jail for a long, long time. Saddam Hussein cannot be allowed to expel international weapons inspectors because we cannot accept another dictator with weapons of mass destruction.

And I want to reiterate to you my solemn and personal commitment that we will continue to press forward on all fronts to redeem the promise of the peace process in the Middle East. The road to peace is never easy, but with confidence and determination and patience, let us continue to travel that road.

Let us also work together to expand religious freedom around the world. Hillary, just a few minutes ago, returned to the White House from her trip to Central Asia, Ukraine, and Russia, where she visited several centuries-old synagogues and met with members of Jewish communities that have reemerged after years of oppression under Soviet rule. These visits highlighted our strong conviction that the transition of peaceful democracy requires a deep commitment to religious, cultural, and ethnic tolerance.

And I know all of you believe that tolerance of difference is no less important here at home. We've overcome many of the challenges that our grandparents and great-grandparents faced when they arrived on these shores, but we still have a lot of work to do to bring all of us together into one America.

So in addition to what you do day-in and day-out to help America seize the opportunity inherent in our diversity, I ask for your help in two other important priorities. First of all, let me urge you to stand up for Bill Lann Lee, my nominee to head the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department. He is the son of immigrants who has dedicated his entire life to fighting discrimination in all its forms. I've nominated him because I think he's the best person in the country to do the job, and no one—no one—has questioned his ability, his experience, or his integrity. He is being held up for political reasons on the dubious proposition that he shouldn't head the Civil Rights Division because he agrees with the President on the issue of affirmative action.

Second, I ask you to participate in our historic race initiative. For many decades, members of the Jewish community have marched side by side with Americans of other faiths and races, fighting for civil rights and racial reconciliation. So I ask you to urge your member federation and coalition partners to convene townhall meetings and find other ways of bringing people together across racial lines to address common concerns. Please help to promote the interaction

that allows us to celebrate our differences and still recognize the overarching values that unite us all.

Ninety years ago, Israel Zangwill coined the term "melting pot" in his play about a young Jewish composer in New York. In that play, he beautifully summed up the promise of our Nation. He said, and I quote, "The palm and the pine, the pole and the equator, the crescent and the cross. Here shall all races and nations unite. Here shall they come to labor and look forward."

I thank you for what you have done over this past century to unite us and to keep us looking forward. And at the threshold of a new century, I look forward to working with you to keep our beacon shining brightly for all the world to see.

Congratulations on your successful general assembly. Again, thank you for all the support that you have given to our efforts and, most especially, thank you for what you do every day to reflect the best in our country and the best hope of the world.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:21 p.m. by satellite from Room 459 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Dore Gold, Policy Adviser to Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel; Conrad Giles, president, Council of Jewish Federations; Joel Tauber and Billie Gold, cochairs, 1997 Council of Jewish Federations General Assembly Planning Committee; and Jeffrey H. Smulyan, chairman and chief executive officer, Emmis Broadcasting.

Remarks to the Democratic Business Council

November 18, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Tom. Steve Grossman, Alan Solomont, and all the people who worked on this dinner tonight, thank you very much for being here.

I have just returned from a great trip to California. I stopped yesterday in Wichita, Kansas, at the Cessna plant, and I saw there a picture of why I got into public life. So, I thought I would start by telling you what I did. We wanted to go to Wichita to the Cessna plant because they have what I believe is the best corporate welfare-to-work program I have ever seen in America, and because they have support from any number of Federal agencies who are helping them to do what they're trying to do.

Cessna has about 10,000, 11,000 employees in Wichita, and they have this program called the 21st Street Program, where they built a training center for people who have been on public assistance. First, if you want to come there, you go through their training program; that's 3 months. Then if you like it, you go through a sort of prework program; that's 3 more months. If you survive them both, they guarantee you a job with good income and good benefits.

And they take the most difficult to place people on welfare—people who have almost no education, no skills, people who have been subject to terrible cases of domestic abuse. And not only that, if you don't have a car or if you've been beat up in your own home, they'll give you an apartment across the street from the training center for yourself and your kids.

I went there, and two of these women got up and talked who had graduated from this program. And there were over 200 there who had. And there were all the local officials, all the State officials in this incredible celebration of this partnership, doing basically what we all ought to do anyway, trying to make sure that everybody has a chance in life—once you set up a system where people are required to be responsible, you've got to give them an opportunity—and recognizing that our destinies are dependent upon one another in very profound ways. It was wonderful.

And when I walked out of that place—the two women that spoke to introduce me were by far the most popular speakers there, I can tell you that, and they just basically told their life stories. And this lady came up to me and she—on the way out, I shook hands with all of the people who were graduates of the program. She said, "You can read about me in the morning paper today, and I'm really glad

you came." So I pick up the paper, and this woman is a single mother with three kids of her own and two twins she took in, trying to raise five kids—a high school dropout, abandoned by her husband, desperate. All of sudden, she finds this program; she's got a place to live; she's got a training program; she's got a future.

That's why I got into public life, to do things like that. And I say that because there is a direct connection between your presence here and what we're able to do in the lives of people in the country. And it often gets lost. And I think it's a real shame.

Most of you who come to a Democratic fundraiser do so not in the hope of getting a tax cut, you probably—when you help the Democrats, you just hope you don't get a tax increase. [*Laughter*] Most of you who come to help us come here because you believe that we are obligated to one another, that we have a sense of mutual responsibility for the future. And you have kind of a large and expansive hope for what people can achieve if they work together to bring out the best in each other. That's probably the driving distinction between us.

But I want you to understand that there is a connection between your sitting here and what I'll be doing tomorrow, and then how somebody will be affected by it out in the country within a week or a month or a year or sometime down the road.

I was thinking about it sitting at dinner tonight. You know, when I became President I said, "Look, I've got a simple strategy here. I want to create opportunity for everybody who is responsible enough to work it. I want us to come together, across the lines that divide us, into one America. I want us to continue to lead the world for peace and freedom. I want a Government that is less bureaucratic but gives people the tools and the conditions they need to make the most of their own lives. That's what I want to do."

We started with an economic program that not a single member of the other party voted for. Instead, they sounded like Chicken Little. They said, "If you pass the President's economic program, the sky will fall; the end will come; the deficit will explode; unemployment will increase."

Well, 5 years later, they're out there able to brag that they voted for a balanced budget. The only reason they could do it is that we had reduced the deficit by 92 percent before the balanced budget law ever triggered in, because of what we did in 1993 with our Democrats. And it was the right thing to do for America.

Five years later, we've got the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years. Look at the crime issue—same thing. I couldn't ever figure out what was going on in Washington on the crime issue when I lived out there in the country. It appeared to me that what happened was, when crime got high and things got hot and heavy, that Congress just passed a bill and increased penalties for everything in sight. But it had been a very long time since anybody had done anything to help people on the streets, either catch criminals or keep people out of trouble in the first place.

So I gave the Congress a crime bill that was essentially written by police officers, community leaders, and prosecutors: 100,000 more police; prevention programs for kids; punish people who are truly bad actors; take the assault weapons off the street; don't let people with criminal and mental health histories buy a handgun. That's what we did. It was pretty simple. It was a police officer's bill.

We had a bitter, bitter fight in Congress. The leaders of the other party fought us. We got a few Republican votes for the crime bill, unlike the economic bill, but they were precious few. And we had to break an angry, angry filibuster in the Senate—all these, you know, omnibus things—we were throwing money away; these police would make no difference; the Brady bill would make no difference, the assault weapons ban would make no difference.

All I know is we've now put 65,000 of those 100,000 police out. The Brady law kept over a quarter of a million weapons out of the hands of people with criminal and mental health histories. The assault weapons ban is good—nobody needs an assault weapon to go deer hunting, and I ought to know; I'm from a place where people do a lot of it. And I just moved last weekend to try to stop people from running through a loophole that's so big you could drive a truck through it in sending assault weapons back into the United States from foreign places of manufacture disguised as sport weapons.

But anyway, you know, they'd say it wouldn't make a lick of difference. All I know is the crime rate has gone down every year for 5 years, and we have the lowest crime rate in 24 years. And if you talk to the police officers of the country, they believe it's because of the ideas

advanced by the Democratic Party and supported by the Democratic Party.

There are people alive today because we did not cave in one more time to the people who didn't want the Brady bill, who didn't want the assault weapons ban, who didn't want to do anything different on crime. They wanted to talk tough; they liked to do that. But when it came time to step up and do something that the police and the prosecutors and the community leaders said would work, the Democrats were there.

Look at the welfare bill. I get sick and tired—I get so tired of hearing our friends in the Republican Party and some of our friends in the press say, "Oh, the President caved in and signed the Republicans' welfare bill." It's a load of bull. And no one could say it and mean it and be honest unless they just didn't understand how the welfare system works.

The bills that they passed, I vetoed. And they passed another bill, and I vetoed it again. They passed a third bill, and I signed it. Why? Because I believe we ought to require able-bodied people to go to work. It didn't particularly bother me that we were ending the national guarantee of a monthly welfare check and letting the States set the guarantee, for the following reason: We have in effect had a State-set guarantee for 25 years, something I never read in any article. Before the welfare law passed, the most generous State in the Union paid a welfare family of three $655 a month; the most tight-fisted State paid the same family $187 a month, under the so-called "uniform Federal law." There was no uniform Federal law on the check.

But I'll tell you what was uniform: food and medicine for the kids. So I said, "If you want me to sign a law requiring people who can work to go to work, leave the kids with food and medicine. You try to take that away, I'll veto it." They did, and I did. And I said, "If you want to make these people go to work, don't make them be bad parents; give me some money for child care. Give me some money to create jobs for people in the high unemployment areas."

And we worked it out, and I signed the bill. It was a great bipartisan bill, it had overwhelming bipartisan support, but the only reason I could get that bill and that I didn't get overridden on my veto was that the Democrats said, "Require people who are able-bodied to go to work, but don't make them give up on their kids. Don't do anything to their kids." We stood for that, we made it stick, and we made a difference.

And when we did it, there were people on the other side who said, "Well, it won't be as effective now." All I know is that there are 3.8 million fewer people on welfare than there were the day I took office—the biggest drop in welfare in history—largely due to the fact that we have a good economy and the right kind of welfare reform system.

I could give you lots of other examples. The first bill I signed was the family and medical leave law, vetoed twice by my predecessor. The leaders of the other party thought it was an undue burden on business to say that, even for larger employers, that a person ought to be able to take a little time off when a child was sick or a parent was dying. But I've had more ordinary citizens come up to me personally all over this country and thank me for the family and medical leave law than any other thing that I've been involved with as President.

And I personally believe it ought to be expanded to cover regular trips to the doctor and a couple of trips to school a year, because one of the biggest challenges we face as a nation is balancing the demands of work and family. Nobody should have to choose between being a good parent and successful at work, because the most important work of any nation is raising children. And if we do that right, most everything else takes care of itself.

So I say that there's a direct connection between your presence here and the 12 million people that have taken advantage of the family and medical leave law; the 8.5 million people whose pensions we saved; the 13.5 million people who have jobs; the 10 million people who got an increase in their minimum wage; the 5 million children who are going to get health insurance coverage for the first time now under the new balanced budget law; the countless number of people who will now have a real tax cut to help them pay for the cost of college tuition; all the children that are going to get computers and software and better instruction in their schools because we said we're going to hook up every classroom and library to the Internet by the Year 2000. There's a connection between your support and that happening.

These things do not happen by accident. They happen because parties with philosophies and choices have the power to make those choices

and bring them to the American people and get them done. And I must—you know, I've been criticized by some in my own party—I like to work in a bipartisan fashion. I'm always happy to reach agreement. But when the tough work had to be done on the deficit, our party did it alone, and 92 percent of the deficit was gone by the time the balanced budget law passed.

When the tough work had to be done on crime and someone had to stand up to the special interest groups that have kept us from doing things we should have done years ago, our party did it almost alone. And when someone had to remind people that welfare was not just a way to punish poor people, it was a way to support work and family, it was the people in our party who supported me, saying, yes, require people to go to work but, no, don't hurt their kids. They gave us the right kind of law.

When there was a wholesale assault on the environment, when people in the other party—they honestly believed this. I'm not attacking their character, I'm attacking their judgment here. They honestly believed that most of these environment laws and rules and regulations caused a lot more trouble than they were worth, and that they were a terrible impediment to the economy. I honestly believe the right sort of environmental laws grow the economy because they accelerate the movement into new technologies, into new fields and dealing with new challenges. That's what I believe; I've always believed that. And I think that we permit the degradation of our environment at our peril. I think it's an obligation we owe our children.

Well, 5 years later, the air is cleaner; the water is cleaner; the food supply is safer. We have more to do, but it's safer. We have fewer toxic waste dumps, and the economy is the best it's been in a generation. I think our idea that you can grow the economy and preserve the environment was the right idea. I think the assault they waged on the environment that we stopped them from raising was ill-advised and unnecessary. And I think now we have 5 years of evidence.

So when you go home tonight, I want you to think about those folks I talked to you about in Wichita. I want you to think about all of the millions of people whose lives have been changed for the better by the policies that we've implemented, and I want you to realize there's a direct connection between the fact that you were willing to stand up and put your voice on our side, put your contributions into our efforts, and give our side a chance to be heard. You made that all happen. That's what the public system we have in America is. That's what it means to be a citizen.

And as you look ahead, I really believe that our country has the 50 best years facing it that any society has ever known if we do the right things—if we do the right things. We've still got a lot of challenges out there—economic, educational, entitlement reform, environmental challenges—a lot of things. But we have to keep our eye on the ball. We should do those things which create opportunity and reinforce responsibility. We should do those things which bring us together as one community—celebrating our differences, but identifying those values that are even more important that bind us together.

We should do those things that reinforce our role as a beacon of freedom and hope and prosperity and security in the world. That's what we should do. That's what the Democratic Party stands for, and that's what you have stood for. I am very grateful and I hope you will always be very proud not only that you were here tonight but that you have contributed to changing the face and the future of this country.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 p.m. in the Ballroom at the ITT Sheraton Luxury Connection Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to C. Thomas Hendrickson, chair, Democratic Business Council; and Steve Grossman, national chair, and Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner
November 18, 1997

Thank you. Thank you very much for being here tonight. I won't take a lot of time because I want to just sit and visit. But I would like to just begin with a story.

Yesterday I was in Wichita, Kansas, coming back from California, and I visited the Cessna airplane manufacturing facility—not the plane facility but their training facility for people they're trying to move from welfare to work. And we went there for a number of reasons. One was to announce that we now have 2,500 businesses who have committed to be part of our partnership to hire people from welfare and put them into the workplace. These 2,500 businesses are small, medium, and large. Seventy-five percent of them are small businesses, but combined they have over 5 million employees.

The other reason I went there is because the way this Cessna project works is the way I'd like to see America work, not only in this issue but a lot of others. They receive support for a number of the things they've done from the Labor Department and from the Housing and Urban Development Department, and of course they have the framework of the welfare reform bill. But here's what they do: They go out and take people—many of them the hardest to place people on welfare—and they put them through a 3-month training program. And then if they go through that, they put them through a 3-month sort of pre-job program. And if they get through both, they get an automatic guaranteed job at Cessna at high wages and good benefits.

And some of these people have very, very difficult home circumstances. They're not just—they're not taking the most well-educated people who just temporarily hit a bad patch and get on welfare. A lot of these folks are high school dropouts. Many of them are women who have been abused in a domestic setting. And they actually have a housing development across the street from the training center to give temporary housing to anybody who either doesn't have a car or has been kicked out of their house because of a violent situation.

And I'm telling you, it was the most exhilarating thing. I was introduced by two women who graduated from this program, and then I met their children. And when it was all over, I looked at the man who was with me and I said, "This is why I got into public life: to be a part of things like this, to change lives in this way, to do something that works."

And of course, having a good economy has helped. They have 1,000 more employees than they had 4 or 5 years ago. But the main thing is, it's fresh evidence that we can make the country work if we do something that makes sense and we do it together and it's consistent with our values.

So for all of you who have made any contribution to the fact that we have the lowest unemployment rate and the lowest crime rate in 24 years and the biggest drop in welfare in history, and we've grown the economy while making the air and water cleaner and the food supply safer and having fewer toxic waste dumps, that we've built more jobs but tried to help families with the family and medical leave law and tax cuts to raise their kids or adopt children or send their kids to college—I hope you'll take a lot of pride in that.

We've got a lot of challenges up the road, but at least no one in America could doubt today that we can make this country work and that when we make it work for everybody, you see the kind of profoundly humbling and awesome stories I saw in Wichita yesterday.

I'd also like to remind you that elections are contests of ideas and perceptions. And I think in a rational world, where everybody had equal access to the voters, our party would be in better shape than it is today, because in '93 we had a big fight over the economic direction of the country, and I think the evidence says we were right and they were wrong. But they profited from it.

In '94 we had a big fight over our crime policy, and we stood up to the people who said I was going to take their guns away if we passed the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. And I think the evidence is, we were right and they were wrong.

I think the evidence is our environmental policy, our education policy, our family leave policy—all these things, I think, our party has been on the right side of history and on the right

side of the basic values of America. And I think the more people like you help us to get our message out and make our points, the more you'll change America and the more, parenthetically, people will know who did what, when, and why.

So there is a direct connection between what I saw in Wichita yesterday and your presence here tonight. And we have to make a lot more of those stories in the future. And I'm very grateful to you for your role in doing that.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:44 p.m. in the Chesapeake Room at the City Club of Washington.

Statement on Signing the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998

November 18, 1997

I have signed into law H.R. 1119, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998." This Act authorizes fiscal year 1998 appropriations for military activities of the Department of Defense, military construction, and defense activities of the Department of Energy. Although I have reservations about some provisions in this Act, it supports a large number of my Administration's defense program and policy priorities. Moreover, the conferees' revision of the bill satisfactorily addresses several onerous provisions that were included in previous versions that my Administration opposed.

This Act provides for a strong national defense, maintains high military readiness, supports our commitments to a better quality of life for our Armed Forces and their families, and authorizes investment programs necessary to modernize the equipment that our forces use. By providing the necessary support for our forces, it ensures continuing American global leadership.

The Act demonstrates that we can maintain a robust defense while achieving a balanced Federal budget. It supports a wide range of quality of life initiatives, including a 2.8 percent military pay raise, an increase in aviation officer career incentive pay, a doubling of the aviation officer career retention bonus, and increases in hazardous duty pay and the family separation allowance. I am also pleased that this Act provides resources to support most of the recommendations of the Department of Defense's Quadrennial Defense Review. In particular, it supports major procurement programs, such as the F–22 and V–22 aircraft, central to modernizing our forces for the 21st century.

The Act also provides strong support for the Chemical Demilitarization Program, crucial for implementing the Chemical Weapons Convention for which the Senate provided advice and consent to ratification earlier this year. It also provides the President new authority to call up 30,000 volunteers from the Individual Ready Reserve for active duty. This gives the Secretary of Defense greater flexibility in tailoring reserve call-ups and enables him to make greater use of the unique skills found in the Individual Ready Reserve.

I am very disappointed, however, that H.R. 1119 imposes restrictions on the Department of Defense's ability to contract with the private sector for the maintenance of weapon systems and components. Both the Quadrennial Defense Review and the Defense Reform Task Force recommended relief from current laws that constrain the Department's efforts to competitively outsource depot maintenance workload. By further restricting, rather than facilitating, such competitive outsourcing, the Act will limit the Department's flexibility to increase efficiency, preserve readiness, and save taxpayer dollars. The Act also changes the terms under which public-private competitions for work at closing maintenance depots can be conducted. Some of these changes should prove helpful, but other changes will likely make the Department's job more difficult. Nevertheless, the Secretary of Defense has indicated that the Department has flexibility to proceed with the remaining public-private competitions in a way that is fair to both sides. The Secretary has pledged to implement the Act so as to encourage all bidders, public and private, and to do everything possible

to ensure that the competitions occur on a level playing field. Such an approach will achieve my Administration's goals of strongly supporting our military forces while providing savings that can be applied to the modernization of our forces.

The Act also attempts to severely limit the President's flexibility to conduct foreign policy by mandating permanent controls on the export of certain high-performance computers to specific countries, including Israel, Russia, and China. It would limit the President's ability to adapt computer export controls to changing security needs and technology trends. The Act would impose unrealistic congressional notification, licensing, and post-shipment requirements that would have the unintended effect of decreasing our ability to identify and prevent exports affecting national security. My Administration intends to work with the Congress to pass legislation that would restore the President's flexibility on computer export controls and allow us to concentrate on preventing exports of real national security concern.

Other provisions of H.R. 1119 raise serious constitutional issues. Because of the President's constitutional role, the Congress may not prevent the President from controlling the disclosure of classified and other sensitive information by subordinate officials of the executive branch (section 1305). Because the Constitution vests the conduct of foreign affairs in the President, the Congress may not dictate the President's negotiations with foreign governments (section 1221). Nor may the Congress place in its own officers, such as the Comptroller General, the power to execute the law (section 217). These provisions will be construed and carried out in keeping with the President's constitutional responsibilities.

Finally, I am disappointed that the Act did not authorize the additional two Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) rounds that the Secretary of Defense requested. The Quadrennial Defense Review and the Secretary's Defense Reform Task Force both concluded that the Department of Defense is burdened by the excessive cost of maintaining a base infrastructure much larger than is required to support our Armed Forces. The money spent maintaining that infrastructure is badly needed for modernization of aging weapons and equipment so that our forces remain the world's best in the 21st century. I call on the Congress to support the Department of Defense request for additional BRAC rounds.

In summary, though the Act raises some concerns, it strengthens our national security by supporting my Administration's plans to modernize and prepare our Armed Forces, advances the quality of life for our forces, and helps assure continued American leadership.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 18, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 1119, approved November 18, was assigned Public Law No. 105–85. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 19.

Remarks on Signing the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997
November 19, 1997

Thank you, Sue Ann. Thank you, Aaron. And I want to thank the Badeau family for showing up. I think it's fair to say it was a greater effort for them than for anyone else here. [*Laughter*] I appreciate the rest of your presence. It was easier for me than anybody; I just had to come downstairs. [*Laughter*] But I'm grateful that they're here.

Secretary Shalala, I thank you and your staff for your remarkable work on this. And I thank the members of the White House staff, all the Members of Congress who are present here. And especially I thank Senators Rockefeller and Chafee and Congressmen Camp and Kennelly for their work and for what they said here.

Congratulations to the Adoption 2002 Excellence Award winners. I thank all the advocates who are here. And I say a special word of thanks, along with all the others who have said it, to the First Lady, who has been passionately committed to this issue for at least 25 years now that I know. Thank you, Governor Romer,

for coming. And thank you, Dave Thomas, for what you've done.

Again let me say to all the Members of Congress who are here, Republicans and Democrats alike, I am very grateful for what you've done. This, after all is what we got in public life for, isn't it? [*Applause*]

Before I make my brief remarks, if you'll forgive me and understand, I have to make one public statement today about the situation in Iraq.

As I have said before, I prefer to resolve this situation peacefully, with our friends and allies, and I am working hard to do just that. But I want to be clear again about the necessary objective of any diplomacy now underway. Iraq must comply with the unanimous will of the international community and let the weapons inspectors resume their work to prevent Iraq from developing an arsenal of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. The inspectors must be able to do so without interference. That's our top line; that's our bottom line. I want to achieve it diplomatically. But we're taking every step to make sure we are prepared to pursue whatever options are necessary.

I do not want these children we are trying to put in stable homes to grow up into a world where they are threatened by terrorists with biological and chemical weapons. It is not right.

It's hard to believe now, but it was just a little less than a year ago when I directed our administration to develop a plan to double the number of children we move from foster care to adoptive homes by the year 2002. We know that foster parents provide safe and caring families for children. But the children should not be trapped in them forever, especially when there are open arms waiting to welcome them into permanent homes.

The Adoption and Safe Families Act, which I am about to sign, is consistent with the work of the 2002 report and our goals. It fundamentally alters our Nation's approach to foster care and adoption. And fundamentally, it will improve the well-being of hundreds of thousands of our most vulnerable children. The new legislation makes it clear that children's health and safety are the paramount concerns of our public child welfare system. It makes it clear that good foster care provides important safe havens for our children, but it is by definition a temporary, not a permanent, setting.

The new law will help us to speed children out of foster care into permanent families by setting meaningful time limits for child welfare decisions, by clarifying which family situations call for reasonable reunification efforts and which simply do not. It will provide States with financial incentives to increase the number of children adopted each year. It will ensure that adopted children with special needs never lose their health coverage—a big issue. Thank you, Congress, for doing that. It will reauthorize Federal funding for timely services to alleviate crises before they become serious, that aid the reunification of families, that help to meet post-adoption needs.

With these measures we help families stay together where reunification is possible and help find safe homes for children much more quickly when it is not. We've come together in an extraordinary example of bipartisan cooperation to meet the urgent needs of children at risk. We put our differences aside and put our children first.

This landmark legislation builds on other action taken in the last few years by Congress: the adoption tax credit I signed into law last August to make adopting children more affordable for families, especially those who adopt children with special needs; the Multiethnic Placement Act, enacted 2 years ago, ensuring that adoption is free from discrimination and delay, based on race, culture, or ethnicity; and the very first law I signed as President, the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, which enables parents to take time off to adopt a child without losing their jobs or their health insurance.

We have put in place here the building blocks of giving all of our children what should be their fundamental right—a chance at a decent, safe home; an honorable, orderly, positive upbringing; a chance to live out their dreams and fulfill their God-given capacities.

Now as we approach Thanksgiving, when families all across our country come together to give thanks for their blessings, I would like to encourage more families to consider opening their homes and their hearts to children who need loving homes. You may not want to go as far as the Badeaus have—[*laughter*]—but they are a shining example of how we grow—they are a shining example of how we grow when we give, how we can be blessed in return

many times over. We thank them and all—all of the adoptive parents in the country.

For those who are now or have been foster or adoptive parents, I'd like to say thank you on behalf of a grateful Nation, and again say at Thanksgiving, let us thank God for our blessings and resolve to give more of our children the blessings they deserve.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:53 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Sue Ann Badeau, who introduced the President, and her adopted brother Aaron, 2 of 19 children adopted by parents Sue and Hector Badeau; Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado; Dave Thomas, founder and senior chairman of the board of directors, Wendy's International, Inc. H.R. 867, approved November 19, was assigned Public Law No. 105–89.

Statement on Signing the Veterans' Compensation Rate Amendments of 1997

November 19, 1997

Today I was pleased to sign into law H.R. 2367, the "Veterans' Compensation Rate Amendments of 1997."

Our Nation provides compensation payments to veterans who were disabled in service and Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC) benefits to the survivors of those who died in military service. By maintaining the real value of these payments, we honor their sacrifices.

This Act provides a 2.1 percent increase in compensation and DIC benefits, effective December 1, 1997. This increase is the same percentage increase that Social Security beneficiaries and veterans' pension recipients will receive in January. Approximately 2.3 million veterans and over 300,000 surviving spouses and children will benefit from this increase.

Time will never erode the supreme value of our veterans' and servicemembers' efforts in defending the Nation's freedom. We also must not allow it to erode the value of our commitments to them. This legislation ensures that the worth of their richly deserved benefits keeps pace with consumer prices. As such, it maintains our obligation to those individuals whose sacrifices we will always remember.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

November 19, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2367, approved November 19, was assigned Public Law No. 105–98.

Statement on Signing District of Columbia Appropriations Legislation

November 19, 1997

Today I am pleased to have signed into law H.R. 2607, the "District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1998."

I am particularly pleased that the Act provides sufficient funding to implement the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Revitalization Act), which includes the main elements of the plan for the District of Columbia that I proposed in my 1998 budget in February. That plan, which was the most comprehensive plan that any Administration had ever proposed for the District, was designed to achieve two goals: to revitalize Washington, D.C., as the Nation's capital and to improve prospects for "home rule" to succeed. The Congress adopted the Revitalization Act as part of the historic balanced budget agreement that I signed into law last summer. Now, with this 1998 appropriations bill, the

Congress has provided the funds to implement it.

The Act also drops several of the objectionable micro-management and other provisions in the original House-passed version of the bill such as Federal funding for private school vouchers, the requirement to reopen Pennsylvania Avenue, the limitation on public assistance payments, the prohibition on Treasury borrowing authority for the District, and restrictions on the District's authority to make improvements in its financial management system.

The Act continues to contain abortion language that would prohibit the use of Federal and District funds to pay for abortions except in cases in which the life of the mother is endangered or in situations involving rape or incest. The continued prohibition on the use of local funds is an unwarranted intrusion into the affairs of the District.

In addition, the Act makes important changes to last year's immigration bill by offering more generous treatment to Central Americans than was available under that bill. These changes make good on the pledge I made during my trip to Central America last spring. Nevertheless, I have several concerns. First, I am troubled by the differences in relief offered to similarly situated persons. I believe, however, that these differences can be minimized in the implementation process. I therefore am asking the Attorney General to consider the ameliorative purposes of this legislation and the unique history and circumstances of the people covered by it in giving effect to its provisions. Second, I believe that similar relief should be made available to Haitians and will seek a legislative solution for this group. Finally, I ask the Congress to revisit its decision to continue to apply some of the harsher rules under last year's immigration bill to other persons with pending immigration cases who are not covered by H.R. 2607. I commend to the public my statement of November 14 for a further discussion of these issues.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 19, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2607, approved November 19, was assigned Public Law No. 105–100.

Remarks at the Ecumenical Breakfast
November 20, 1997

Thank you very much, and welcome to the White House. I am delighted to see you all. Let me say that we do want to talk about the obligation imposed on all of us to secure a future in which all of us are a part.

But in light of developments in the last day in Iraq, I would like to say just a word about that. The meeting of the foreign ministers last night in Geneva strongly reaffirmed our unanimous position: Saddam Hussein must comply unconditionally with the will of the international community and allow all the weapons inspectors back to Iraq so they can get on with doing their jobs without interference. After that meeting, he said he would do that. In the coming days we will wait and see whether he does, in fact, comply with the will of the international community.

I just want to reiterate that the United States must remain and will remain resolute in our determination to prevent him from threatening his neighbors or the world with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons. This is an issue that I hope will become even more important to all Americans and a greater subject of discussion. We must do that. That is the duty we have to our children.

Now, let me say I look forward to these meetings every year. I have done, I think, one or two breakfasts like this every year I've been President. And even though we're discussing a kind of public issue today, I get a lot of personal solace out of this, and it always helps me sort of to put things back in perspective. And to give you an idea of how badly we in Washington need things put in perspective here, I got a cartoon out of The New Yorker magazine that is a doctor talking to a patient. You might imagine that the patient is anyone who spends 60 hours a week or more working in this city. The

doctor is talking to the patient and he said, "Before we try assisted suicide, Mrs. Rose, let's give the aspirin a chance." [*Laughter*] I wouldn't say that you're the aspirin—[*laughter*]—you will alleviate even that, I think.

I'd also like to thank so many of you for the work you've done with us on public issues: on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and after the Supreme Court struck it down, on the Federal Executive order I issued, going as far as I could with my executive authority to apply the principles of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to Federal employees. I thank those of you who worked with Secretary Riley and the Justice Department on the very important work we did to try to clarify the lines of religious expression for students and teachers in our public schools. That, I think, did a great deal of good, and I know that Secretary Riley recently had a summit of religious and education leaders in St. Petersburg to talk about what can be done within the schools to promote racial harmony and to raise performance.

I thank you for the work that many of you have done with us to support the cause of religious freedom around the world. That has become, I think, a very significant issue for many of you in this room and many Americans. And of course, it's still a very important issue—regrettably, it's an important issue in many nations around the world and one that we have to keep working away at.

I also would like to thank you for some of your—some of you have been involved in the America Reads program. I know that the church Hillary and I attend here in Washington regularly has 45 volunteers. I got the newsletter just the other day and the pastor noted that I was not yet one of them. [*Laughter*]

Many of our religious groups are working on the Welfare to Work Partnership. We have 2,500 private companies now in that effort who have pledged to hire people from welfare to work, and they're doing a marvelous job. But very often the houses of worship provide incredibly important services for families and children in transition efforts. This is working. We have 3.8 million fewer people on welfare than we did the day I became President, about almost 2 million fewer people since I signed the welfare reform bill a couple of years ago. And because of the way the system works, our States have even more money now to spend on education and child care and job placement and other supports, which makes the opportunity for people who care about the poor in our society who today are disabled from entering the mainstream of American life that much greater, to make sure that even the people that we thought hardest to place could succeed.

Today I do want to talk about our racial initiatives. When I started this, a lot of people said, "Why are you doing this? There's not any riot in the cities." There are some examples of racial discord; we know a fair number of the church bombings—or burnings appear to have been racially motivated. But people said, "Well, why are you doing this?" I think that it is a sign of strength if a society can examine its problems before they become a festering sore that people who are otherwise uninvolved have to face. I also believe that one of our obligations in this administration, as we bring this century to a close and begin a whole new millennium, is to think about those things which we will be dealing with for the next generation, those things which, if we respond properly, can change the whole texture of life in America for the better.

And also, just because there's not any civil discord that's apparent doesn't mean we don't have a lot of serious problems. If you look at the fact that juvenile crime has not gone down nearly as much as crime among adults, if you look at what's happening to the exploding prison population in America and the racial implications of that, if you look at the fact that we still have disparities among our various racial groups in the credit practices of banks and the access to higher education and the earnings in the workplace and the increasing relationship of that to success as young people in education, it is clear that our attempt to keep making progress toward the American dream requires us to make progress on the issues of race and all those that are related.

And if you look back over the entire history of America, we started with a Constitution that we couldn't live up to—just like none of us live up perfectly to the Holy Scriptures that we profess to believe in. And our whole life as a nation has been an effort punctuated by crisis after crisis after crisis, to move our collective life closer to what we said we believed in over 200 years ago. And that kind of change always requires spiritual depth, spiritual resources, spiritual conviction. After all, we said all men are created equal, but you can't vote

unless you're a white male landowner. I mean, that's where we started. We're a long way from that today. And we saw all the efforts to move beyond all those barriers very often in spiritual terms.

So where are we today? Well, first of all, America has become markedly more diverse racially. And that means we're becoming markedly more diverse culturally and in religious terms, as well. Today, Hawaii is the only State in which no racial group is in a majority. But within a few years, our largest State, California, with 13 percent of our population, will not have—even Americans of European descent will not be in the majority there. Within probably 50 years, but perhaps sooner, there will be no single racial group in a majority in the entire United States.

Now, the scholars have said for 200 years that America was not about a race or a place, it was about an idea. We're about to find out. [*Laughter*] And we had best be ready. Across the river here in Fairfax County, Virginia, is one of the 5 school districts in America with children from over 100 different racial or ethnic or national groups—180 different national and ethnic groups in the Fairfax County School District. Their native languages number 100. We want them all to learn to speak and to read and to function in English and to be able to do very well in school and to be able to make a contribution to our American way of life.

And as I said, it has religious implications. I attended—right before I was inaugurated this last time, I went to a Southern Baptist church service, early service on Sunday, where the minister was a man from Arkansas who had been a friend of mine there. And he said, "This is a little different from the church I had in Arkansas." He said, "I've got a Korean ministry here. I have so many Korean members. And I have to run an English as a second language course in the church every night." And of course, most of the people who come here from Asia are not Southern Baptists. [*Laughter*] I mean, some may think that's—Reverend Dunn said, thank God. [*Laughter*] I'm sure he's the only one of you not seeking to increase his flock. [*Laughter*]

But this changes things—this changes things. Things that are deeply embedded in the culture, for example, of the African-American church, elemental aspects of American culture that in some ways made African-Americans, even in the midst of their oppression, the most socially cohesive of Americans, thanks to the African-American church, will be foreign to a lot of the new Americans that are coming in here not part of that tradition, not being caught up in it.

How will they react if they're subject to systematic discrimination? How will they react if they can't get a loan at a bank, even though they're honest and have a record of honesty and success? How will we deal with all these things, and how we can avoid it? And most of all—and a lot of you are involved in these things—how we can get our children, early, to know that they can live in a different way, and in so doing, to teach their parents—which we see over and over and over again can have a very valuable impact.

Well, these are just some of the things that I wanted to mention, and we'll talk about it after breakfast. But the fundamental issue is, we know what we're going to look like; the demographers can tell us that. But they can't tell us what we're going to be like. That's a decision we have to make. And I am persuaded that we will be an infinitely better, stronger nation if that decision is informed by, driven by, embraced by, and advanced by people of faith in our country. And so that's why I asked you here today, and I thank you very much.

Now I would like to invite Dr. Thomas White Wolf Fassett to give the invocation. Then I would like for you to enjoy breakfast, and we'll have a discussion after breakfast.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:23 a.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to James M. Dunn, executive director, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs; and Dr. Thomas White Wolf Fassett, general secretary of the Board of Church and Society, United Methodist Church.

Remarks Announcing the Health Care "Consumer Bill of Rights and Responsibilities"

November 20, 1997

Thank you very much, first of all, Peter, for your outstanding remarks and the power of your example. And I accept your offer to play golf. [*Laughter*]

I thank all the Commission members and the members of the staff for a truly remarkable piece of work. And I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to Secretary Shalala and Secretary Herman, who cochaired the Commission and who, I believe, did a remarkable job, and I thank you very much. I thank the Vice President for his work in overseeing this effort and for his concern.

This whole health care issue is very personal to me and to our family, to the First Lady. When I was running for President, I met person after person after person who had a cost, a quality, or an accessibility issue with the health care system. But long before that, as a Governor in what my opponents used to call a small southern State, I had the great gift that representing a small population gives you, of knowing a high percentage of the people who hired me, from all walks of life and all social strata, from all different circumstances. And I just kept—I had such ambivalent feelings. I could see in my own State that we had the finest health care system in the world. I saw miracle after miracle after miracle, I saw person after person given a chance to reconstitute his or her life, and then all these terrible problems arising from the cost or the quality or the accessibility issues.

So we've worked very hard on them. The Vice President mentioned the quality issues. I would also like to say, this has been a very good year across the board for American health care. In the balanced budget bill we have $24 billion to provide health insurance to another 5 million children, about half of those who don't have health insurance—something that has become very important because the number of uninsured Americans has continued to rise since 1993. Ironically, even as the percentage of people in the work force eligible to purchase health insurance with the involvement of their employers has gone up, because of price the coverage has gone down.

We had a significant step in reforming the Medicare program to add many years of life to the Trust Fund and provide more choices, including preventive care to Medicare recipients and earlier tests for mammographies for younger Medicare-eligible women. We had what the American Diabetes Association called the most significant advance in the care of diabetes since the discovery of insulin 70 years ago, in this bill. In a day or so, I'm going to sign the bill reforming the Food and Drug Administration and its procedures. The FDA, I might point out, has already won an award for its groundbreaking work in accelerating the approval of drugs while continuing to meet safety standards to try to increase the availability of possibly life-saving medication more quickly.

So a lot of good things happen. Yesterday I signed an adoption bill which was the product of an overwhelming bipartisan consensus in Congress which will revolutionize adoptions, including adoptions of children with special needs, which also will have a terrific health impact on some of the most vulnerable children in this country. So I want you to see this Commission's work against that backdrop. There is an emerging consensus in America that while people may not have wanted to bite the whole apple at once in 1994, almost the whole populace wants to keep nibbling away at the apple until we actually have solved the problems of cost, accessibility, and quality for all responsible American citizens.

What this Commission has done today with their health care consumer bill of rights is a truly extraordinary thing—all the more extraordinary because the Commission actually represents all walks of life and all the different financial equities in the health care debate in America. And again, let me say, I thank you very much. We will be much closer to making these rights reality for every American because of the courage of the Commission and because of the composition and the broad experience of the different Commission members.

Throughout our whole history, our strength has come from our families, from our individual

citizens, from our continuing commitment to redefine and expand the parameters of opportunity and freedom, and at the same time, to do it in a way that brought us closer together as a society instead of dividing us further. Those values were in America's Bill of Rights, and they are certainly in this health care consumer bill of rights.

Today, our families face so much change, and of course the changes in the way we work, the way we live, the way we relate to each other and the rest of the world are quite profound. I think, in a major way, the mission of our administration here must be to try to help America prepare for these changes so that we can expand the opportunities they present and adequately meet the challenges they present, and so that we can go forward together.

Health care is changing dramatically, as we all know. The Vice President detailed some of those things. And we have worked hard to help people deal with these changes. Now, there are still particular problems that plainly require specific solutions. Millions of Americans have seen their health plans convert to HMO's and new kinds of health insurance. In many cases, managed care does bring lower costs and improved preventive care. And the health care industry, I believe, as a whole truly shares our goals of improving quality. And I have never been one who believed that improving efficiency involved the sacrifice of quality and, often, not even a sacrifice of quantity.

Our administration has reduced the size of the Federal Government by 300,000, eliminated a few hundred programs and several thousand pieces of regulation, and I have yet to have a single American citizen come up to me and say, why did you get rid of this or that. So we believe that you can have efficiency and improve quality and often improve the sheer volume of service as well. That's one of the things that technology makes it possible for us to do.

Still, I think it's fair to say that almost every family feels some insecurity at the scope and pace of change in the world, including the scope and pace of change in the health care industry. And very often people feel actually lost because they have come up against this change in a way that is, to be charitable, not positive.

There are so many people in this country that because of these changes feel like they're always going to be on the losing end of cost-cutting and quality issues in every sector of life, maybe even where they work, and they certainly are most frightened of it when it comes to health care, even more frightened than when it comes to their own job, I think, because with the unemployment rate being low and real flexibility in American labor markets, Americans have proved that they are incredibly resilient at getting new jobs. And increasingly, those new jobs are as good or better than the ones they lost, something that was not true just a few years ago. But when it comes to health care, you can't be sure of that kind of recovery, and no matter how much confidence you have in your own resilience, somebody else has got to help you.

So even as we are trying to give Americans more job security in a changing environment by keeping unemployment low and intensifying our efforts to help people if they do lose their jobs to get better skills and find a job that is as good or better, we have got to recognize that the elemental insecurity that a loss of confidence in the quality, the accessibility, or the affordability of health care can breed in our society is staggering. The flip side of that is that if we can address those concerns, the increased confidence people have in the stability of the society as it affects their family and their lives will make them immeasurably more able to deal with the challenges of technology and globalization and change that no one can repeal.

So I don't think it is possible to minimize the peripheral impacts, positive impacts of having the right kind of consumer bill of rights in health care and how much it will do to the sense of stability people feel on the job; how much it will do to increase employee productivity when they're not worried about their husband or their wife who got cancer 3 years ago, or if they're not worried about what's going to happen if their kid is in a car accident, like Peter was. If they know that at least they're going to have the best chance they can get, it will have a terrific impact to stabilize and sort of harmonize our society in ways that I think will be immensely positive for the economy. And obviously, the business leaders on this Commission agree.

Now, consider the consumer protection issue in the larger context. Today, Americans receive consumer protection when they purchase cars, use credit cards, buy toys for their children. All this Commission is recommending is that we extend that kind of protection when a person

visits a doctor, checks into a hospital, or buys into a health plan. Whether it's traditional health care or managed care, we have to make sure it's not inferior care. There are basic standards that I believe every American should be able to count on wherever they live, whatever their needs. Those standards ought to be the right of every citizen.

Here is what the health care consumer bill of rights says: You have the right to be informed about your health plan in plain English. You have the right to choose the right doctor for the right type of care; the right to medical services in an emergency wherever and whenever the emergency arises; the right to know all your medical options, no matter how much they cost; the right to respectful care and equal treatment at every health care facility by every health care provider; the right to know your medical records are confidential and only used for legitimate purposes; the right to express your concerns about the quality of care you receive and to take action when that care is inadequate.

This consumer bill of rights, as has already been said, is the product of a broad consensus from a broad group of business leaders and health insurers, working people and health advocates, doctors and nurses. There are still those who oppose it, and that is their right. But this is a case where the national interest must prevail over the narrow interest, where the family's interest must prevail over the fear of change.

I ask those who are afraid, on the other side, to balance in their equation the fear that has been in the hearts of all the Americans who have confronted the health care system without this consumer bill of rights. We all have to bear our fair share of the uncertainty of change if we are all going to feel secure in the face of the future. And that seems to me to be the best argument that we can take to those who do not yet agree that this is the right thing to do.

These protections, in fact, are long overdue, and now we have to act to make them real for all Americans. Some will require Federal standards to be implemented. Where they do, I challenge Congress to make them the law of the land. There will be no more important test in the coming months of our commitment to strengthen our families. And I look forward to working with Congress.

You heard the Vice President say there's broad bipartisan support for moving forward here. But we shouldn't wait for Congress to act, especially when it's not necessary. So today I am acting within my power as President to implement the rights to the extent that I legally can. I'm directing every Federal agency that administers or manages health plans to adopt the protections of the consumer bill of rights, and to report back to the Vice President about where they need legislation to do so. With this step, we can ensure better quality health care for tens of millions of Americans, including all Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries and all Federal employees. And I challenge all private health plans to adopt the consumer bill of rights voluntarily, to give their members greater confidence and security.

In that connection, I want to thank GTE and one of our Commission members, an officer of GTE, Randy McDonald. They are the first large company to guarantee the consumer bill of rights to all the 400,000 people on their health plan, employees and their family members. It's an extraordinary step. And if they can do it, others can follow. I don't know if Randy is here today, but if he is, will you stand up? Thank you very much. God bless you.

Finally, it would be wrong for us to end this without acknowledging that there can be no rights without responsibilities, that our community can only go forward when there is a corresponding responsibility for every opportunity and every right.

The new world of health care offers greater choice and more fundamental opportunities for health than ever before. And today we outlined the rights that every American should have in dealing with that health care system. But every American also has an enhanced obligation to take an active role in his or her own health care and to take responsibility for his or her own health. We spend a lot of money in this country every year that we wouldn't spend if we'd just go through the day in a sensible way every day. And we have to acknowledge that, and we cannot blame the health insurance industry or the health care providers or anybody else in the wide world for the burdens we impose on ourselves for the extra cost, the lower income, the reduced productivity that are the direct result of daily choices made by individual citizens that they do not have to make in the way they live their lives, and we ought to be honest about that.

And we should never point the finger at other people when we have problems until we have first examined ourselves and what we have to do. And I know a lot of companies are looking at ways to reward responsible behavior and ask that some payment be made for that behavior that imposes costs on society as a whole. That's a large part of what we're attempting to do in settling this issue of the marketing and selling of tobacco to young people in America in ways that violate our laws. So I think that has to be a part of this; we can never lose sight of it.

When President Kennedy proposed a consumer bill of rights over 30 years ago, he said, "Under our economic as well as our political form of democracy, we share an obligation to protect the common interest in every decision we make." I am convinced, as I have said repeatedly, that the coming years will be a time of remarkable breakthroughs in science and medicine, remarkable breakthroughs in the space and in the ocean, remarkable breakthroughs in the structure of human genes. They will also be a time of remarkable opportunity to relate to other people around the world, economically and culturally. They can be, this next 50 years, the best half-century human society has ever known. But we have to look after the common interest. No matter how individualized our computers, our telephones, our fax machines, our self-employment—no matter what happens, we will still have to protect the common interest if we want to have safe streets, good education, good health care, a clean environment, and a healthy economy.

Today, by standing up for individual rights, this Commission has advanced the common interest, and America will be much better for it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:11 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry member Peter Thomas, Chair of the Subcommittee on Consumer Rights, Protections, and Responsibilities, who introduced the President. The Office of the Press Secretary also made available the Commission's report, entitled "Consumer Bill of Rights and Responsibilities."

Memorandum on the Health Care "Consumer Bill of Rights and Responsibilities"

November 20, 1997

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget

Subject: The Health Care Consumer Bill of Rights and Responsibilities

Last spring, when I appointed the members of the Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry, I specifically charged them to develop a consumer bill of rights. This period of rapid change and experimentation in the way Americans receive and pay for their medical care holds the promise for improved quality, greater choice, and lower expense. At the same time, we must identify and protect certain fundamental rights of patients and their families so that, whatever health care delivery system they choose, they can obtain the information and care they need when necessary.

Health care consumers also need to understand their responsibilities in a changing health care environment to ensure that they get the best possible care. Confirming such rights and responsibilities is critical to ensuring that the quality of medical care does not suffer as we seek to expand access and improve efficiency of delivery.

The Consumer Bill of Rights and Responsibilities in Health Care, issued today by the Commission, fully lives up to my high expectations. The members of the Commission have brought to bear their own considerable abilities and have obtained information from a wide range of sources. This Bill of Rights and Responsibilities is a comprehensive and thoughtful document

that will be an excellent guide as we move through this transition in health care delivery. We must take steps to see that the rights contained in this document become a reality for all Americans.

Therefore, I hereby direct you to take the following actions consistent with the mission of your agency.

First, I direct you to determine the extent of your current compliance with the recommendations of the Commission.

Second, I direct you to use your administrative authorities, including existing regulations, advisories, and other guidance regarding health plans under their respective jurisdictions to initiate appropriate administrative actions consistent with the recommendations of the Commission.

Third, I direct you to identify the statutory impediments to compliance with the recommendations of the Commission.

Finally, I direct you to report back to me, through the Vice President, by February 19, 1998, with your findings and the administrative actions you have already undertaken and will undertake to effect the Commission's recommendations.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Statement on Signing the Savings Are Vital to Everyone's Retirement Act of 1997

November 20, 1997

I am pleased to have signed into law H.R. 1377, the "Savings Are Vital to Everyone's Retirement Act of 1997," (SAVER Act). This Act will address the important issue of retirement savings through a public-private sector partnership. It is an important step, taken in a bipartisan manner, to increase awareness of the need for pension and individual savings so American workers may enjoy a secure and comfortable retirement. I want to thank all the members of both parties who worked with us to produce strong bipartisan legislation.

Under the SAVER Act, I will convene the first national summit on retirement income savings in 1998 to foster increased awareness of the importance of saving for retirement. Currently, only two-thirds of workers with the opportunity to participate in a 401(k) plan do so. Although this represents an increase from less than 40 percent in 1983, two-thirds is simply not good enough. We have to do better, particularly because more and more Americans are relying on these types of plans for retirement savings. Subsequent summits on savings will take place in 2001 and 2005.

My Administration will work to make sure that the summits help educate employers about the types of plans that are available, including traditional defined benefit pension plans, as well as a relatively new defined contribution plan that is especially designed for small businesses. The summits will also identify problems workers have setting aside money for retirement, and that employers have in assisting their workers to do so. Recommendations will be produced by the summits as to what the private and public sectors can do to promote pension and individual savings. I am particularly concerned about the savings of women, minority, and low- and moderate-income workers, for whom putting away money for retirement is often particularly difficult.

The SAVER Act calls for the public and private sectors to work together in planning and conducting the national summits on retirement income savings, which I will co-host with the congressional leadership of both parties. The Act also affirms the ongoing efforts of my Administration to promote retirement savings through public outreach by directing the Secretary of Labor to maintain and expand the Department's program of retirement savings education.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

November 20, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 1377, approved November 19, was assigned Public Law No. 105–92.

Statement on Signing the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998

November 20, 1997

Today I have signed into law S. 858, the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998." The Act authorizes appropriations for the intelligence-related activities of the United States during fiscal year 1998.

This Act results from the hard work of many people in the Administration and in the Congress who are dedicated to both a strong national intelligence capability and effective congressional oversight.

I strongly endorse section 307, the basic objective of which is to ensure that, insofar as possible, the U.S. Government provides all relevant information to U.S. citizens (and their family members, as appropriate) who are the victims of violent crimes committed abroad. So that this provision cannot be construed to detract from my constitutional authority and responsibility to protect national security and other privileged information as I determine necessary, and so that the provision does not require the release of information that is properly classified, I direct that it be interpreted consistent with my constitutional authority and with applicable laws and executive orders.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 20, 1997.

NOTE: S. 858, approved November 20, was assigned Public Law No. 105–107.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting Line Item Vetoes of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

November 20, 1997

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

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel the dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998" (H.R. 2107). I have determined that the cancellation of these amounts will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachments, constitutes a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. H.R. 2107, approved November 14, was assigned Public Law No. 105–83. The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on November 24.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting Line Item Vetoes of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

November 20, 1997

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

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel the dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the "Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998" (H.R. 2160). I have determined that the cancellation of these amounts will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachments, constitutes a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. H.R. 2160, approved November 18, was assigned Public Law No. 105–86. The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on November 24.

Remarks on Signing the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997

November 21, 1997

Thank you very much. After Secretary Shalala made you all laugh, she reminded me that she has to go catch a plane. She's going on a trip to Asia, and she's winding up in Bhutan. She said, "You know, some people think Bhutan is the most beautiful place in the world. And the King is there, and he's got four wives, and they're all sisters." And she said, "I wonder if he'd like four and a half." [*Laughter*] I thought the private joke was even better than the public one, so I thought I'd give credit.

Let me, first of all, thank the Vice President and his reinventing Government staff for the work that they have done on the FDA, and Secretary Shalala and all the people at HHS, and Sally Katzen and the people at OMB and folks in the White House, the industry leaders who are here. But let me especially thank the Members of Congress, all those who are here and at least two who are not, Congressman Bliley and Congressman Dingell, for the work that—this really astonishing work. It was a 2-year process. This bill passed by a voice vote in both Houses. And yet it is a very significant overhaul in the work of the Food and Drug Administration. It also, it seems to me, is symbolic of what we should be doing as a country.

The FDA, which was created under Theodore Roosevelt, as the Vice President said, is really, I think, one of the signal achievements of the Progressive Era. Why was it necessary? Because more and more people were moving from the farm to the city and making a living in factories, and instead of consuming the food that they raised on their own farms, they had to go down and buy the food from somebody else. And more and more people had access to doctors, and doctors had access to medicine that was being discovered that they couldn't know everything about. So somebody needed to say, "Hey, this medicine is okay. We've tested it. It's okay. You can give it to your patients in Iowa or Oregon or Arizona or Alabama."

And so a whole new world of possibility opened when people could move from farm to factory and when people could have access to a doctor when they couldn't see one before. But there needed to be someone who said, here's the public interest in trying to make sure

the food is safe and the drugs are safe and they do what they're supposed to do.

And it's worked stunningly well, really. Throughout the entire industrial era of the 20th century, our country has continued to see its life expectancy increase and its economy grow and diversify. But when I was out there—the Vice President is right—I brought this up in our transition back in '92, because when I went across the country in 1992, everywhere I went people were complaining, on the one hand, that they were beginning to be concerned about some food safety issues and, on the other hand, that the health and welfare of the American people was actually being undermined by a system in the FDA that, at least the people who were involved in it thought, was too slow and somewhat arbitrary and not giving the American people the drug approvals and the medical device approvals in a timely fashion.

So we set to work on it, and we found there was an enormous amount of interest in the Congress. The Vice President's right, the FDA deserves, I think, a great deal of credit for the internal changes that have been made, that have been recognized, and particularly on the drug approvals, the speed of them. But this legislation, I think, is very, very important.

And again I say, it is also symbolic of a larger mission we should be about. We're maintaining and redefining the public interest at a time when there are new challenges to food safety, which we've tried to meet, partly in the Department of Agriculture and partly with some important bipartisan legislation the Congress passed about a year ago, and when we have new possibilities in both medicine and medical devices. And what we want to do is get those to people as quickly as possible and still protect the public interest. And we know now we have new options for that because of the change, again, in the underlying nature of the society, moving from the industrial age to a technology/computer information dominated age in which we have a lot more opportunities to do things that will speed this approval process. And on the other hand, in the food area, we know because we've now gone from seeing people get their food from their neighbors who were farmers while they lived in the cities, that food has become more and more and more an international commodity and we have an even higher responsibility, not only through the FDA but generally through the Government, to secure the safety of our food supply.

So I think the changes we are making are very important not only on their own merits but because what you have done is a model for what America has to do in area after area after area: clearly define the public interest and then change the way we pursue it, consistent with the tools and the responsibilities and the opportunities available in this time. And all of you should be very, very proud of that.

Let me say that, as everybody knows, this bill is the product of 3 years of hard work that involves all the people I have already mentioned. I just think it's worth pointing out that at the beginning of the process, the sides stood worlds apart. I think that is an understatement. [*Laughter*] And the fact that there was a process by which you could think through differences and build a true consensus that is bipartisan and involves all the stakeholders, resulting in a bill—if somebody told me 2 years ago, "Two years from now you'll be standing over at the Old EOB and you'll be about to sign a bill that passed the Congress by a voice vote, and it will have more than two words in it, so it won't be an empty bill; it will, in fact, be a sweeping reform of FDA," I would have taken odds against that. And I think you should all be very, very proud of yourselves.

Let me just highlight a few of the bill's provisions. First, we continue working with the business community to get more drugs approved faster. We've reauthorized the Prescription Drug User Fee Act for 5 more years. It ensures that the cost of reviewing and approving drugs is shared between industry and Government. Since 1992, these additional revenues have helped FDA hire some 600 more employees, cutting drug approval time in half already, and we want to do better.

Second, the bill writes into law many of the reinventing Government measures introduced by FDA a few years ago, reducing the requirements and simplifying the review process for new drugs and medical devices without compromising safety. And I congratulate the Vice President for all his work particularly on this effort.

Third, we will offer new hope to critically ill Americans by expanding access to drugs and therapies whose FDA approvals are still pending. Anybody who's ever had a family in this situation knows what an important part of the

legislation this is. We know that for many patients, experimental treatments represent their best, perhaps their only, chance for recovery. That's why this bill writes into law current FDA policies that allow doctors and patients to use new drugs before they are formally approved. Already, thousands of AIDS, cancer, and Alzheimer's patients have found new hope, even new life, with these experimental therapies. We will also expand the database on clinical trials of drugs that fight serious illnesses so that patients can keep track of their progress.

It's been said that while the century we are about to leave has been an age of physics, the 21st century will be an age of biology, perhaps yielding cures to diseases we thought incurable. We are already witnessing the medical possibilities of the future, as the Vice President said. This fall alone, the FDA has approved new drugs and treatments for everything from HIV to breast cancer, cardiovascular disease to cystic fibrosis, Parkinson's to epilepsy.

The FDA has served America well. Today, with the bill I'm about to sign into law, we can ensure that it will serve America well into the 21st century and, I hope, serve as a model again for how we can maintain our goals of pursuing the public interest and adjust our means to the possibilities and the challenges of a dramatically new era. The FDA has always set the gold standard for consumer safety. Today it wins a gold medal for leading the way into the future. And thank you all.

I'd like to ask the Congressmen now to join me up here so we can sign the bill.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:50 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. S. 830, approved November 21, was assigned Public Law No. 105–115.

Statement on Signing the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997

November 21, 1997

I am pleased to sign into law S. 830, the "Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997." This bipartisan legislation culminates several years of work by my Administration and the Congress on steps to streamline and rationalize the process by which the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approves new drugs and medical devices, while ensuring that these products, on which the American people rely, are safe and effective. The Act represents the most comprehensive reform of our Nation's drug, medical device, and food laws in decades. I believe that it is a good compromise on a difficult set of issues and am pleased that the Congress and my Administration were able to work through these issues and enact a bipartisan bill. Most importantly, I am pleased that S. 830 addresses my key concern that any FDA legislation maintain our high standards to protect the American people from dangerous drugs, devices, and foods.

This legislation will extend through Fiscal Year 2002, the Prescription Drug User Fee Act, which requires drug companies to help underwrite the cost of FDA reviews of their products' safety and efficacy. This measure has enabled the FDA to eliminate backlogs and significantly shorten the review time of new human drug applications without compromising quality standards. Supported by the drug industry, the Prescription Drug User Fee Act illustrates the true benefits of a public-private partnership.

Certainly, FDA reform did not start with this bill. The Vice President has been working on reforming and reinventing the FDA since 1993. This bill codifies many of the reforms proposed by the Vice President's Reinventing Government Initiative. For example, it modernizes the regulations of biological products, eliminates the batch certification and monograph requirements for insulin and antibiotics, and streamlines the approval process for drug manufacturing changes. This Act also codifies reforms proposed by the FDA's Center for Devices and Radiological Health that will significantly improve both the rigor and timeliness of its premarket review of medical devices.

Notably, S. 830 will expand FDA's current program to streamline the filing and approval of new therapies for serious or life-threatening conditions. It will also codify FDA regulations and practices designed to ensure that patients will have access to therapies for serious and life-threatening conditions before they are approved for marketing. The Act requires the Department of Health and Human Services to establish a databank, providing information to the public on clinical trials of experimental treatments for serious and life-threatening conditions.

In addition, S. 830 includes a provision that eliminates certain health information dissemination restrictions, while maintaining public health protections. For example, product sponsors, manufacturers, or distributors will now be permitted to furnish to health professionals, providers, and others, peer-reviewed journal articles on an "off-label" use of an approved or cleared drug or device, so long as the manufacturers commit to completing the research needed to approve such use and meet other specified conditions. Drug manufacturers will also be able to give cost data to health maintenance organizations and other institutional purchasers of prescription drugs, so long as it is based on competent and reliable scientific evidence. The Act will also resolve the issue of pharmacy compounding—the process of making customized medicines—so that legitimate pharmacy compounding is allowed, while the manufacture of unapproved drugs is not.

While I am satisfied with the resolution of the issues in this legislation, I am also pleased that the Congress included sunsets to certain of the Act's provisions so that, at the appropriate time, we can evaluate whether the proper compromises were reached. As FDA reform did not start with this bill, it will not end with this bill. Even with the streamlining provided in S. 830, the FDA will continue to face the challenge of fulfilling its many responsibilities and requirements within available resources. The Vice President and I look forward to continuing our work with patient groups, industry, and the Congress to make sure that the FDA is meeting the challenges of the future and providing safe and effective products to all Americans.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 21, 1997.

NOTE: S. 830, approved November 21, was assigned Public Law No. 105–115.

Remarks on Receiving the Man of Peace Award

November 21, 1997

Dalia, Michelle, Members of Congress, members of the administration, General and Mrs. Shelton, Secretary Christopher, Secretary Vance, General Powell, thank you all for coming. To the Ambassadors of Israel and Jordan and Egypt, we thank you for being here today. Shimon and Leah, thank you for your friendship, for your remarks, and for your continued profound and eloquent striving for peace.

I am delighted that this prize will fund scholarships for young Americans to study in Israel, further strengthening the bonds between our nations and deepening the friendship between our people. And I am profoundly honored to be the first recipient of the Man of Peace Award. But actually, as we all know, I can accept this only on behalf of all people in our administration and previous administrations and, indeed, citizens in this country who have devoted themselves to helping to bring peace in the Middle East. There can be no greater recognition that this award was founded by the family of Yitzhak Rabin and by Shimon Peres, two men who helped to give the world one of its greatest gifts, the hope of a new era of peace in the land of light and revelation.

You know, I was sitting here thinking when Shimon and Leah were talking of all the times that Hillary and I and Al and Tipper were with one or all of them, and it's so hard to say now, but actually, from time to time, we had a lot of fun doing this.

There were times when I thought that my role in the Middle East peace process was to bring to bear the wealth and power of the United States to work in a positive way and

to work things through with Arab States, and all of that. A lot of times I thought I was Prime Minister Rabin's fashion adviser—[*laughter*]—which shows you just how much trouble he was in. [*Laughter*]

Upstairs—in my office upstairs, which is actually almost exactly right above this room, I have on a little table, in a silver tray that I believe Shimon gave me, the yarmulke that I wore at the Prime Minister's funeral, a little pin I had to wear to go to the graveside, and a small stone I took from the grave. But above it I have the picture of us together the last time I ever saw him, where I'm straightening the bow tie I had to get for him because he didn't bring a bow tie to take to this black-tie dinner that we attended.

I say that to remind you that the real purpose of peace is to allow people to laugh, to return to ordinary life, to appreciate the little things in life, and to appreciate it with people with whom they have previously been at odds and that it is not something we can be discouraged about, it has to be done little by little.

I remember the day we were in here and we were fixing to go out, in September, and sign the peace agreement. And the Prime Minister was of two minds. First, you know, people were grinding on him, "How can you do this? You can't trust the Palestinians," and all this, and he had this great one-liner, "Well, you can't make peace with your friends." But then when I said, when we went out there it was going to be quite an extravaganza, and Mr. Arafat was an emotional person, and there was going to have to be a handshake—well, now, the handshake was another thing altogether. [*Laughter*]

He said, "I have been fighting him for decades." I said, "You just told me you can't make peace with your friends. There is going to be a billion people watching. What are you going to do?" He said, "All right, but no kissing." [*Laughter*] And so I'm glad the press didn't know that, because there's always this question, is the glass half empty or half full? So the whole world was electrified by this picture of these two men shaking hands. If the whole story had been known, someone would have written the story, why didn't they kiss? [*Laughter*]

We have to remember what the purpose of this is. Shimon Peres and Yitzhak Rabin rose to the height of Israeli politics by being concerned with the security of the State of Israel. And after a lifetime devoted to its security, based on their experience and their understanding not only of the particular situation but of human nature, they reached a unique partnership premised on a commitment to peace as ultimately the only guarantor of security. They found the sort of courage that we saw when Sadat and Begin signed the Camp David accords.

And I will never forget that great day here in September of '93, when Yitzhak Rabin said, "Enough of blood and tears." Leah mentioned the things which happened afterward, and we have seen a great deal of progress, the interim accords, the peace with Jordan in the Araba, growing diplomatic ties with neighbors.

Shimon said in his Nobel Address that Israel had proved, and I quote, "that aggressors do not necessarily emerge as the victors." But also, he had learned that the victors do not necessarily win peace. To win peace these two leaders, on behalf of the Israeli people, stepped beyond the bounds of convention, put aside old habits of suspicion and mistrust. And after an assassin's bullet took Yitzhak's life, Shimon stayed true to the path they had chosen, even when the enemies of peace waged terror against the people of Israel.

We know from experience both before and since that progress is possible and progress is difficult, that barriers fall only if people show a consistent and constant will to go forward, guided by and bound to several principles. I think it's worth repeating them here today. Israelis and Palestinians must embrace the spirit at the heart of the Oslo accords, not jockeying for advantage but working together for the benefit of both sides. Both sides must dedicate themselves to building confidence, step by step, through a series of agreements on issues affecting both Palestinians and Israelis. Both sides must refrain from actions that undermine the joint pledge they have made to strengthen security. Both sides must approach each other as partners, joined by the prospect of peace and security. Both sides must live up to the letter and the spirit of their obligations.

In recent months, you have to acknowledge at least that the pace of change has slowed and that the bonds of trust have eroded on both sides. The answer is not to bemoan the present condition but to renew our resolve to move forward.

During recent negotiations here in Washington and in the region, Israelis and Palestinians

worked together seriously in an atmosphere of genuine respect. They faced the essential task of building cooperation and preventing terrorism. They moved closer to agreement on concrete steps to benefit the Palestinian people. They worked to advance the discussion on more difficult issues they will face in permanent status negotiations.

Now both sides have got to realize the need for urgency. The window of progress will become smaller with time. The frustration of ordinary people, both Israelis and Palestinians, will grow in the absence of progress. That is why we want the parties to work intensively on the matters that Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat have undertaken to discuss: security cooperation, redeployment of Israeli forces, a time-out on provocative actions, the acceleration of permanent status talks. By addressing these issues, we can establish for Israelis and Palestinians that peace will bring tangible benefits. By speeding the progress on this track, we can move closer to invigorating negotiations between Israel and Lebanon and Israel and Syria to establish a lasting and comprehensive peace.

In recent weeks, as Iraq has challenged the United Nations, we have been reminded again of how vital it is to continue forging a community of shared values throughout the region to strengthen the bonds among all people who oppose intimidation and terror, and how we will never ever do that until there is peace between Israel and her neighbors, and that the absence of that peace makes the other difficulties, tensions, and frustrations all the more troubling because it compounds them and undermines our ability to seek a unified solution.

I think I should say just a few words about Iraq before closing. Early this morning, the international weapons inspectors arrived back in Baghdad, including the Americans assigned to the team. Their unconditional return is an important achievement for the international community. It shows once again that determined diplomacy backed by the potential of force is the only way to deal with Saddam Hussein. We must make sure that inspectors are able to resume their mission unimpeded. The inspector team has a clear mission and a clear responsibility. They must be able to proceed with their work without interference, to find, to destroy, to prevent Iraq from rebuilding nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and the missiles to carry them.

Let there be no mistake: We must be constantly vigilant and resolute, and with our friends and partners, we must be especially determined to prevent Saddam's ability to reconstitute his weapons of mass destruction program. Our children and our grandchildren will not forgive us unless we honor the work of these UNSCOM professionals. We must not let our children be exposed to the indiscriminate availability and potential of use and actual use of the biological and chemical and smaller scale nuclear weapons which could terrorize the 21st century.

The UNSCOM team of dedicated professionals have labored quietly and effectively for 6 years. The past 2 weeks have made them famous people in the world. Let us not so much cherish their fame as value their mission. And let us be determined to see that it can go forward.

Leah and Shimon, it was about 5 years ago that I promised Yitzhak, as President Carter had promised Menachem Begin, that the United States would be there every step of the way with Israel as it walks the path of peace. Today I renew that pledge for myself, our administration, and indeed for the American people. I am deeply honored by this award. But the only prize in the end that really matters is the prize of peace we must give to the children of the Middle East.

For as long as I live, I will be grateful for the profound honor I had to work with you, Shimon, and with Yitzhak, to get to know your families, your coworkers, your friends, to see one of those magic moments that the Nobel Prize-winning Irish poet Seamus Heaney spoke of when he said that sometimes people just leave aside their cynicism and their bitterness, and hope and history rhyme. That is what you've made happen. The only way we can truly honor the memory of our friend and the continuing work of our friend, Shimon Peres, is not to let it go but to bear down and see it through.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:27 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Dalia Filosof, daughter of assassinated Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, and Leah Rabin, his widow; Michelle Waldin, granddaughter of former Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres; Gen. Henry H. Shelton, USA, Chairman,

Joint Chiefs of Staff, and his wife, Carolyn; former Secretary of State Warren M. Christopher; former Secretary of State Cyrus R. Vance; Gen. Colin Powell, USA (Ret.), former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Ambassadors to the United States Eliahu Ben-Elissar of Israel, Marwan Jamil Muashir of Jordan, and Ahmed Maher al-Sayed of Egypt; Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; and Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel. The Rabin Foundation and the Peres Foundation jointly established the Man of Peace Award.

Statement on the Korean Peninsula Peace Process

November 21, 1997

I am pleased with the agreement reached today in New York to begin plenary talks on December 9 in Geneva to achieve a lasting peace on the Korean Peninsula. It carries forward the four-party peace initiative President Kim Yong-sam and I launched in April 1996. In Geneva, the four parties—the United States, the Republic of Korea, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and the People's Republic of China—will together discuss how we can secure a stable and permanent peace on the Korean Peninsula. There is a lot of hard work ahead. But this is an important first step and the United States is prepared to be a full partner in helping the Korean people build a future of peace.

The President's Radio Address

November 22, 1997

Good morning. Today I'd like to speak to you about a breakthrough for education, our agreement to move forward with national tests to make sure every schoolchild masters the basics. The best way to give our children the world-class education they need to thrive in the 21st century is by setting high standards of academic achievement. When we fail to encourage our children and expect a lot of them, we in fact encourage them to fail. That's why I've called upon America to join me in raising educational standards and adopting national exams to measure our progress at meeting the standards.

We've now taken a significant step forward in this effort. Last week I signed an education bill that supports the high national standards and the development of the first-ever voluntary tests of fourth graders in reading and eighth graders in math. And as I had recommended to Congress, we put control of the tests in the hands of the independent, bipartisan National Assessment Governing Board, often called NAGB. Congress created NAGB a decade ago; it includes Governors and legislators of both parties, business leaders, parents, and teachers.

I'm pleased to be joined in the White House by the NAGB board members, who have just convened for the first time since taking on their new responsibilities, and they've just presented me with their plan for developing the national tests, including a pilot test next fall. Several new members have been appointed to help, including Diane Ravitch, an Assistant Secretary of Education under President Bush; Lynn Marmer, the president of the Cincinnati school board; and Jo Ann Pottorff, a member of the Kansas Legislature. I'm grateful they've agreed to take on this important role.

I'm confident the board will ensure that the new tests measure what they should, the basics—nothing more, nothing less. These tests will be national, not Federal. And as Diane Ravitch has said, they'll be a yardstick, not a harness. They're a vital measuring tool to help parents, teachers, and school officials demand accountability and excellence.

This is a landmark step toward putting high standards in the classroom and keeping politics

out. It builds on what is clearly the best year for American education in more than a generation.

This year, we have made great progress on our pledge to ensure that every 8-year-old can read, every 12-year-old can log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old can go on to college. In the bill I signed last week, we helped to build a citizen army of reading tutors; nearly doubled our investment in education technology; we expanded public school choice and competition; and we provided the largest increase in Pell grant scholarships in two decades.

As we raise standards for our children, we're also providing them with the tools they need to meet the challenge and seize the opportunities of the 21st century. Working together, we're lifting our children's sights, raising their hopes, and honoring our obligation to improve education today so that they can meet the challenges of tomorrow.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 7:30 p.m. on November 21 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on November 22.

Remarks on Arrival and an Exchange With Reporters in Denver, Colorado
November 22, 1997

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to make a few remarks about the conference that I'm about to leave for, of Asia-Pacific leaders in Vancouver. But before I do, I'd like to say a couple of words about a topic the city of Denver is very much focused on now.

Recently, this wonderful city has witnessed several vicious, violent crimes. The Justice Department has opened a civil rights investigation into at least one of those cases; therefore, I cannot comment specifically on it. But I can say this: We must not, and I know the people of Denver will not, tolerate acts of violence that are fed by hate against people of another color. And we must not tolerate violence and hatred targeted against police officers, the people who put their lives on the line for us every day. And finally, we must honor and support the efforts of our fellow Americans, like the courageous woman here in Denver, who act to prevent or mitigate such violence.

These tragic incidents are painful illustrations of why our recent White House Conference on Hate Crimes and our race initiative are so important and why we have to do more to combat acts like this and to prevent them, by removing the poison that breeds them from all our hearts.

Let me also say it is wonderful to be back in Denver. I appreciate Governor Romer and Congressman Skaggs and Congresswoman DeGette for flying out here with me. And I was glad to be greeted by Mrs. Webb and a number of other officials. I want to thank the people of Denver again for the wonderful job they did in hosting the Summit of the Eight this summer. I'd also like to say a special word of appreciation to Congressman Skaggs, as he leaves his career in Congress, for all that he has done.

Now, as you all know, I'm on my way to Vancouver for a summit of leaders of the Asia-Pacific region, to continue our efforts to build a community of Asia-Pacific nations dedicated to working together for security, prosperity, and peace.

America is and must remain a Pacific power as we enter the 21st century. Our security demands it. We fought 3 wars in Asia in this century; 37,000 American troops still stand guard for freedom in Korea; a profound transition is underway in China, the most populous nation in the world. Our prosperity requires it because Asia buys nearly a third of what we sell abroad, supporting millions of high-paying American jobs. More than ever, America's future and Asia's future are joined.

With such deep stakes in the region, our security and our economic interests must go hand in hand, including strengthening our security alliances in the region with Japan and other nations; building a constructive relationship with China; promoting peace on the Korean Peninsula, where I am very pleased that we have a glimmer of hope in the initiation next month

of the first permanent peace talks since the end of the Korean war; and opening the markets to American goods and services. APEC is an important forum for encouraging partnership and progress in these areas.

In 1993, I convened the first meeting ever of Asia-Pacific leaders in Blake Island, where we embraced a common vision of an Asia-Pacific community, of shared strength and prosperity and peace. Since then, we committed to achieve free trade in the area by 2020. We forged a blueprint to achieve our goal. We laid the foundation last year with concrete market opening initiatives, including an information technology agreement that cuts to zero tariffs in computers, semiconductors, and telecommunications. This amounts to a $5 billion cut on the sales of American high-tech products abroad, a cut that will lead, we believe, to hundreds of thousands of new high-paying American jobs.

Now, in Vancouver, we'll take the steps to make APEC work for our people. One of our top priorities there will be strengthening and stabilizing Asia's financial markets so that their economies and ours stay on the right track. That's important for America because our economic strength is increasingly tied to theirs.

To lay the groundwork for future growth, I'll also keep pushing to reduce barriers of trade to American products. These international trade and financial flows have helped to drive Asia's strong growth in the past, and if the leaders act aggressively to promote financial stability and to keep opening the markets at the same time, Asia's future growth prospects, and therefore America's, are stronger.

Our approach to financial stability stands on two pillars. First, each country must take responsibility for putting sound economic policies in place, including open and reliable economic information and solid financial deregulation—regulation, excuse me—to bolster investor confidence.

Second, the international community must be prepared to help countries that are taking the right measures themselves, with the International Monetary Fund playing the central role.

Last week in Manila, our Asian-Pacific financial officials created a framework to promote these principles, establishing a process for countries to provide speedy financial support on a case-by-case basis to help a neighbor bolster its reserve with a second line of defense after IMF funding; setting up a regional forum to monitor, identify, and address risks to financial stability before they escalate; and recommending that in our global economy, where capital flows are faster than ever, the IMF create a new window for providing short-term financing. I'll be working closely with the other leaders in Vancouver to advance this framework for action. I'll also be working to keep on tearing down barriers to trade where America's competitiveness is strong.

Already, our exports to Asia are worth $250 billion. Imagine the opportunity for our workers and businesses as trade barriers are cut further. In all my discussion with Asian and with Latin American leaders, my message is clear: We need to keep working to open these markets; it's the best path for prosperity, for growth, for good jobs, for better lives for people in America and people in all these other nations.

We can build this future of better prosperity, stability, and prosperity we committed ourselves to in Blake Island, Washington, in 1993 if we keep working on it in Vancouver.

Thank you very much.

Situation in Iraq

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*]—sanctions on Iraq?

The President. I reiterated my position, and I'll be glad to say it again. The United States is concerned about the welfare of the people of Iraq; we don't want to see them suffer unnecessarily. We took the lead in putting in place a policy in the United Nations that permits us to expand humanitarian assistance there. But the most important thing is that those inspectors need to be back at work, and they need to work without impediment. Mr. Butler gave a report today to the United Nations Security Council which points out that there are still impediments to their work, and he recommends a more robust inspection regime. That is what we need to focus on.

I understand President Yeltsin's position, and I thank him for the work they did to end the crisis, at least temporarily—we hope it's ended permanently, but we're not sure. But keep in mind, it is more difficult for these inspectors to do their work with regard to biological and chemical weapons than it is with regard to missile and nuclear issues under their jurisdiction. And we have to do more.

And again I say, I want to compliment the members of the press. We sometimes have our

differences, but I think there has been a real effort to make the public aware of the storage of chemical and biological agents that Iraq admitted having in 1989 and now has no records, cannot produce records proving it destroyed—and then the admitted stores that were there in 1995, just 2 years ago.

So I just want to—what I emphasized to President Yeltsin is we have come a long way by working together, and we have to continue to work together. And the decisions about what to do with the inspections should be made based on the evidence, the facts, and the professional judgment of the inspectors. Neither the political inclinations of the United States nor of our allies should control those decisions.

This is about the future safety not only of the people in Iran and on its borders but indeed of the whole world. It's not hard to carry this stuff around in small amounts once it's developed.

So it was a very good conversation, a very forthright one, and I thought a constructive one, and I believe it will enable us to take the next steps by working together.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:58 a.m. at the Denver International Airport. In his remarks, he referred to Jeannie VanVelkinburgh, a bystander wounded November 18 while attempting to help an African immigrant who was shot at a Denver bus stop; Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado; Wilma J. Webb, wife of Mayor Wellington E. Webb of Denver; Richard Butler, Executive Chairman, United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) charged with dismantling Iraq's weapons of mass destruction; and President Boris Yeltsin of Russia.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Luncheon in Denver
November 22, 1997

Thank you very much. Governor, I'm very grateful for what you said and grateful for what you're doing. It's hard enough to be a Governor; even if you've been doing it as long as Roy has—[*laughter*]—it still requires some effort. And to do that and still be willing to travel around the country and represent the Democratic Party and deal with the challenges we've had to face in this last year takes somebody with a heart of gold, and a steel backside to be on the plane all the time, and a pretty tough skin to take some of the slings and arrows that they fling at you. And I don't think we could have had a better leader for our party than Roy Romer in this last year. And I'm very grateful to you.

Thank you, Mrs. Webb, for being here and for what you said. Wilma and I had a good talk at lunch about the kind of the afterglow of the experience we had in bringing the G–8 conference here a few months ago. When I saw Sharon, I told her that for the rest of my life every time I saw her I would imagine her riding into the arena on that beautiful horse. [*Laughter*] I was almost willing to take odds she would have ridden in here on that horse today. It was wonderful.

But it was a great experience for us. And it was a great thing for me to be able to show that part of America to the other world leaders and to the rather vast retinue that came with them from all over the world. And I can tell you, they were just fascinated because—I was kind of carping at lunch—I go a lot of places, but very often I might as well just be moving around from Federal office building to Federal office building in Washington. Sylvia Mathews is hiding her head. You know, my staff's idea of a good foreign trip is: I get off the airplane; I get in a limousine; I go to a government office building; I talk to three people over a cup of coffee; I go get briefed for an hour; I go to a dinner; I sleep a little bit and turn around and come home. And it doesn't really matter what country I'm in. I'm always ragging them about that. [*Laughter*]

But you were able to show all these people something really special about Colorado, about the West, and about the diversity and texture of America. And that's important because we have the same problems in dealing with each other around the world as sometimes we do in Washington. That is, the harder that you work and the less interpersonal time you have, the

more likely you are to be driven by whatever the difference of the moment is being exaggerated by people who either work for you or work for them or write about it in the political press, and you wind up drifting apart. And so—and sometimes unnecessarily. So the fact that—I mean, you really did further the interest of the United States in building a more cooperative, peaceful world simply by letting them see real people living real lives in an interesting and, for them, a novel context. So I thank you for that.

Roy said one other thing that I want to reiterate. I want you to know that I thank you for being here, and you have to understand that there is a significant connection between your presence here and what happens in Washington and what has happened in Washington for the last 5 years. I don't think anyone would dispute the proposition that this country is in better shape than it was in 1992. And in 1992 when I ran for President, I wanted to take our country in a new direction based on our oldest values of work and family and opportunity and responsibility, community and world leadership, the things that America has stood for throughout this entire century, and most of it for most of our existence.

But it was obvious that we needed, among other things, a different notion of Government—that the arguments that I read as a Governor—and every Governor I knew, including yours, had the same reaction. We'd read in the paper every day, wherever we lived out here in the hinterland, about some fight they were having in Washington. And it looked to me like they were having a fight about whether the Government should try to do everything when we were broke and couldn't, or whether the Government should do nothing and just sit on the sidelines because Government was the source of all of our ills. Where we lived and worked and the people we worked with, we didn't think either one of those things was true.

So the first thing I did was, I went there with a determination to try to get decision-makers in Washington to rethink the notion of Government and the role of Government in moving America forward and in bringing America together. And I believe that the role of Government is to give people the tools they need and establish the conditions so they can make the most of their own lives. And therefore, I think we should do those things which promote both opportunity and responsibility among citizens. We should do those things which bring us together, across the lines that divide us, into one America. And we should do the things that are necessary to maintain our leadership for peace and prosperity and freedom in the world, because all those things are necessary if we're going to have a 21st century which can be, and I believe will be, the best time in all of human history for the people of our country and hopefully for people around the world.

Now, there are differences between the parties. When I became President, my economic policy was unanimously opposed by the other party in Congress—unanimously. Not a single one of them voted for my economic plan in 1993. And they said it would be the ruination of America; it would deepen the recession; it would explode the deficit. Well, 5 years later that plan has produced $810 billion worth of deficit reduction. The deficit is 92 percent smaller than it was when I took office—92 percent. That is before—it's very important you understand it—that is before the bipartisan balanced budget agreement kicks in. One reason we were able to have a bipartisan balanced budget and agree on how to do it is, it's not so hard once 90 percent of the heavy lifting is behind you. [*Laughter*] And I think it's important to emphasize that.

The second thing that we were able to do is to develop a national crime policy. And again, the leaders of the other party opposed my crime policy. I sometimes get tickled when I read in the paper, they talk about how the President adopted Republican positions on crime. I said, "Hello? Who are these people? Where were they?" [*Laughter*] They fought bitterly—bitterly.

Now, it's no secret; I've got a good personal relationship with Senator Dole and a fair and a high estimation of him. I awarded him the Medal of Freedom. I think he's a remarkable fellow. The angriest I ever heard him on the floor of the Senate was when he was unsuccessful in filibustering the crime bill. He tried to kill it.

The NRA was against it, said I was going to take everybody's guns away. And they said, "If you put 100,000 police on the streets it wouldn't make a lick of difference—just as sort of a boondoggle." They attacked us for being for after-school programs for kids and preventive programs to keep kids out of trouble in the

first place. But our crime bill was basically written out of the experience of police officers and prosecutors and community leaders who were in communities where they were already lowering the crime rate by doing what was in our bill.

So we passed the bill with 100,000 police officers and with tougher punishment where appropriate, but with prevention measures and with the assault weapons ban. And 5 years later, we've had 5 years of steeply dropping crime, and the murder rate has dropped 22 percent in the last 3 years in this country.

Now, you know here in Denver—you've just been through it—the crime rate is still too high, and there's still too much violence in this country. But we're going in the right direction. And that happened because of a political choice the American people made, and they knew how to make it in part because they heard the messages of the competing candidates. There is a direct connection between your presence here and that decision. And we had a huge fight about it.

In welfare, the same thing is true. I didn't mind letting the States set the level of assistance to people on welfare because they had been, in effect, doing that for 25 years anyway. Before I ever signed the welfare reform law, there was a difference of more than 4 to one—more than 4 to one—between what a family on welfare could get in the State where the benefits were the lowest and the State where the benefits were the highest—3½ to one. I don't want to overexaggerate—[*laughter*]—3½ to one. I just redid the math in my head.

And I had no problem in requiring people who are on welfare who are able-bodied and able-minded to go to work. I thought that was important, because—we were talking around our table—half the welfare caseload was becoming people who were just permanently on welfare, almost, and sometimes intergenerationally. And that has nothing to do with compassion. You are not being compassionate when you leave people in a position of dependency when they don't have to be there.

On the other hand, it's important, it seemed to me, when you require people who can work to work, not to ask them to hurt their children in doing it. After all, the biggest problem working families have today, many working families, is balancing the demand of taking care of their kids and taking care of their job. And I hear people even with very comfortable income levels, when they're honest, say they feel conflicts between their obligations to their children and their obligations at work. And I think that it's not an exaggeration to say the most important job that any society has, ever, is raising good, strong, ethical children. That is society's most important job. So why should we expect people on welfare to sacrifice the most important job of society to do what is the most important job, arguably, in the short run to give them the self-respect and the independence they need to contribute to our common welfare?

So I vetoed two bills because they took away medical care and nutrition for kids and they didn't give enough money for child care and because I wanted more money to put people to work in high unemployment areas. Once we resolved those things, I signed that bill. And I think it's a good thing. And the results are clear: We had the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history, 3.8 million fewer people on welfare than the day I became President. So we're moving in the right direction.

The environment: The air is cleaner, the water is purer, the food supply is safer, and there are fewer toxic waste dumps. And we proved you could grow the economy and improve the environment at the same time. Now we have to prove we can do that with greenhouse gas emissions to deal with the climate change issue. And it will be tougher, but it clearly can be done—clearly. There's no question, if you just look at the evidence, that we can do it.

So what I want you to know is that every time you see something like that that's good, that's a product of a choice because we had a fight about all those issues. We had an honest debate, a partisan debate about these issues.

In this last year we passed a balanced budget agreement that had overwhelming bipartisan support, but there were elements that our side brought to it. We said, okay, we want to balance the budget, and we don't mind giving families the tax cut; we don't mind giving businesses the tax cut if we invest properly in giving all Americans access to college—we want tax breaks for that; we want to spend some money to provide health insurance coverage to the children of working families who don't have it. We've got enough money for 5 million more kids to get health insurance in working families with low incomes. That's half the uninsured kids in

the country. And we got the biggest new investment in education since 1965. That was because of choices that we made in Washington that the people who were there wouldn't have been able to make if you hadn't helped us get there. There's a direct connection between your presence here and the things that are in that budget.

And just this last week—let me just close with this—I had a week—it was a killer of a week. And what you saw probably in the headlines was the work we were doing on Iraq, but let me tell you what else went on last week.

We signed a bill that we worked on for 2 years to overhaul the way the Food and Drug Administration regulates medical devices, pharmaceuticals, and the foodstuffs they regulate—2 years. It passed by voice vote—everybody. But underneath that there were these incredible conflicts and rubbing up against—and debates and everything. And the way it came out, I believe the public interest is dramatically advanced, because if you've got a safe drug or if you've got a safe medical device, for goodness sakes, you want it on the market as quick as possible. So we had to strike all those balances. Well, the public interest side of that—a lot of that work over the last 2 years came from people that you helped to elect and from attitudes that you helped to advance.

I signed a bill dramatically overhauling the foster care and adoption procedures and clearing away a lot of the obstacles to quicker adoption, even for children that have serious health problems. And my wife has worked on these subjects for 25 years. I have rarely seen her as happy as she was last week. [*Laughter*]

And all these advocates from all over the country came in, and I met a family that had adopted 20 children, including 3 of them who were wheelchair-bound. And to see these people who care about these kids—you know, just last year we put in a $5,000 tax credit for adoption. But you need to know—we all talk about how we believe in family values—there are hundreds of thousands of kids out there that need a home that are trapped in a foster care system.

And one of my staff members after it was over came up to me with tears in his eyes—the guy has nothing to do with the human services area—he came up to me, and he had tears in his eyes and said, "I just want you to know that I spent 9 years of my childhood in one foster home after another. And this is going to change entire lives for people."

And then I went to Wichita, Kansas, to the Cessna plant and saw what that company is doing to take hardcore welfare recipients and put them through training programs and guarantee them jobs. And a lot of these women have been severely beaten by their spouses or partners, have no money, are high school dropouts. Cessna provides housing, a 3-month training program, a 3-month pre-job program, and a guaranteed job for anybody who can finish. And I saw people speaking—they had two of these women speaking. If you'd been told that 6 months ago they were on welfare and had less than a high school education, you wouldn't have believed it. You would have thought they were members of the Wichita City Council. [*Laughter*] And I expect they both could be if they put themselves up for election now. [*Laughter*]

We announced—you saw yesterday, we announced that we're going to have the first permanent peace talks between North and South Korea, in the four-party context we proposed, since the end of the Korean war. We're working through a very difficult situation in Iraq and, I think, in an appropriate way. And I know those things have dominated the news. But if you think about what happened in America for Americans this week, there were a couple of times when all of us just looked at each other and said, "You know, this is what we got in public life to do. This is what makes all the other stuff worth it."

And what I want you to understand is, the decisions that are made—and the way they're made—are made by real human beings who have real views and real convictions, in conflict with other real human beings who also have honest views.

You know, I had a long talk with Senator Lott yesterday. I like Senator Lott. You know, we lived across the river from each other in our former lives, and it's nice having the Senate Majority Leader without an accent. [*Laughter*] We like each other. We understand each other. I had to give him 5 pounds of barbecue when Mississippi beat Arkansas in football. [*Laughter*] I like him. And he would tell you the same thing. We really look at the world differently. We see things differently. We have honest differences of opinion. And what Roy told you is true: That's what's kept this country going for 220 years.

I believe history will record that at this moment in time our views were right and that

we prepared the world—prepared America for a totally new world. But you've got to know that you helped to make it possible. And you should never let that sort of fashionable rhetoric demeaning the whole act of contributing to your democracy so people who believe what you do can hold up their side—that's there's something wrong with that. There's nothing wrong with that.

Tonight when you go home, you think about being at this lunch; you think about those adopted kids; you think about the people who are going to get drugs that will keep them alive; you think about those women that can now be going into the work force because their kids do have food and medicine and child care; you think about the doors of college being opened to everybody for the first time in the history of this country. You think about all that and be proud.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:42 p.m. in the Mansion at the Lawrence C. Phipps Memorial Conference Center-University of Denver. In his remarks, he referred to Wilma J. Webb, wife of Mayor Wellington E. Webb of Denver; and Sharon Magness, member of the host committee for the Denver Summit of the Eight and president, Magness Arabians.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Reception in Denver

November 22, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Governor, Congressman Skaggs, Representative DeGette, Vice Chair Rodriguez, and Lieutenant Governor Schottler, and to all the officeholders and all the candidates and all the would-be officeholders. I'm delighted to see my longtime friend Dottie Lamm and all the others here who are going to put themselves up in our Democratic primary for office this next year. Thank you for being here. I'm glad to see Americans here from all walks of life, Native Americans, Hispanic-Americans, African-Americans, Asian-Americans, a few of us Irish boys. [*Laughter*] This looks like the Democratic Party to me, and I'm proud to be a member of it, and I hope you are.

I would like to begin by thanking Roy Romer—who, as all of you know, has a full-time job that he has done superbly well, I think as well as any Governor in the entire United States—for also being willing to take on the extremely challenging job of being the chairman of the National Democratic Party in the last year. He's done a superb job, and I'm very grateful to him. You should be proud of him.

I want to thank David Skaggs for his superb performance in Congress and tell him I'm really going to miss him, and I wish him well, and I am very grateful that he has done what he's done so well for so long. Thank you, David.

And I want to tell you that Diana DeGette has done very well for a newcomer, in fact, better than a lot of people who have been there a long time. And I hope she has no trouble staying there for a long time. Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, as all of you know, I've had a rather interesting week and, on occasion, a rather exhausting one. But it's also given me time to think and reflect about the larger purposes of public life and what our role is in it. And if you don't remember one other thing I say today, when you leave here, remember this: You ought to be proud of the fact that you're a member of this party, and you ought to be proud of the fact that you're not ashamed to show up and support it, including contributing to it, because the good things that have happened to this country in the last 5 years bear a direct connection to your willingness to support people who would fight for those good things and fight through tough elections to advance our ideas, our values, and our causes. And I want you to be proud of yourselves, because I'm very proud of you.

When I ran for President I was worried about the direction of our country. I don't think anyone can possibly say—or dispute the fact that America's in better shape today than it was in 1992. It is, in many ways.

What have we done? We have pursued old values with new means for a new time. We

have sought to strengthen families and communities, to advance work and opportunity of all kinds, to increase responsibility among our citizens, to bring the American people together—across all the lines that divide us—into one America, and to continue to be the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity in the whole world. That's what we sought to do.

And we're living in a new and different time. The way we live is different. The way we work is different. The way we relate to each other and the rest of the world is different. We're more different. We are increasingly diverse within our own country. Just across the river from my office in Washington—actually, it's your office; I'm just a temporary tenant—just across the river there's the Fairfax County School District with children from 180 different national and ethnic groups, with native languages that number over 100. We are increasingly different. We cannot expect to be able to go into this new era doing things the way we always did.

So the American people gave us a chance to govern in 1993. And we had different ideas from the Republicans. And I don't subscribe to the kind of vicious personal attacks that characterize too much of our politics today. You know, I was telling the folks at the lunch at the Hill—I had a great meeting with Senator Lott yesterday, the Republican Majority Leader. I like him personally. Besides, he's from Mississippi, just across the river from me, and it's relaxing for me to have a conversation with a congressional leader that doesn't speak with an accent. [*Laughter*] I had to send him 5 pounds of barbecue a couple of weeks ago because Mississippi beat Arkansas in a football game. [*Laughter*] We have a nice relationship. He would be the first to tell you we do not agree on many things about how this country should respond to the challenges of the moment. That doesn't reflect on his character or mine; that's different judgments we make about what we ought to do. But it will make all the difference which views prevail. Or even when we reach principled agreement, it makes all the difference whether the debate is going on in the first place. And that's what I want you to understand.

There is a direct connection between your political activism, the decisions that are made back in Washington and the reverberations it has in the lives of people in Colorado. And that's why it's so important that you do what you are doing.

Let me just give you an example. One, we clearly have the strongest economy in a generation. The beginning of our big recovery was the passage of the 1993 economic plan. It did not get a single Republican vote. They said it would increase the deficit and bankrupt the economy.

Five years later, really just a little over 4 years later—4 years—we have reduced the deficit by 92 percent. That is before the balanced budget agreement saves one red cent. That's one reason we could have a bipartisan balanced budget agreement; it's easier to reach a deal once you have done 92 percent of the heavy lifting. Your party did that. Your decisions made that. And we did it while lowering taxes on our hardest pressed working families and investing more money in education, more money in technology, more money in our future. It was a party decision; it was a good decision.

We got the lowest crime rate in 24 years. We had a crime bill that put 100,000 police on the street, preventive programs for kids, takes the assault weapons off the street. If people in Denver aren't for that now, I don't know when they'll ever be. It was a party fight. We did get some Republicans to vote for the crime bill, and I'm grateful to them, and I always will be. But the leadership of their party fought us in a sometimes bitter fight. But we prevailed. And what we did was what the police officers, the community leaders, and the prosecutors asked us to do, right across the political spectrum. And the crime rate has come down for 5 years; the murder rate is down 22 percent in the last 3 years. Now, that is the record. Those ideas made a difference. And the people you helped get elected who did that had an impact on the lives of the people all across America.

We passed a welfare reform bill that, yes, does require people to move from welfare to work if they're able-bodied and, yes, gives States more say in how to design work programs. But what it didn't do, because I vetoed two bills before, is to take food or medicine away from kids. And it does guarantee more money for child care when poor people go to work. And it has now $3 billion to help communities, where unemployment is very high, to help create jobs.

What is the result of that? We had the biggest decline in welfare rolls in history—3.8 million—

and the smallest percentage of Americans on welfare since 1970. Now, with the smallest percentage of Americans since 1970, lowest crime rate in 24 years, the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years, it makes a difference.

We also proved you can do it and have cleaner air, cleaner water, safer food, fewer toxic waste dumps. Our ideas have been proven to work for the American people. They never would have had the chance to work if it hadn't been for people like you—out here like you—all across America, sticking up for them. So you should be proud of the that and tell people about it and tell them that ideas have consequences; they made a difference; and the ideas that the Democratic party had for the 21st century in America were the right ideas, and that's why we're moving in the right direction.

Here's what I think the central questions are for the future—and that's why we're not going to run out of steam and there's always going to be plenty to do for the foreseeable future. What are the central questions facing our country? They're facing every advanced country in the world.

Number one: So we're living in an information age, dominated by computers and high technology. And that's great. How do we preserve all the benefits of this age, all of the phenomenal individual opportunities, the great opportunity for all these new companies to start, and give all these young people things to do and still preserve the social contract? That is, what about the people that get left behind? How are we going to retrain them? How are we going to put them back in the mainstream of American life? How can we keep people moving forward and not leave anybody behind? How do we meet the challenge in the future of growing the economy and meeting the environmental challenges?

Our next big one is to dramatically reduce greenhouse gas emissions in this country so we don't contribute to global warming. Can we do it? Of course we can. If you look at the physics, we can. If you look at all the scientific data, it's out there. Are we going to do it? How are we going to do it? If we ask the American people to sacrifice their standard of living, we will never sustain a majority support for it. So we have to do it intelligently. We have to have the right ideas.

How are we going to preserve access to health care, retirement, family leave, and child care for workers in an environment where we need maximum flexibility in the work force, where there are more and more small companies, where each year we set a new record for the number of new small businesses? How are we going to preserve our public schools and give all our kids access to education but have them flexible enough, creative enough, embracing technology enough, embracing accountability and standards and results enough to produce results that will continue to get support for the public schools from people who don't even have kids in schools anymore? How are we going to meet our intergenerational responsibilities? What are we going to do when the baby boomers retire? I, for one, don't want my kids to go broke trying to support me. Neither do I want to see Social Security or Medicare destroyed. Can we reform entitlements and, at the same time, help all the kids in this country who are living below the poverty line? Of course we can. But not unless we're thinking about it, and not unless we have the right values and the right ideas and we're willing to have the right kind of change.

And I think I know that you believe that our party needs to be the party of positive change. How are we going to respect all the differences, even celebrate the differences among us, and still say, okay, you can be an Irish-American or Italian-American, whatever, but there are things that bind us together as one America that are more important than any of that? So it still will matter to be an American in the 21st century.

These are great questions. No society has fully resolved them. But I say the Democratic Party has a fair claim on the allegiance of the American people because we have the best economy in a generation, the lowest crime rate in a generation, the lowest welfare rolls we've had in a very long time and the biggest drop in history, and a better environment with a growing economy, and we're moving the world toward peace and freedom. And that's the message I want you to give. And most important, that's the message I want to sink into your mind and heart.

Everyone knows that last week I was overwhelmingly preoccupied, this last week, with the situation in Iraq. And I don't have much more to add to that, except one of our biggest obligations is to deal with the new security challenges

of the 21st century. And while the nuclear threat between two great countries is receding—I talked to President Yeltsin today about his efforts to get the START II treaty ratified there so we can bringing these nuclear weapons down, getting more countries to sign on to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—we must face an enhanced threat of chemical and biological warfare practiced by terrorists, organized criminals, drug traffickers, and others in the 21st century. And it's our solemn obligation to minimize that threat for you in the next 50 years, the same way we avoided having another nuclear war—a nuclear war in the last 50 years.

But underneath that, a lot of things you might not have noticed happened. And I want to tell you about them, again, so you'll understand there is a consequence between what you do and what we do. We signed a bill reforming the Food and Drug Administration that will move drugs to market and medical devices to market quicker. It will save lives. The bill took 2 years to pass, and the Republican views were heard, the Democratic views were heard, all the stakeholders' views were heard. It passed by a voice vote. It will save lives. It makes a difference.

We passed a bill to reform the adoption laws in America, a subject that Hillary has been working on literally for 25 years. And we had all these advocates there from all over the country and a couple that had adopted 20 children, including 3 in wheelchairs—adopted, not just given a foster home to, adopted—and people from all over the country. And you could see that it was going to change lives. And afterward, a member of my staff came up to me and said, "I just want you to know that I lived in foster homes for over 8 years when I was a kid growing up, and this is going to change lives, hundreds of thousands of people's lives."

I went to Kansas and saw what Cessna is doing with our welfare reform program to take the hardest-to-place welfare people, oftentimes women that had been brutally abused in their homes, and give them training programs and jobs and guarantee jobs to them. I'm talking about high school dropouts—that had been brutally abused—in Cessna making high wages with guaranteed benefits, and they have a 71 percent success rate.

And all these things happen, and just repeatedly somebody will be with me that works with us and we'd all look at each other and we'd just laugh and say, "You know, this is what we got into public life to do, to give people the tools to change their lives for the better."

That is what the Democratic Party stands for. And you need to take a lot of pride in it, and you need to understand what we have done, how it happened, and what we intend to do. And if you do that, then this State, where we have to win the independent vote to win any elections, will see us as the party of positive change. We'll have more Democrats. We'll have more young people who are Democrats. The main thing is, we'll have a better America. When you go out of here today, you tell people that, and be proud you did what you did.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:23 p.m. in the Tennis Pavilion at the Lawrence C. Phipps Memorial Conference Center-University of Denver. In his remarks, he referred to Manny Rodriguez, vice chair, Colorado State Democratic Party; Lt. Gov. Gail Schottler of Colorado; and Dottie Lamm, Democratic senatorial candidate.

Remarks at a Dinner for Senator Patty Murray in Medina, Washington

November 22, 1997

Thank you very much, Senator. Thank you, Lori, and thank you for the convictions you expressed in your remarks. And I want to thank you and Lars for opening your home, and I want to thank your children for the wonderful gifts they gave me from their classes.

Mayor Rice, Mayor-elect Schell, Congressmen Dicks and McDermott and Smith; candidates Brian Baird and Greta Cammermyer; and ladies and gentlemen. I want to say most of all, thank you for being here for Patty Murray. We have representatives of great companies here, Boeing,

Microsoft, Starbucks, and others. We have representatives of labor here. We have educators here. We have Native Americans here. We've got small-business people. We have all different kinds of folks that make up Washington State's future and America's future. And I want to thank the first lady of Washington for being here. It's my understanding that there's a good chance that Gary Locke now has a sterling opportunity to become the first American President of China as a result of his—[*laughter*].

I also want to say Congressman Dicks is an incredibly graceful loser tonight. [*Laughter*] You were great, but those of us who know you know that you hated every minute of that—[*laughter*]—which is one of the reasons you are such a good Representative of your people. [*Laughter*]

I would like to say just a generic word of thanks to the people of Washington for sending Norm Dicks and Jim McDermott and Adam Smith and Patty Murray to Washington. And there's a reason I'm here, besides the fact that Patty Murray is a Democrat. And I hope the fact that she votes with me most of the time will not be a deterrent; the people of Washington voted for me twice and I appreciate that very much. But Patty Murray will take a tough stand and do what's right over the long run even if it's painful in the short run. And in a period of great change in how we work and live and relate to the rest of the world, I think that's a pretty important quality. Someone who remembers that her obligations to her children translate into a larger obligation to the children of this State and Nation is someone worthy of your support.

She was one of the cosponsors of our deficit reduction plan back in 1993, and we didn't get a single vote from the other party. They said, oh, we were going to explode the deficit and bankrupt the economy, and I heard all that. And some of the voters bought it in 1994. But now you know, because—this year the deficit is $23 billion, down 92 percent from where it was before I took office, and that's before we get one dollar of savings from the Balanced Budget Act, thanks to Patty Murray. And I'll never forget it.

She fought to pass the crime bill in 1994. And I'll never forget it; I thought I was lost in the fun house when people said, "Well, Mr. President, they'll accuse you of being a Republican. Democrats aren't supposed to care about crime." I said, "Well, if you've ever been a victim, you know it has no partisan tinge." And we had a crime bill that was basically written by community activists, police chiefs, and prosecutors, based on what was working to bring the crime rate down in communities around the country that were doing something about it.

It made pretty good sense to Patty Murray, even though she didn't agree with every provision of it. And she stood up and fought for it. And we had the bitterest partisan opposition. We did get some Republican votes for it, and I'm very grateful to the people who voted for it, but the leadership was stomped-down against it. And they went out, and they got some profits out of that. They convinced a lot of people in rural Washington we were going to take their guns away. And I was able to go back to Washington in 1996—to this Washington—and say, "You beat some Congressmen here over that gun issue and if you lost your gun, I want you to vote against me, too. But if you didn't, they didn't tell you the truth, and you need to send them a message." Two hundred and fifty thousand people lost the right to buy handguns because they had criminal backgrounds or they were stalkers or they had mental health histories, and America is a better place because of it. And we don't need these assault weapons in the hands of young street gangs in our country, and we're putting 100,000 police on the street. The crime rate's come down 5 years in a row because Patty Murray had the courage to stand up and do what was right in 1994. And she deserves the support that—[*applause*].

And let me say this is also important, not just when we have disagreed in Washington but when we have agreed. We had an overwhelming bipartisan majority for the balanced budget plan that I signed this year, and I applaud the Republican leadership and all the Republicans who voted for it. But in reaching that kind of agreement, it came out the way I wanted because we had Democrats in the mix, because Patty Murray was fighting to restore education funding.

Just imagine this now—we passed and I signed—they passed and I signed a balanced budget that not only will balance the budget, I believe, before 2002 when it was supposed to but has the largest increased investment in education in a generation, 35 years, including funds to do our part working with the private sector to hook up every classroom and library

to the Internet by the year 2000, to train the teachers, get the software, do the things we need to do, open the doors of college to all Americans because of the tax cuts and the scholarships and the work-study funds. It's a terrific bill. It includes the biggest increase in health care for poor children in working families in 30 years, and I'm proud of that. It includes a huge increase in biomedical research, and I'm proud of that.

We contributed a lot to that, the members of our party, because we said it's okay to be fiscally conservative; it's imperative in the world we're living in. But if we're going to grow the economy over the long run, we've got to invest in our people, all of our people. That's what Patty Murray fought for, and she deserves your support for that. America is a better place because of it.

Let me just say, in addition to that, I hope all of you who are here for her understand that there really is a very direct connection between your presence here for Patty Murray or when you support Norm Dicks or Jim McDermott or Adam Smith or anybody else you support—there's a very direct connection between your presence and your support and what happens in America a long way away in Washington and how it comes back to you. I thought Lori's remarks were pretty compelling in that regard and stated it better than I probably could.

But we're living in a time now where no one has all the answers because of the dramatic scope and pace of change. And every country in the world with an advanced society is trying to deal with the following question, in a thousand different ways: How do we get the benefits of this huge technological and information revolution, the globalization of economics and society, people being able to move information and money around and even themselves around in the flash of an eye; how do we get the benefits of all this and meet the challenges it poses and preserve some sort of coherent life for ourselves, our families, our communities, and our nations? How do we preserve the common good as we break down the old bureaucracies, the old established ways of doing things, and all of that?

And you see it in a thousand different ways. How can you maximize economic growth and improve the environment instead of undermining it? How do you take advantage of the things you have to do to protect the environment or grow the economy and help the people that are dislocated, and do it in a prompt and quick way so they can go on and be part of tomorrow's economy so that everybody who is willing to work hard and be responsible can have their say? How do you bring the benefits of this marvelous new economic system to the places that it hasn't reached yet? How do you balance the demands of work and family when way more than half the women in the work force—I mean women with children under the age of one are in the work force and when people I know in upper income, in comfortable income groups, who aren't even United States Senators, have the same plaintive statement that you heard from Senator Murray tonight? I hardly know anybody with school-age kids, without regard to their income, that hasn't had at some point a serious sense of conflict between their obligations at work and their obligations at home.

And I might add—I want to compliment Patty on this—we had some differences within our caucus over the welfare reform bill. My position was, having worked as a Governor with welfare for many years, was it didn't make any sense to stay with the system we had because we were trapping people in welfare dependency if they didn't have many skills. But it didn't make any sense to do what our friends in the other party wanted to do and just tell them they had to go to work, because if they took low-wage jobs, they'd be hurting their kids if they gave up their health care and their nutrition and if they didn't have any training and any opportunity to do better.

So we fought hard for a bill that would say: If you're able-bodied and you can go to work, you've got to go to work, and you can have your benefits terminated within a certain time if you don't. But we won't take medical care away from your children; we won't take nutrition away from your children; we will give billions of dollars more in child care, because we know you can't afford to pay for that if you get a low-skilled job; and we'll give some extra money to the areas where there aren't enough private sector jobs.

And then Patty Murray said, "Don't forget a lot of these women on welfare have been in abusive positions in the home, and you shouldn't hold them to the same standards unless they have supports that are extraordinary." I just was in Wichita, Kansas this week—we were talking about it—where I saw a training facility for people on welfare with a housing

project across the street for welfare recipients who had no cars or had suffered abuse in their previous homes. But Patty Murray brought that to our attention. She said, "You've got to do this with a conscience." And we all have to recognize that the most important job of any society is the raising of children.

So I believe that these general problems that—you can see it in every advanced society—have to be met with a commitment, number one, to seize the future, not run away from it, whether it's in education or trade or technology; but number two, with an understanding that in America, to preserve the American dream, you have to guarantee opportunity for everybody who is responsible enough to work for it. And we have to reaffirm the fact that among all of our differences, we're still united as one America. That's basically what I'm trying to do.

We have to redefine our notion of what the Government is supposed to do, away from a Government that tries to do everything and a Government that says that we're the problem, we're not going to do anything, to action that focuses on genuine partnership and giving people the tools to make the most of their own lives.

Now, I think our approach has worked pretty well. I think if, after 5 years that Patty Murray and I have been teammates in Washington, we have the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years, the lowest crime rate in 24 years, the biggest drop in welfare in history, an improvement in the economy, cleaner air, cleaner water, fewer toxic waste dumps, and safer food, I think that's a pretty good argument to reelect a Senator who supported those policies and that direction for America.

Let me just close with this thought: In the end how you feel about somebody like Patty Murray basically depends upon how you feel about your place in America and what you think it will mean to be an American in the 21st century. There are a lot of very brilliant people who believe that the nation-state is fast becoming a relic of the past, that the technological revolution basically means that globalized financial and product and service markets and extremely localized governments will dominate the 21st century.

I believe that we don't have a person to waste and that the mission of America is to create opportunity for everybody that's responsible enough to work for it and then to reassert our fundamental values of community in a world where there are maybe not the cold war nuclear threats that we faced for 50 years but where, make no mistake about it, we have real threats to our security at home and abroad.

I just came from Denver today, a wonderful American city, where they've got radical right-wing groups, skinhead groups, that have been involved in the death of a police officer, the shooting of an African on the streets there, the shooting of a woman who bent down to help the person on the streets there.

We see what happens in Bosnia or Northern Ireland and the Middle East, where people hate each other over race or religion, and say, "That stuff can't happen here." It can't if we don't permit it to happen here. But if we don't teach our children and practice and live that we are part of one community, in spite of whatever differences we have, if you agree to obey the law and work hard and go to school if you're a kid and go to work if you're an adult and take care of your children and pay your taxes and do the right thing, you're part of our America. We have to teach people that. Just like kids have to be taught hatred.

You know, I'm not running anymore. Some people are happy about it. [*Laughter*] One child said to me today she wished I could run for a third term. I heard a draft right there, you know. [*Laughter*] No, it wasn't Chelsea; believe me, it's not Chelsea. [*Laughter*] She'll be glad when I'm home. She wants her daddy back, I think.

But what I really believe, having observed this over the last several years as we go through these massive changes, that the biggest difference in attitude between the two parties—and I'm heartened when we can do things like reach this wonderful compromise to overhaul the Food and Drug Administration to get drugs and medical devices to the market more quickly, or to reach this wonderful compromise in overhauling the adoption and foster care laws of the country to move children into homes more quickly. And we reach these things after we debate. But if you hear our side of the debate, basically it's not true that Democrats are not fiscally responsible, committed to bringing the crime rate down, committed to running a strong economy, committed to a strong foreign policy. That's not true.

We just believe that you can't hold a country together unless you honestly believe everybody counts; unless you honestly believe we don't have a child to waste; unless you honestly believe that the United States of America in the 21st century must mean, more than ever, one America that celebrates all of our diversity, lets all the entrepreneurial things that could possibly happen occur, tries to stay on the edge of change, but tries to make sure everybody can have a shot at the brass ring, and challenges every citizen to serve in some way beyond his or her immediate self-interest because we're all better off when the least of us are better off.

And how you feel about Patty Murray, I think, more than anything else, depends upon how you feel about that. I know one thing: She has done a wonderful job for you. She has advocated for Washington's interests. She has worn me out on specific environmental interests in this State. She is always there. But the real thing that's important about her is how she feels about her country, the children, and the future. And I want you to make sure that everybody in this State knows that at election time.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:30 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Lori MacDonald Jonsson and Lars Jonsson, dinner hosts; Mayor Norman B. Rice and Mayor-elect Paul Schell of Seattle; Brian Baird and Greta Cammermyer, candidates for Washington State's Third and Second Congressional Districts, respectively; Mona Lee Locke, wife of Gov. Gary Locke of Washington; Denver police officer Bruce VanderJagt and African immigrant Oumar Dia, slain in separate incidents earlier in the month; and Jeannie VanVelkinburgh, wounded while attempting to help Mr. Dia.

Remarks at a Reception for Senator Patty Murray in Seattle, Washington
November 22, 1997

The President Thank you very much. Ken, thank you for that wonderful introduction. I kind of wish you'd just finish the speech, you did so well. [*Laughter*] And Senator, thank you for your hospitality tonight and for your terrific statement and for a terrific record. Washington State should be very proud of Patty Murray. She has done a remarkable job.

I'd also like to say a special word of thanks to my dear friend, your outgoing mayor, Norm Rice, for all that he has done for you and for me. I wish Mayor-elect Schell well, and I pledge my cooperation. I thank Norm Dicks and Jim McDermott and Adam Smith for what they do for you and for our country in Congress. And I wish Brian Baird and Greta Cammermyer all the best in this election. I hope you'll help them.

Patty did such a good job that I almost feel like the sort of old saw about everything that needs to be said has been said, but not everyone has said it yet. [*Laughter*] But I would like to try to ask you to think about the issues she raised and the points she made and the work she's done in the context of where we are on America's journey.

If you just think back to 1992 when we were running for this job—I for President; she for Senator—our country was in a stagnant economy. We seemed to be increasing our social tensions. And we seemed to be drifting toward a new century and a new millennium and a very different time. Now, I don't believe that any person, even the most ardent partisan on the other side, could deny that America is in better shape today than it was 5 years ago.

It happened partly because of specific actions and specific votes and largely because of the enormously impressive efforts of all of our citizens all across this country getting up every day and trying to do the right thing. But it also happened, I believe, because we have been trying to pursue a common vision.

I ran for President because I wanted to reclaim the future for our children; because I wanted to restore a sense of possibility and confidence to people, that everybody who worked hard and did his or her best ought to have a chance; and because I really thought we had to do far more to prepare this country for the 21st century if we wanted to have opportunity for every responsible citizen, if we wanted to

have a community of one America across all the lines that divide us, and if we wanted to continue to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity. I hope you have seen, in the difficult week we have just had over the weapons inspections in Iraq, how important it is for your country to continue to stand up for peace and freedom and security around the world.

So we started with this vision that we didn't have a person to waste, that everybody ought to have a part of our America, that we all needed to make ourselves into a common quilt of effort to prepare this country for the future, that we all needed to serve beyond our narrow ways in larger ways. And we knew that would require us to change. But one thing we had to change, what I thought was the completely irrelevant debate about Government in Washington where one side said, "We ought to keep on trying to do everything even though we don't have any money," and the other side said, "Government is always a problem; we should do nothing."

Our administration and Patty Murray, we said, "Now, we can't do everything; we're in debt. But we can't sit on the sidelines and let America drift and divide either. We are committed to a new form of Government that will create the conditions and give the American people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives. And we will do whatever we have to do to change our economic policy, our crime policy, our welfare policy, our environmental policy, our family policy, our health care policy, our foreign policy to meet the challenges of tomorrow. We're not going to freeze yesterday, and we're not going to allow ourselves to be divided. We're going into the future, and we're all going together." That is what we have said here.

Just consider this—Patty Murray mentioned the budget bill in 1993—we lost some people in the Congress, maybe some in Washington State, who had the courage to vote for the budget bill. Why? Because the other party advertised heavily that we had raised the income taxes of ordinary citizens, that we were going to raise the deficit, bankrupt the economy, and it was going to be a disaster.

Well, the truth is that we cut taxes for 10 times as many people as raised them, including working people with children on modest incomes; that we reduced the deficit; that we continued to invest in education and our future. And 5 years later—we just got the latest figures—the deficit, before one dollar of the balanced budget plan is saved—before one dollar—based on the 1993 economic plan, has been reduced by 92 percent. Patty Murray was right, and they were wrong. The people who stood up were wrong. They were wrong.

In 1992, everywhere I went in America people were distraught about crime. They wanted something done about it. And I had learned already that the easiest thing in the world for a politician to do is to stand up in front of a crowd and talk about being tough on crime, and then you don't have to think anymore and, you know, just serve up some bill that raises sentences for some crimes and walk away.

But I was determined we could do better than that, and that we ought to listen to the police officers and the prosecutors and also the community workers who work with all these troubled kids all across our country, and let them write us a crime bill. And we did. And Patty Murray and I stood up for it. And all across the country, and in Washington State, there were some Members of Congress who lost their seats because the other guy said, "They're trying to take your guns away from you. They're going to take your hunting rifle away from you."

Well, in 1996, I had the pleasure of going all the way across this country, from New Hampshire, where it happened, to Washington State, where it happened, two States that voted for me and then voted people out over this gun issue. And I said, "You voted people out in '94 over this gun issue. And if you have lost your gun, I want you to vote against me, too." [*Laughter*] "But if you haven't lost your gun, one more time they did not tell you the truth, and you ought to let them know you do not appreciate it and send them a message."

So the hunting seasons rolled on from Washington to New Hampshire. [*Laughter*] But 250,000 people with a criminal record or a serious mental health history couldn't buy handguns, and this is a better country because of it, and there are people alive on the streets because of it. And we've already put two-thirds of those police officers on the street, and the crime rate has gone down. It's a better country.

In welfare, on the other side they wanted to say, any able-bodied person——

[*At this point, an audience member required medical attention.*]

The President. I got my doctor coming to look; we're all right, relax—they wanted to say, "Any able-bodied person that doesn't get a job in a certain amount of time should just be cut off welfare." We said, "It's okay to make people go to work if they're able-bodied, but don't hurt their children. Don't cut off their medical coverage. Don't cut off their food coverage. Give them child care. Give them job training, and give them a chance to make a full life." That's what we said. And you know, a couple of vetoes, but we finally did it our way. We've had the biggest drop in welfare rolls in the history of this country. So I believe our side was right, and theirs was wrong.

On the environment, when they won the Congress in '95, they tried to implement the contract on America; their idea of the contract was get rid of all the environmental rules and regulations because they are bad for the economy. Our idea was you can make the economy better and the environment better. That's Patty Murray's idea. That's why she got such a big hand on Hanford—[*applause*].

The truth is, today, 1997, compared to 1992, we have 13.5 million more jobs, cleaner air, cleaner water, fewer toxic waste dumps, and a safer food supply. Patty Murray was right, and her critics were wrong. And you ought to send her back to the United States Senate on the basis of it.

So I guess my plea to you is, the people of Washington State have been good to Bill Clinton and to Hillary Clinton and to Al and Tipper Gore. You voted for us twice. You've given us a chance to serve. But we need leaders in this battle who understand what local conditions are and what local concerns are and who stand up for the big national issues.

Patty Murray can come before the people of Washington and say, "Compared to where we were, we've got the lowest unemployment rate in 23 years, the lowest crime rate in 23 years, the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history, a cleaner environment, and I support the direction that this country has taken. That is working." And, furthermore, let's look to the future. Who do you really trust to give every child in this State world-class education? Who do you really trust to make sure that we do everything we can to provide health insurance to the children in poor working families who don't have it? Who do you really trust to continue to fight these environmental battles and to deal with all these other things? Patty Murray.

I say this now, and every group of Americans I speak to: This is a democracy. There is a direct line of causation from your presence here tonight, the contribution you have made, the work you will do to what happens in Washington, DC, the decisions that are made, and how it echoes back all across America into every little hamlet in this State. This is a better country because the ideas and the values that Patty Murray espouses have dominated the American political landscape, and we are further toward the future, toward building that bridge to the 21st century because of it—more opportunity, more citizen responsibility, and a much, much stronger sense of community than if those who opposed her ideas and her votes had prevailed. So you stick with her, and we'll go there together.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:05 p.m. in the Pavilion at the Seattle Center. In his remarks, he referred to Ken Alhadeff, chairman, Elttaes Enterprises; Mayor-elect Paul Schell of Seattle; and Brian Baird and Greta Cammermyer, candidates for Washington State's Third and Second Congressional Districts, respectively. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Jean Chretien of Canada in Vancouver, British Columbia

November 23, 1997

President Clinton. I want to thank the Prime Minister for hosting this and for giving us the chance to come back to Vancouver. My family and I had a wonderful vacation here back in 1990, before I was President—back when I had

a family life that was normal—and we loved it. This is a great place for the APEC summit.

I also want to thank Canada again for what I think is very probably the most cooperative relationship in the world in trade and investment and in the work we do in the environment and law enforcement. And I hope that as we look ahead to the new century, that the partnership that we've had, the cooperation we've had will be a genuine model that other countries will try to follow.

I think it's worth mentioning, Mr. Prime Minister, that we committed ourselves again to work to find a meaningful solution to the problem of climate change and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. We talked about our continuing commitment to secure democracy—democracy's roots and sustainability in Haiti. We discussed a number of other issues, and I wanted to say to you that I very much welcome these initiatives that were launched last April in Washington on how we can meet the environmental challenges of the future and how we can work to fight criminals who use cross-border telemarketing schemes to prey upon both Canadians and Americans.

And I wanted to reiterate also here in Canada that we discussed this issue of Pacific salmon, and our special representatives have been working hard to get these stakeholders talks restarted. I am committed to them. I think this issue has gone on too long; it's caused too much friction between our people. And I want to reaffirm to you publicly that I believe this process can produce an agreement in good faith and that I will do my part to implement it in good faith.

And finally, let me just thank you for your leadership in APEC. I am very, very pleased with the agreement which has been reached by our ministers to try to tear down tariffs and open trade in nine different areas that covers $1.5 trillion worth of trade. This is a very important achievement for this, and I think it will go quite nicely with our efforts to discuss what we can do about the current financial issues in Asia.

Our ministers in Manila have offered a proposal for the IMF to take a lead, for us to back them up, and for the countries themselves to take appropriate steps. I think that's the right approach.

But I would say to all of you, I think this is a time for confidence in the future of Asia and confidence in the future of our relationship with them. We have a few little glitches in the road here; we're working through them. And I think in no small measure because of your leadership, Mr. Prime Minister, and the position Canada has enjoyed of trust and respect among all nations, this is likely to be one of the best meetings that we've ever had, and it's coming at exactly the right time because of all the developments in Asia. And I thank you for that.

Prime Minister Chretien. Thank you very much.

Situation in Iraq

Q. Mr. President, do you see anything confrontational or ominous in the latest statements by Iraq's Ambassador to the United Nations suggesting that this crisis may not be over, and Iraq is standing firm, et cetera, et cetera?

President Clinton. I can't blame him for saying that because I've said that. I've also told you that the crisis may not be over. All I can tell you is that the international community, through the United Nations, has resolutions that relate to Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program. We have an inspection team that I think has done a very good job, often under very trying circumstances. The leader of that team, Mr. Butler, made a very forthright and clear report yesterday to the Security Council, and they have taken what I believe so far is appropriate action.

It is clear that there is a massive amount of work that has to be done there, especially in the chemical and biological inspection areas, in order for UNSCOM to fulfill the mandate it has been given by the United Nations. And I am determined that it should do so, and I believe all of us are.

Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum

Q. Prime Minister, your Foreign Minister this morning seemed to suggest that people, in his words, will question the value of APEC if it doesn't help some of these countries move toward democratic rights. I didn't think that's what APEC was all about. Do you agree with what Mr. Axworthy said? And I wonder if Mr. Clinton sees that also as one of the aims that APEC should have.

Prime Minister Chretien. The aim of APEC is an economic discussion for liberalization of trade among the countries. Of course, when—but the reality is this: APEC is a good meeting

to discuss these things, but we have a lot of bilateral meetings at the same time. So we promote the changes that we believe should happen in some of the countries on a bilateral basis. These subjects are not discussed officially at APEC because APEC has not been structured for that.

But it's great for us that it gave us the occasion to have bilateral meetings with these leaders. And for example, I would have bilateral meetings with all of them, and in fact, the President of China is coming to Ottawa—the occasion of APEC—for meetings in Ottawa and Toronto. So APEC is the cause of a dialog of that nature that is very useful for all of us. But APEC is not a meeting that is organized for that type of discussion.

Fast-Track Trade Authority

Q. Prime Minister, did you discuss fast track, especially in relationship to liberalization of trade in the Americas? And also, President Clinton, on this, too?

Prime Minister Chretien. Well, there was not a direct discussion on that. We will have a meeting in Chile later on. And I understand that the vote was not taken in the United States, but it was a postponement. But it's up to the President to assess what is happening there.

We are very much interested that we carry on on the goal that we have set to us, to all of the countries of the Americas, when the President, at his meeting in December '94, I guess—where we decided that by year 2010 we should have an agreement with all the Central and Latin American and Caribbean countries to be part of a kind of an expanded NAFTA.

President Clinton. Let me say, if I were you, I would not read too much significance into the fact that the vote was not held at the end of the last session of Congress. I think Congress will act on fast-track legislation early next year. And we're going to do our best to prevail.

I think it's important to note that in the difficulties in the House of Representatives there were a number of issues not directly related to trade, which played a role in our inability to take the vote at that time.

I also would say, though, specifically that a lot of the legitimate concerns over the nature of our trading relations with the rest of the world were brought to bear in the debate on the procedural vote, and they reflected the dilemma that is going on in every advanced society in the world, in Canada, in all of Europe, everywhere, which is, how do you achieve the benefits of the global economy—let me finish—how do you achieve the benefits of the global economy and still preserve the social contract? How do you make sure that when you expand trade—you mentioned human rights—how do you make sure, when you expand trade, you're actually elevating the human condition of your trading partners? How do you make sure that we have a strategy for expanding trade and growing economies which allow—not only allow but encourage all of us to be more environmentally responsible?

So a lot of these things just need to be worked through in governing bodies throughout the world. And I think that in that sense it's a healthy thing. But I expect we'll take some positive action on fast track early in the next year, and I would urge that all kind of wait and see what we do, but I'm hopeful.

Landmines

Q. Mr. President, did the Prime Minister convince you to sign on to the landmine treaty?

President Clinton. No, we haven't discussed that. But let me just tell you we haven't discussed that yet here; we had a conversation about it on the telephone the other day. The Prime Minister has worked very hard to create the biggest possible tent for everyone to be in to this treaty. I want to first say that I think Canada has done a remarkable and an important thing in trying to get the countries of the world to agree not to produce, deploy, or sell landmines. And I applaud that.

The United States, I believe, has destroyed more landmines since I've been President than any other country in the world, 1.5 million in our own stocks; we're about to destroy another 1.5 million. We also have spent about half the money spent in the world on demining activities. We lost a plane off the coast of Africa just a few weeks ago, and all of its crew, having deposited a demining team in Africa. And we're increasing by 25 percent our demining budget.

Now, because of the unique circumstances of our program, we may not be able to sign on. We don't think we can sign on to the agreement as it's presently written because of our responsibilities in Korea and because our antitank defenses are not covered by the words—the plain words of the treaty as other countries' antitank

defenses are. Everybody recognizes they're legitimate. And I hope we can work that out, but if we can't, it should not diminish the fact that Canada has done an enormously important thing.

Simultaneously with that, what I am trying to do is to encourage all the major producers and sellers of landmines in the world who are not yet part of—out of the Ottawa regime or any other commitment, to make appropriate commitments not to produce, deploy, or sell these mines. And I will continue to do that.

So I'm going to work together with the Prime Minister on this as best I can. And if we are not able to sign it because of those two issues, that should not diminish the achievement that Canada has made to get other countries in this. And meanwhile, we will continue to be the world's number one destroyer of landmines, and we will continue to spend more money and exert more efforts to bring these mines out of the ground that are killing people around the world.

Prime Minister Chretien. And yesterday we add Thailand to agree to sign the treaty, and we had a discussion with the Prime Minister of Singapore this morning—was looking at that. We are frustrated—some of the countries who are not signing the treaty we are frustrated to make a statement that they will not engage into selling landmines and so on.

So we made a lot of progress, and we'll keep the pressure, gentle pressure, on the President—[*laughter*]—every time that we have an occasion to get them to move. I do think that there is a way to take care of the problem of Korea and so on, but it's complicated—I understand that—for the President of the United States, more than for me.

President Clinton. Let me just say, though, there's not that much difference in our position. This is a question of how that treaty was worded and the unwillingness of some people to entertain any change in the wording of it.

I believe I was the first world leader at the United Nations to call for a total ban on landmine production and deployment. And I strongly support what the Prime Minister is doing. And when they were meeting in Oslo, we implored the people there to give us the exceptions we needed, recognizing that in the Korean Peninsula we've never had indiscriminate use of landmines that have had—put civilians, children at risk, and that we have the unusual situation of having a huge North Korean army there just a few miles from Seoul and no way to stop the movement there without leaving the minefields there, and that we have a situation with our antitank weapons which we have tested over and over again to prove that they don't amount to antipersonnel weapons that can be left in the field and cause danger to innocent civilians.

But the people who were at Oslo decided they would not try to accommodate us for whatever reason. That was their legitimate reason. A number of world leaders said they thought I was right, but that they couldn't get it done. Now, I'm not going to fight over that. I think that's silly. We should look at the evidence. What is your record on landmines? Which nation has destroyed the most landmines? Which nation is doing the most to promoted demining? The answer to that is the United States.

And I support what Canada has done. And I think it is a great mistake to make this whole story about whether we will sign on to this or not. That was a decision made by people who decided that our antitank weapons were not entitled to be protected. My first responsibility, since I may have to send our troops into conflict situations on behalf of a lot of the nations that have signed on to this treaty, is to make sure that if I do that I can protect them. Now, that is my position.

So I regret the fact that our antitank systems are the only ones in the world that weren't covered by this. They have their position on that. They have their reasons that because of where they were in the Oslo process they couldn't change. That's fine. It's a great mistake to make that the story.

Canada has done a magnificent thing getting all these countries involved in this, continuing to raise the issue. We have done a great thing by destroying the weapons and by leading the world's demining effort. And we should work together as closely as we can and not let the differences over the wording of this treaty and whether we sign on the bottom line at some time or another obscure the fact that we are moving to rid the world of these antipersonnel weapons. It is a big deal, and it should be seen as a positive deal that should not be obscured by how this whole business about our participation in the treaty developed.

International Agreement on Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Q. With Kyoto a week away, have you come to any agreement on reducing emissions, any target dates? Did you decide anything today?

Prime Minister Chretien. We have not decided what will be the result of Kyoto, but we have agreed that it is very important to have an agreement in Kyoto. And there are some discussions at this time between the different participants to find a compromise. We have been engaged in that. I discussed that with the President this morning. We want to involve the developing nations, too, because this is not a problem only with the industrialized nations; this is a global issue. And even if we do what is right among the industrialized nations, the problem can be increasing over years because of the developing nations. It's not affecting only the countries where the pollution is caused; it's going into the atmosphere; it's moving around.

So we want to have some statement made by the developing nations, and we will use this meeting at APEC to talk to some of the big countries, like China, to engage them. I talked yesterday with Mexico, who are part of what we call the B categories, to get engaged and to make some commitments that will be useful to solve the problems in the long run.

It's not only a problem of industrialized nations, it's a global problem. And the President and I, I guess, would agree on that, that it has to be done in a global fashion. So we will be negotiating in Kyoto to involve them and try to get some credit for when we're helping them to develop their economy in such a way that they will pollute less. And it is a great occasion for these countries to do the development of their energy production and to do it the right way because they're starting, and it's better to do it right at the beginning than to wait for 10 or 15 years and have to start again.

So these are the types of discussions that I had with the President this morning, where we want to work together with both the industrialized nations and the developing nations, too.

Asian Economies

Q. Mr. President, you said the U.S. should back up the IMF in its efforts to find some sort of stability in Asian economies. What is the U.S. prepared to do by way of backing up the IMF? How would you explain to the American public what their stake is in this issue?

President Clinton. First of all, let me describe what we agreed to do in Manila, our ministers, and what Secretary Rubin and Deputy Secretary Summers have worked very hard to develop.

We basically, in response to the Asian financial markets crisis, said there ought to be a three-step plan here. Number one, the International Monetary Fund ought to take the lead. Number two, they can't take the lead unless countries themselves have responsible policies that inspire investor confidence, and we listed those. Number three, the other developed countries ought to be in a position to together have a sort of a backup stabilizing reassurance support. And it doesn't involve an enormous amount of money on the part of any country—nowhere near, for example, the commitment we made in Mexico.

And we had a bill in the last session of the Congress that was in with our U.N. arrears that, as you will remember, was held up because of another domestic political dispute, but again, I expect that will be worked out early in the next year. So that's kind of where we are.

We're just banding together with the other countries to give a little backup to the IMF because we know how much these huge flows of capital—they're very massive around the world, and they move based on a perception of what is going to happen in the future, where confidence is of the essence. So confidence requires good practices within the countries, a strong IMF, and the backup for the other countries. Our commitment is limited but significant enough to send that signal when in tandem with all of our other allies.

Prime Minister Chretien. And we're working on this problem since a long time. You will remember the summit in Halifax——

President Clinton. Yes, Halifax.

Prime Minister Chretien. ——where that was the theme of the summit because we had a feeling that it was to be a problem. So we have strengthened the mechanism used by IMF and trying to prevent the crisis and so on. But as the President said, there is a lot of speculative interpretation of what is going on—that we have to say. And we believe that in the Asia-Pacific, the countries are not facing a massive recession; it's not true at all. These countries will still be growing. And a lot of the mistakes that were made were not necessarily made by action of

government. It was a lot of people borrowing short-term money to build hotels and office buildings and so on. And suddenly, with the speculation, they're trapped. And the government has come to the rescue of who?—of the private sector. And we have to keep that in mind.

So we need to try to—and I guess there is a lot of consensus here that we have to back up the IMF, ask the countries to have the proper programs to meet the requirements of IMF. And what is important—in the communique it looks like we have made more agreements than predicted because we believe that we have to carry on on the course of freer trade and more movement of capital around the world. That's the way that growth will come, and it is through growth that you can attend to the social problems that exist in all these countries.

President Clinton. I'd like to say one other thing. Just a minute. If you look at—I just want to hammer home this—maybe the best thing we're doing to help the situation is the agreement we've made to push for lower tariffs and open trade in nine new areas, including environmental technology, which will help what we're trying to do on climate change, because that will show that we understand that we're leading the way to growth through increasing trade and investment in the areas that are critical to the 21st century economy.

The Prime Minister has made this point over and over again, but I predict to you that our making that common commitment and going forward and building on what we've done with the information technology agreement will have a significant positive impact in the confidence people have about whether they should be investing in all the countries participating here, including our two.

[*The following question was asked in French. Prime Minister Chretien answered in French, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.*]

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, concerning the IMF, given the fact that Korea and Thailand are already involved, do you think the agreement is sufficiently solid?

Prime Minister Chretien. I think the answer is positive, and we will be helping, if necessary. The IMF is a first line of defense; then perhaps we might need a second line of defense. And I think that the IMF has managed very well the Mexican crisis 3 years ago. This is a very important example. And it will also be able to manage the Pacific crisis. And if there are additional resources that are needed, we will be communicating with members of the IMF, if necessary. And I trust that it will work.

Thank you very much.

Q. Are you prepared for the United States to participate in a backup to any IMF package to aid South Korea?

President Clinton. First of all, I think that the South Korean situation is covered by the statement we put out in Manila. And I think the important thing that we should do now is to focus on how South Korea fits within that framework. South Korea—we should look at that, we should—the IMF is going to look at it; the IMF is going to make a judgment. There are certain things the South Koreans may have to do. And then, under certain circumstances, any country involved—if you look at what we agreed to do in Manila, whether the backup comes into play or not depends on what happens in the first two instances—what the country does, what the IMF does, what the judgment is now.

So it's completely premature to make a decision about that. The South Koreans have a very powerful economy with a great amount of potential. And a lot of this is going to be—involves making adjustments now in it and then restoring the natural productive capacity and growth to the economy. I'm—certainly I don't see how anyone could be less than hopeful about the long-term prospects for the South Korean economy given their remarkable achievements over the last few decades.

Prime Minister Chretien. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 153d news conference began at 10 a.m. in the East Room at the Pan Pacific Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Nizar Hamdun, Iraqi Ambassador to the United Nations; and Richard Butler, Executive Chairman, United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM).

Statement on the Death of Jorge Mas Canosa
November 23, 1997

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the death of Jorge Mas Canosa, Chairman of the Advisory Board for Cuba Broadcasting and long-time champion of a free Cuba.

It was Jorge's vision which ultimately led to the creation of Radio Marti by Congress enacting the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act in 1983, to encourage the communication of accurate information and ideas to the people of Cuba. He served as Chairman of the Advisory Board from its inception.

Jorge was a born leader and organizer, whose tenacity, strength of conviction, and passion I greatly admired. He galvanized his community, his adopted country, and people around the world for the cause of freedom and democracy in Cuba. We have lost a forceful voice for freedom in Cuba and elsewhere, but his dream lives on. He will be missed.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Irma, and his sons, Jorge, Juan, and Jose. Hillary and I join the Cuban-American community and others around the world who care for the cause of freedom in Cuba in mourning his loss.

Statement on the Effectiveness of Anticrime Measures
November 23, 1997

Crime rates continue to fall dramatically throughout the country, and it's no accident. With community police at the center of our efforts, we have worked to give communities the tools they need to rid their neighborhoods of gangs, guns, and drugs. We have made real progress: There are nearly 5,000 fewer murders annually in America today than in 1993.

Now we need to take juvenile crime head on. The spending bill I will sign next week includes more than $100 million to hire scores of local prosecutors, probation officers, and others to crack down on gangs. With these provisions, coupled with new after-school programs and a $195 million anti-drug media campaign, we can begin to pursue a strategy that works to keep all of our youth on track.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 23, but it was embargoed for release until 6 p.m.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Jiang Zemin of China in Vancouver
November 24, 1997

Situation in Iraq

Q. President Clinton, if we might, could we have a question about Iraq? I wondered why it was so important that the U.N. inspectors be able to—why is it critical that they see these palaces which Saddam Hussein now has made off limits?

President Clinton. Well, let me say, first of all, like all issues, this should be looked at on the basis of the real underlying facts. The term "palace" has a different meaning in Iraq than it would to the ordinary American. The ordinary American would hear the word "palace," and they would think, a very fancy residence for a head of state or a member of a royal family.

There are 78 such palaces in Iraq. Many of them are huge compounds. Some of them actually encompass more land than Washington, DC, does. So to put 78 palaces, when you look at what they really are, off limits according to Mr.

Butler and our inspectors would mean that they could not adequately search for chemical and biological weapons operations. Our position is, if the inspector team says they ought to do it, that's a lot of land, a lot of buildings, and they ought to be able to do what they think is necessary.

Q. Well, do you suspect that he's using these palaces to hide illegal arms?

President Clinton. Well, they have acknowledged that in 1995—as late as 1995, that they had quite substantial stores of weapons and potential weapons that would be prohibited and subject to inspection and destruction under the U.N. resolution. And I just want the inspectors to be able to do their job. My suspicions are not important. The only thing that matters here is that the inspectors can do their job under the U.N. resolutions.

Q. President Jiang, does China support—you have one more week as President of the Council—does China support the U.S. position that there should be unimpeded inspections in Iraq?

President Jiang. I'll ask the Foreign Minister to answer your question.

Q. All right.

Foreign Minister Qian Qichen. We have supported always the completion of inspection in Iraq in the United Nations.

Wei Jingsheng

Q. Mr. President, is Wei Jingsheng going to be able to come home ever, do you think?

President Jiang. Well, this matter will be handled according to China's judicial procedures.

International Agreement on Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Q. President Clinton, do you think you'll press China on global warming?

President Clinton. We've discussed this before, and I hope we get a chance to discuss it again today. I think we have a framework that's good for China, good for the United States, good for the world. We're going to talk about it some more today.

Wei Jingsheng

Q. Mr. President, have you talked with Wei Jingsheng?

President Clinton. No, we just got here. [*Laughter*] We haven't talked about anything.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:45 p.m. in the Princess Louisa Suite at the Waterfront Centre Hotel. In his remarks, the President referred to Wei Jingsheng, Chinese dissident recently released for medical treatment in the United States.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan in Vancouver

November 24, 1997

Asian Economies

Q. Mr. President, can you assure Americans that the Asian financial crisis won't damage their portfolios or hurt them financially in any way, especially those who are middle-aged or older who are preparing to retire? How does that affect Americans, what's going on over there?

The President. Well, it affects us in several ways. First of all, we sell about a third of our exports to Asia. And if the Asian financial difficulties worsen, don't get better, then the value of the Asian currencies goes down; they don't have money to buy exports anymore; their exports to our country and to others become much cheaper; and more importantly, they lower the overall rate of economic growth in the world, which would hurt Americans. That is the most likely negative consequence of that.

Now, obviously, if there—we have seen that when there are problems in financial markets in some parts of the world, sometimes it bleeds over to other parts of the world, and it can have an impact on our stock market, for example, which would go to the question that you raised.

My view is that we should approach this with determination but with confidence. I mean, after all, we have a lot of productivity and a lot of hard-working people in Asia. And we have now, after the Manila meeting, a mechanism to approach these financial challenges. So we need to take this very seriously. We need to work

very hard at it. We don't need to be at all casual, but we should also have confidence that we can work through it.

Q. Is Japan going to need a bailout from the IMF?

The President. Are you asking the Prime Minister?

Q. No.

The President. I'm not in a position to answer questions about Japan's situation, except that I think that we believe that they must, and we're certain that they will, deal with these issues in an appropriate fashion. We just want to be in a position to be supportive when we can, and that's what we said at Manila, and that's what we did in Indonesia. But I think Japan can lead Asia out of this difficulty with the strength of its economy and the right moves.

Q. With the recommendations that came up in Manila, there's some suggestion that maybe—that the leaders might have to go further than the ministers went to nip this in the bud, to really fix it.

The President. Well, that's one of the things we're going to discuss here. We haven't really had the leaders meetings here. I mean, we're all talking one on one, but when we get into the APEC meeting, one of the things we want to discuss is, do we believe what happened at Manila will work? If so, what are we prepared to do to make it work? What are we prepared to do if we have to go beyond that?

But I think if you look at the basic framework of Manila, it's quite an intelligent idea. Every country should have good economic policies on its own. The IMF should fashion a remedy appropriate to that country in these times. If that fails or is insufficient, then those of us in the region will come in and support it—to try to make so it's like a three-level approach. I think it makes a lot of sense, and I don't think we should assume that it's not adequate until we give it a chance to work.

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

International Agreement on Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Q. Mr. President, on Kyoto, Secretary Albright today said that the U.S. would act first, which has been the policy. And then she said that well-off developing nations presumably should be the next up. Will you or will you not push for all developing nations to sign the treaty or to somehow make some sort of firm commitment to reductions?

The President. Well, we believe the developing nations, as well as the developed nations, should be involved in the process. We also have always made clear that they should not be asked to adopt the same targets that we are but that what we want to do is to find a way for the largest possible number of nations to participate in Kyoto so that we can tell the developing nations, "Look, we don't want you to give up your future economic growth, but we do want you to work with us to get there with a different energy path than we adopted, because the technology is there and you will actually benefit more from doing it right the first time than from paying for a big transformation after you've already developed in this way."

And keep in mind, we have to do this. Otherwise, 30 years from now, all of us in the developed nations will have lowered our greenhouse gas emissions, and increased emissions from other countries will mean we will not have made one bit of progress. So we have to find a way to do this and still reassure these developing nations they're not giving up future growth.

I believe we can, and we're working on it. I'm lobbying as hard as I can here and have been, as you know, and did all through Latin America. I'm doing the best I can.

NOTE: The exchange began at 1:47 p.m. in the Princess Louisa Suite at the Waterfront Centre Hotel.

Remarks to the United States Consulate Staff in Vancouver
November 25, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you. First of all, this is the first chance I've had to say thank you, Ambassador Giffin. Let me thank all of you for coming, all of you who work for the American consulate here, for our Embassy, both the Americans and the Canadians who are here. And those of you who brought your children, thank you for bringing your children.

I know that whenever a President comes to another country and to another community, the very happiest time is when he gets on the plane and leaves—[*laughter*]—because it's a lot of trouble. And I appreciate the trouble that you have taken to make my second visit to Vancouver a really wonderful one.

I was told that when I came here before as President in 1993, to meet with President Yeltsin, I was the first sitting President ever to come to Vancouver. Now I hope that no one will ever catch my record. But it is a wonderful place.

And I want to thank Gordon Giffin, who is almost as Canadian as he is American, for his willingness to become our Ambassador and leave his happy home in Georgia. And I thank Mary Ann Peters, who worked for me at the National Security Council before she came here as a DCM. Ken Fairfax was also at the National Security Council. He had to track nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union; I imagine he's happier in Canada now. But he did a fine job. And Jim Tomsheck used to be on my Presidential protection detail; he's now an assistant treasury attaché. And I asked him whether this was not a better job and he said, "Well, both of them were an honor." I think that was a political way of saying this is a much better job. [*Laughter*]

Thank you, Jay Bruns, and thanks to all the people here at the consulate. I do think that you went the extra mile to turn—to move the consulate to a golf course. I know that my love for golf is legendary but this is sort of overdoing it. I appreciate you coming here because it is on the way to the airplane.

And speaking of the airplane, Air Force One, and Harrison Ford, I actually made arrangements for Harrison Ford to see Air Force One for the first time when we happened to be in Wyoming. And I was present when he asked Glenn Close to become his Vice President. If you've seen the movie, you know she's the Vice President. And she and I were sitting there, and he got down on his knees and proposed to her. [*Laughter*] It was very romantic. And she said, "I can't. I'm too busy." And I looked at her, and I said, "Glenn, you do not say no to the President." [*Laughter*] So that's how the movie came to be.

Let me say that this APEC meeting was a very important one. Historically, it may be to the most important one we've had since we started meeting in my first year as President at Blake Island, Washington. We committed ourselves to a common vision of peace and stability and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region. Then we met in Indonesia and then in the Philippines. We adopted a plan, a strategy, a blueprint for open trade by the year 2020.

And last year, we came out for the information technology agreement, to reduce to zero tariffs on computers, semiconductors, and telecommunications equipment. It's now been embraced by the World Trade Organization, and it amounts to a $5 billion tariff cut on American products and services. It's an enormous positive impact for the United States, and indeed, it will also help Canada and every other country that manufactures and sells such equipment. And it will lift the living standards and the quality of life of people all around the world.

This year, we proved that our community is for good times and for challenging ones, as well. Asia's financial difficulties would have made it tempting for some of our partners to turn inward, maybe even to stay home. But instead, we agreed to open trade in nine new areas totaling $1.5 trillion in goods and services, everything from chemicals to medical equipment to environmental technology. This is a really strong vote of confidence in our common future.

We also supported an action plan to meet the financial challenges that we all face in Asia. And I say that advisedly, we all face them, because Canada and the United States will not be unaffected unless we can restore confidence and growth and forward progress throughout the Asian area.

We believe that the affected countries are doing the right thing in committing to take the right steps to remain strong, with the IMF taking the lead for international community and with other advanced countries backing them up when it's appropriate.

Last year we set an agenda for more open trade. This year we set an agenda to help us meet the challenges of the international financial system in the 21st century and to tackle other problems, including global warming. We committed to working to achieve an agreement in Kyoto, which is coming up in just a couple of weeks. I can't tell you how important I think this is. The scientific evidence is overwhelming that the Earth's climate is warming at a more rapid rate than it has in thousands of years. The leader from Papua New Guinea was here, saying that he literally feared huge chunks of his country being overrun if the sea level rises. He said, "It's not just our livelihood; it's our culture and our religion. It's everything about our life."

We know that global warming will lead to more extreme weather developments, the floods in the northern part of the United States, the fires in Indonesia, things of this kind. And so we know that we have to face these together.

We have already endorsed some things that will help, including a big natural gas energy network from North to South Asia which will dramatically cut greenhouse gas emissions that would otherwise come from coal or oil. We are going to take on the transnational consequences of environmental crises like the forest fires burning across Indonesia. We're developing an emergency program to predict, prevent, and coordinate our response to natural disasters of that kind in the future.

We're acting to meet the challenges that we'll face as a community and seize the opportunities we can only seize fully as a community. And I just want to reemphasize that your work is vital to that success. It wasn't so many years ago that it would have been unheard of for a few leaders from Asia, from North America, and from South America to sit around and have the kind of conversations we've had for the last 2 days. We didn't agree on everything, but we agreed on a great deal. And the world is better off and our people will be better off because of the work that you helped to make possible.

Again let me say a special word of thanks to all of our own citizens here at the consulate for serving as ambassadors of the United States, and to the Canadian citizens who work to help us do our job every day.

I wish Secretary Albright were here with me. She gives a great pep talk to all of you, and she would say that one of the great unnoticed benefits of the balanced budget agreement I signed last summer is that for the first time in years we have taken the cloud off the annual debate about whether the United States would walk away from fully funding our diplomatic efforts around the world in a way that supports people like you here and in every other nation in which we're represented. The balanced budget agreement did a good thing to help fund fully our diplomatic efforts. And I hope that will give you a lot of security and boost your morale as you do America's mission in the months and years ahead.

Let me finally say a special thank-you to the people of Vancouver. Hillary and Chelsea and I had a wonderful family vacation here a few years ago at the beginning of this decade. I fell in love with the city. We went over to Victoria; we loved everything we saw over there. And when I came back today to the same place that I met with President Yeltsin 4 years ago, I saw again what an astonishing and unique place this is for historic and cultural reasons and for all the modern reasons that I'm sure that a lot of you young people know and understand far better than I do.

I am gratified that we came. I'm pleased by the results of the meeting. And again, thank you very, very much for what you do to help the United States move the world to a better place in a new century.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:32 p.m. at the Shaughnessy Golf Course. In his remarks, the President referred to Mary Ann Peters, Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Embassy in Canada; Ken Fairfax, consulate economic officer; Judson L. Bruns III, U.S. Consul General, Vancouver; actor Harrison Ford; actress Glenn Close; and Governor General Wiwa Korowi of Papua New Guinea.

APEC Economic Leaders' Declaration: Connecting the APEC Community

November 25, 1997

1. We, APEC's Economic Leaders, met today in Vancouver, Canada, to reaffirm our commitment to work together to meet the challenge of sustaining regional prosperity and stability. Certain of the dynamism and resilience of the region, we underline our resolve to achieve sustainable growth and equitable development and to unlock the full potential of the people who live here. We agree that the prospects for economic growth in the region are strong, and that Asia-Pacific will continue to play a leading role in the global economy. The goals we have set, including the achievement of free and open trade and investment in the region by the dates set out in the Bogor Declaration, are ambitious and unequivocal.

2. We take note of the rapid expansion of APEC's activities in recent years, and the increasing leadership role it plays in global economic affairs. Flowing from commitments embodied in the Osaka Action Agenda and the Manila Action Plan for APEC, we welcome the designation of 1997 as *APEC's Year of Action.* We have reflected on the concrete *results* that APEC cooperation has generated throughout the year, and set out a *vision* of how we may build upon these achievements in the years ahead. As the year draws to a close, we note with satisfaction that we have met and surpassed all the tasks we set for ourselves at our last meeting in Subic.

3. APEC—Addressing shared challenges: We have had a thorough discussion of recent financial developments in the region. Our economies and the international community as a whole have a strong interest in seeing a quick and enduring restoration of financial stability and healthy and sustainable growth. These events reflect new challenges in the international financial system that require new responses. The global dimensions of these problems suggest the need for a global response, with regional initiatives to complement and support these efforts. We are resolved to work together to address these shared challenges.

There is no doubt that the fundamentals for long-term growth and prospects for the region are exceptionally strong. We remain convinced that open markets bring significant benefits and we will continue to pursue trade and investment liberalization that fosters further growth. Prudent and transparent policies, particularly sound macroeconomic and structural policies, human resource development strategies, and effective financial sector regulation are key to restoring financial stability and realizing this growth potential.

But we need to go further. We believe it is critically important that we move quickly to enhance the capacity of the international system to prevent or, if necessary, to respond to financial crises of this kind. On a global level, the role of the IMF remains central. Therefore, we welcome and strongly endorse the framework agreed to in Manila as a constructive step to enhance cooperation to promote financial stability: enhanced regional surveillance; intensified economic and technical cooperation to improve domestic financial systems and regulatory capacities; adoption of new IMF mechanisms on appropriate terms in support of strong adjustment programs; and a cooperative financing arrangement to supplement, when necessary, IMF resources. We urge rapid implementation of the Manila Framework. We also look forward to the conclusions of the IMF study already underway on the role of market participants in the recent crises.

We recognize that as the region's most comprehensive economic forum, APEC is particularly well suited to play a pivotal role in fostering the kind of dialogue and cooperation on a range of policies and develop initiatives to support and supplement these efforts. We ask our Finance Ministers, working closely with their Central Bank colleagues, to accelerate their work launched in Cebu in April on the collaborative initiatives to promote the development of our financial and capital markets, and to support freer and stable capital flows in the region. APEC can play a particularly valuable role in exploring ways, in cooperation with the World Bank, the IMF, and the Asian Development Bank, of intensifying its economic and technical

cooperation, giving priority to upgrading financial systems, enhancing cooperation among market regulators and supervisors and other measures to help improve the integrity and functioning of financial markets. A good example of private-public partnership in these areas is the recently-announced Toronto Centre for Executive Development of Financial Sector Supervisors.

We look to our Finance Ministers to report on progress on all of these initiatives early in the new year and to concrete outcomes at their next meeting.

4. APEC must play an increasing role in addressing such challenges. We are resolved to work together to achieve concrete results through dialogue and problem-solving. Recognizing the diverse interests and circumstances of its membership, APEC has given rise to entirely new approaches to international economic cooperation. Based on three mutually supportive pillars—trade and investment liberalization, business facilitation, and economic and technical cooperation—the APEC approach addresses regional challenges and opportunities in an integrated fashion so that all members develop the capacity to participate fully in and benefit from this cooperation. By connecting the community APEC has helped us to build relationships and share knowledge to improve the well-being of our citizens. These partnerships enhance our prosperity and progress, enrich our lives and foster the spirit of the APEC community.

A Year of Action—Key Results

5. We welcome the concrete results achieved this year in implementing the trade and investment liberalization commitments we set out at Subic Bay. We recognize efforts made by members to improve the commitments in their Individual Action Plans. APEC's collective achievement in enhancing the comparability and transparency of these plans is important in ensuring that our undertakings are well understood in the marketplace. The views of the private sector are critical to ensuring that APEC's efforts remain focused and on target. In this regard, we welcome the review of the Manila Action Plan for APEC which was carried out by the APEC Business Advisory Council, and instruct our ministers to take ABAC's views into consideration in the preparation of future plans. As Individual Action Plans remain the core mechanism for APEC's trade and investment liberalization activity, we reaffirm our commitment to their annual improvement.

6. APEC's liberalization proceeds on a voluntary basis, propelled by commitments taken at the highest level. In this regard, we welcome the action taken to accelerate by two years the time table for the identification of sectors for early voluntary liberalization, a decision that underlines our determination to advance the pace of liberalization in the region and globally. We endorse the agreement of our Ministers that action should be taken with respect to early voluntary liberalization in 15 sectors, with nine to be advanced throughout 1998 with a view to implementation beginning in 1999. We find this package to be mutually beneficial and to represent a balance of interests. We instruct Ministers responsible for trade to finalize detailed targets and timelines by their next meeting in June 1998. To sustain this momentum, we further instruct that the additional sectors nominated by members this year to be brought forward for consideration of additional action next year. We underline our commitment to comprehensive liberalization, as stated in the Osaka Action Agenda.

7. Among multilateral and regional fora, APEC is a pioneer in the area of trade and investment facilitation. Our business community tells us that this is the area of APEC activity of most immediate relevance to them. Lowering costs, eliminating red-tape and delay, promoting regulatory reform, developing mutual recognition arrangements on standards and conformance, and increasing predictability are clear benefits, especially to operators of small and medium-sized enterprises. The *Blueprint for APEC Customs Modernization,* which puts forward a comprehensive program to harmonize and simplify customs clearances by the year 2000, provides a model. We urge the acceleration of trade and investment facilitation through APEC's Collective Action Plans and direct Ministers to use APEC's economic and technical cooperation activities to build capacity, adapt procedures and incorporate new technologies.

8. On the eve of the 50th anniversary of the GATT we reflected on the rich legacy it has conferred through the encouragement of open trade regimes. We reaffirm the primacy of the open, rules-based multilateral trading system under the WTO and reiterate our commitment to APEC's activity proceeding on the basis of

open regionalism. We invite trading partners outside APEC to follow suit.

Full and active participation in and support of the WTO by all APEC economies is key to our ability to continue to strengthen the global trading system. We encourage the acceleration of substantive negotiations on protocol issues and market access with a view to achieving universality of WTO membership. We reaffirm our undertaking to implement fully all existing WTO commitments and the built-in agenda of the WTO according to agreed timetables. We also challenge the WTO to build on APEC's efforts towards further broadbased multilateral liberalization. We note with pleasure the leadership that APEC has demonstrated in advancing in the WTO the conclusion of Agreements on Information Technology and Basic Telecommunications. We undertake to work in a determined fashion to achieve a successful conclusion to WTO negotiations on financial services by the agreed deadline of December 12, 1997. As agreed by our finance and trade Ministers, a successful conclusion would include an MFN agreement based on significantly improved commitments. This result will enhance competition within our financial systems, foster development of regional capital markets, promote financial integration, improve the regional capacity to intermediate savings and strengthen our economies' resilience in the face of external shocks.

9. We are pleased with the progress that has been made in implementing the 1996 Framework for Strengthening Economic Cooperation and Development in APEC, and call on Ministers and officials to focus on addressing the key challenges identified therein. We direct Ministers to give all elements of the Framework equal weight and attention, and to be mindful of its indivisibility as an integrated set of objectives requiring coordination and communication across the APEC agenda. We applaud the effort in 1997 to apply this Framework approach to APEC's work on two key challenges in the region—infrastructure and sustainable development. We direct Ministers to focus further efforts on capacity-building in 1998 through work on developing human resources and harnessing technologies of the future to enable all members of the APEC community to benefit more fully from trade liberalization.

10. Meetings of Ministers responsible for finance and trade provided early impetus for APEC's work in 1997. We commend their activities as a direct contribution to our goal for sustainable growth and equitable development. We are also gratified by the substantial contributions that Ministers responsible for environment, transportation, energy, small and medium-sized enterprises, and human resource development have made in 1997 to APEC's work. We welcome the progress of APEC fora in involving business, academics and other experts, women and youth in 1997 activities, and encourage them to continue these efforts.

11. APEC members share a belief in the contribution of free markets to achieving our growth and employment objectives. While they have a clear role in managing the impacts of economic transition, governments alone cannot solve the complex questions posed by our interconnected world. We are pleased to note a leap in business involvement in all levels of APEC activity this year. As Leaders, we have profited from our dialogue with the APEC Business Advisory Council. We commend their initiative in increasing their exchanges with Ministers and Senior Officials. We will reflect on recommendations set out in ABAC's 1997 *Call to Action.* We also welcome ABAC's intention to establish a Partnership for Equitable Growth, and express appreciation for recommendations on diverse and important issues such as standards, business mobility and capital market development. We stress the need for APEC to broaden its outreach to a wider segment of the business community.

Noteworthy in 1997 has been the wealth of APEC activities and initiatives in support of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Although ours is a region of traders, many SMEs encounter obstacles to their full participation. We stress the importance of strengthening our SME sectors, to allow them to take advantage of linkages into regional trade and investment opportunities by promoting a business environment that stimulates creation of new enterprises. We commend the fact that many specialized APEC fora have developed programs to address the needs of SMEs. We take note of the priorities and approaches set out in APEC's 1997 *Framework for SMEs,* and instruct Ministers to ensure they are applied.

A Vision for the 21st Century

12. Connecting APEC's instruments—Intense growth in the economies of Asia-Pacific over

the past decade has had far reaching impacts on our societies. Growth and employment, as well as improved incomes and quality of life, are welcome benefits. In all of our societies these positive outcomes have been accompanied by structural and environmental pressures. Globalization has emerged as a reality. Rapid urbanization and advances in information technology are transforming our cityscapes, as well as the way in which we interact. Our ability to adapt to new developments will determine our success in achieving sustainable and equitable development among and within societies in the region. We applaud the efforts made this year to integrate APEC's instruments—liberalization, facilitation and economic and technical cooperation—in addressing emerging challenges.

13. Connecting with our constituents: We stress our common belief that ongoing and ambitious trade and investment liberalization remains indispensable to the health of our economies. To underpin our efforts, support among the people of the region for continuing trade and investment liberalization is essential. We welcome the decision by Ministers to develop an APEC-wide work program to assess the full impacts of trade liberalization, including its positive effects on growth and employment, and to assist members in managing associated adjustments.

14. Connecting our economies: Our discussions today have focussed on regional infrastructure requirements in support of economic and social development. We endorse the work that has been carried out this year on infrastructure applications to make city life more sustainable, in particular the *Sustainable Cities Program of Action.* The rapid growth of urban centres poses daunting challenges such as bottlenecks, supply constraints, as well as health and environmental concerns. Governments must strive to ensure adequate access to infrastructure for people in all walks of life, urban or rural. Capacity building through economic and technical cooperation is essential to ensure the ability of all economies to address these critical challenges.

Infrastructure is inextricably linked to the questions of financial stability that we have addressed. In addressing regional infrastructure decisions, governments and business must work together to ensure that long-term financial sustainability is adequately considered. Cooperation with business and international financial institutions and development banks can be critical to achieving optimal project planning. We endorse the attached *Vancouver Framework for Enhanced Public-Private Partnerships for Infrastructure Development.* We also are pleased by the agreement to enhance cooperation among Export Credit Agencies and Export Financing Institutions in support of regional infrastructure development, as well as agreement to undertake a feasibility study on a Network of Infrastructure Facilitation Centres to encourage information sharing and transparency. Recognizing the importance of telecommunications and information technology for building an Asia-Pacific information society, we agree that the Asia-Pacific Information Infrastructure is an essential basis for ensuring the competitiveness of the region in the 21st Century.

15. Connecting electronically: We agree that electronic commerce is one of the most important technological breakthroughs of this decade. We direct Ministers to undertake a work program on electronic commerce in the region, taking into account relevant activities of other international fora, and to report to us in Kuala Lumpur. This initiative should recognize the leading role of the business sector and promote a predictable and consistent legal and regulatory environment that enables all APEC economies to reap the benefits of electronic commerce.

16. Connecting science and technology: In view of the growing role of science and technology in promoting economic growth and its close linkages to trade and investment flows, we direct Ministers to formulate an APEC Agenda for Science and Technology Industry Cooperation into the 21st Century, and present it to us in Kuala Lumpur. We also welcome other regional networks to strengthen science and technology linkages, including the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU).

17. Connecting the issues: Achieving sustainable development remains at the heart of APEC's mandate. Equity, poverty alleviation and quality of life are central considerations, and must be addressed as an integral part of sustainable development. We have made a commitment to advance sustainable development across the entire scope of our workplan. We welcome the results of the multi-sectoral symposium on relationships among food and energy and the environment under the pressures of rapid economic and population growth, as well as the

interim report we have received. We look forward to presentation of a more detailed and action-oriented report in 1998.

18. Connecting efforts on climate change: We recognize the importance of accelerating action on a global level to deal with emissions of greenhouse gases. We affirm that this issue is of vital significance, and that it requires cooperative efforts by the international community, in accordance with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. We emphasize our strong support for a successful outcome to the Third Conference of the Parties in furthering the objectives of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UN–FCCC). We note that all APEC members can make important contributions to this effort. We also agree that the enhancement of energy efficiency plays an important role in addressing climate change. We affirm the importance of flexible and cost-effective cooperative approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, including by promoting the development and diffusion of beneficial technologies. We recognize the legitimate needs of developing economies to promote their sustainable development in furthering the objectives of the UN–FCCC and, in this respect, the importance of enhancing the availability of beneficial technologies.

19. Connecting emergency response: We recognize that unexpected disasters which affect one of us can affect all of us, and that we can benefit from sharing expertise and collaborating on emergency preparedness and response. We welcome the initiative of Ministers in this regard.

20. Connecting the people of Asia-Pacific: Continued prosperity in the region will depend heavily on our willingness and our ability to vest the next generation of leaders of the region with the skills and knowledge they require. We applaud the initiative to involve youth throughout APEC's 1997 activities. Education and skill-building remain key objectives for long-term employment of our youth, and we call on Ministers to work with young people, academics, workers and business to share approaches on successful transitions from the learning environment to the work force. We welcome the Electronic Source Book on work, study and exchange opportunities in the region, the establishment and development of the APEC Education Foundation, and the APEC Youth Skills Camp and the APEC Youth Science and Technology Festival, both to be held in 1998 in Seoul. We appreciate the offer by Singapore to establish an APEC Education Hub, which includes the granting of scholarships to APEC students. We welcome the holding of a Ministerial Conference on Education in 1999 in Singapore to explore the possibility to expand this initiative, offering quality programmes to students in the region.

We believe APEC should take specific steps to reinforce the important role of women in economic development. We welcome the offer of the Philippines to host a Ministerial Meeting on Women in 1998 in Manila, to take stock of progress to date in involving women in APEC's agenda and to determine next steps to integrate women into the mainstream of APEC's activities.

21. Spanning twelve time zones from St. John's to Sumatra, APEC bridges both distance and diversity. Through a combination of concrete results and renewed vision, the spirit of community which unites us has been strengthened and broadened this year. The people of the region remain its greatest asset. As Leaders, we are accountable for safeguarding and improving their economic and social well-being. Our people are the foundation on which the APEC community is built. We commit ourselves to ensuring that APEC remains responsive to their concerns.

The Vancouver Framework for Enhanced Public-Private Partnerships in Infrastructure Development

November 25, 1997

Strengthened partnerships between the public and private sectors are needed to put in place and manage the infrastructure required by the APEC region to meet its economic, environmental and social goals. To this end, we declare the following:

Voluntary Principles

We reaffirm the Voluntary Principles for Facilitating Private Sector Participation in Infrastructure developed by Finance Ministers, namely:

(i) To establish and maintain a sound macroeconomic environment.

(ii) To establish stable and transparent legal frameworks and regulatory systems to provide a high level of investor protection.

(iii) To adopt sectoral policies that promote, where applicable, competitive and efficient provision of infrastructure services.

(iv) To increase the availability of long-term capital required for infrastructure investments by accelerating efforts to broaden and deepen domestic financial and capital markets.

Financing and Investment

(v) *We reaffirm* Finance Ministers' call on multilateral financial institutions to catalyze and support member economies' own efforts in infrastructure development, including by promoting sound framework policies through technical assistance, facilitating flows of private capital while continuing to provide direct financial support for infrastructure development, and developing innovative financing mechanisms to address the long-term financing requirements of infrastructure projects.

(vi) *We encourage* Finance Ministers to continue to implement the specific initiatives launched in Cebu to facilitate, in collaboration with multilateral financial institutions and the private sector, the development of domestic financial and capital markets. In this regard, we ask them to continue to work with private sector financiers and providers of risk coverage and investment ratings to promote the development of robust and liquid domestic bond markets, including markets for asset-backed securities which, as noted by ABAC, will enhance private investment in large-scale infrastructure projects.

(vii) *We welcome* the mutual cooperation Protocol signed by participating Export Credit Agencies and Export Financing Institutions to enhance, on a project-by-project basis, the attractiveness of infrastructure investment for private sector participants.

Improving Capacities

Improving capacities is key to accelerating the development of economically viable infrastructure projects that the private sector can support. To this end, *we affirm* the need for action in the following areas:

(viii) To promote the application of state of the art practices in each phase of the infrastructure planning, development, management, use and retirement cycle.

(ix) To develop domestic capacities so that public officials involved in infrastructure development in agencies dealing with private investors have appropriate expertise and an understanding of commercial approaches to infrastructure investment, and by promoting technological cooperation, including through private-private and public-private partnerships.

(x) To promote the application of state of the art practices in risk mitigation and management, including by promoting the most effective use of private and public sector capacities.

(xi) To promote transparent, predictable and accountable procedures, including for bidding and selection processes, and to encourage the use of international competitive tendering.

(xii) To ensure that infrastructure supports the achievement of economic, environmental and social goals by incorporating sustainable and equitable development principles in the design and operation of infrastructure facilities.

Information and Consultation

We recognize the importance of information in supporting the participation of the private sector, especially small and medium-sized enterprises, in infrastructure projects and *commit* to engaging the broad public in building on the outcomes achieved in key sectors such as information infrastructure, intelligent and integrated transportation systems, economically and environmentally sustainable energy infrastructure, sustainable cities, and infrastructure to support rural integration and diversification.

To these ends, *we call on Ministers:*

(xiii) To improve the availability of information to support participation in infrastructure investment by the widest possible range

of companies, including by small and medium-sized enterprises, both on a solicited and unsolicited basis.

(xiv) To foster effective consultations to ensure that planned infrastructure meets our communities' needs.

We direct the relevant Ministers to take the necessary measures to make good these declarations of intent with the express purpose of substantially and measurably increasing the participation of the private sector in infrastructure development in the APEC region and promoting infrastructure development in support of overall economic growth and development goals.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Iran

November 25, 1997

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

I hereby report to the Congress on developments since the last Presidential report of May 13, 1997, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) (IEEPA). This report covers events through September 30, 1997. My last report, dated May 13, 1997, covered events through March 31, 1997.

1. The Iranian Assets Control Regulations, 31 CFR Part 535 (IACR), were amended on August 25, 1997. General reporting, record keeping, licensing, and other procedural regulations were moved from the IACR to a separate part (31 CFR Part 501) dealing solely with such procedural matters (62 *Fed. Reg.* 45098, August 25, 1997). No substantive changes to the IACR were made. A copy of the amendment is attached.

2. The Iran-United States Claims Tribunal (the "Tribunal"), established at The Hague pursuant to the Algiers Accords, continues to make progress in arbitrating the claims before it. Since the period covered in my last report, the Tribunal has rendered five awards. This brings the total number of awards rendered by the Tribunal to 584, the majority of which have been in favor of U.S. claimants. As of September 30, 1997, the value of awards to successful U.S. claimants from the Security Account held by the NV Settlement Bank was $2,480,897,381.53.

Since my last report, Iran has failed to replenish the Security Account established by the Algiers Accords to ensure payment of awards to successful U.S. claimants. Thus, since November 5, 1992, the Security Account has continuously remained below the $500 million balance required by the Algiers Accords. As of September 30, 1997, the total amount in the Security Account was $127,880,441.04, and the total amount in the Interest Account was $17,771,382.12. Therefore, the United States continues to pursue Case A/28, filed in September 1993, to require Iran to meet its obligation under the Algiers Accords to replenish the Security Account. Iran filed its Rejoinder in Case A/28 on April 7, 1997. The United States has requested that the Tribunal schedule a hearing in the case.

The United States also continues to pursue Case A/29 to require Iran to meet its obligation of timely payment of its equal share of advances for Tribunal expenses when directed to do so by the Tribunal. Iran has not yet filed its Rejoinder in the case.

3. The Department of State continues to respond to claims brought against the United States by Iran, in coordination with concerned government agencies. On August 8, 1997, the United States filed its Statement of Defense in Case A/30, in which Iran alleges that the United States has violated paragraphs 1 and 10 of the General Declaration of the Algiers Accords. Iran bases its claim, *inter alia,* on press statements about an alleged covert action program aimed at Iran and on U.S. economic sanctions.

Under the February 22, 1996, settlement agreement related to the Iran Air case before the International Court of Justice and Iran's bank-related claims against the United States before the Tribunal (reported in my report of May 17, 1996), the Department of State has been processing payments. As of September 30, 1997,

the Department has authorized payment to U.S. nationals of 35 claims against Iranian banks totaling $12,021,532.54. The Department has also authorized payments to surviving family members of the aerial incident, totaling $41,550,000.00.

The Tribunal has scheduled a hearing date of February 17–19, 1998, in Case No. A/11. In this case, Iran alleges that the United States failed to perform its obligations under Paragraphs 12–14 of the Algiers Accords, relating to the return to Iran of assets of the late Shah and his close relatives.

4. U.S. nationals continue to pursue claims against Iran at the Tribunal. Since my last report, the Tribunal has issued awards in five private claims, all of which were filed prior to the January 19, 1982, filing deadline by individuals who are dual U.S.-Iranian nationals.

On April 23, 1997, Chamber Three issued an award in *Vivian, Jamshid and Keyvan Tavakoli v. Iran,* AWD No. 580–832–3. The Tribunal dismissed the claims of Jamshid and Keyvan Tavakoli for lack of jurisdiction, finding that they had not proven their dominant and effective U.S. nationality. The Tribunal determined that Vivian Tavakoli's claim fell within the Tribunal's jurisdiction and awarded her $375,952 plus interest plus $10,000 in arbitration costs for Iran's expropriation of 170 shares in the Western Industrial Group recorded in her name. The Tribunal rejected her claim for other additional shares in that company for lack of proof.

On May 22, 1997, Chamber One issued an award in *Vera-Jo, Laura and J.M. Aryeh v. Iran,* AWD No. 581–842/843/866–1, finding that all three claimants were dominant and effective U.S. nationals for purposes of Tribunal jurisdiction, and awarding the claimants a total of $19,658,063.84 plus interest and $200,000 in arbitration costs for Iran's expropriation of the claimants' shares in various Iranian companies.

On June 20, 1997, Chamber Two issued an award in *Betty Monemi v. Iran,* AWD No. 582–274–2, dismissing the claim for lack of proof. The Tribunal held that the claimant had not established that Iran had taken actions resulting in the loss of rent from and real estate value of the home to which her claim related or that she had made the requisite demand for the funds in her bank account to allow recovery.

On September 25, 1997, Chamber Three issued an award in *Moussa Aryeh v. Iran,* AWD No. 583–266–3, directing Iran to pay the claimant $519,571 plus interest and $15,000 in arbitration costs for Iran's expropriation of the claimant's real property. In so doing, the Tribunal found that Iranian law did not expressly prohibit ownership of real property by dual nationals so as to bar recovery in this case. It held that while Iranian law placed certain restrictions on the ownership of real property by an Iranian national who acquires a second nationality, those restrictions as applied in the Aryeh case simply required sale of the property under certain conditions, with the proceeds to be paid to the dual national owner. Also on September 25, 1997, Chamber Three issued an award in *Ouziel and Eliyahou Aryeh v. Iran,* AWD No. 584–839/840–3, dismissing the claims on the grounds that the claimants did not prove that they inherited under their father's will the property which they alleged was expropriated by Iran or that they held a beneficial interest in other properties purchased by their brother.

In Tribunal-related litigation in United States courts, on June 23, 1997, the District Court of the District of Columbia issued its decision in *McKesson Corp. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran,* granting McKesson's motion for summary judgment. The court found that Iran's interference with McKesson's shareholder rights ripened into an expropriation by April of 1982. In its decision, the court gave preclusive effect to the Tribunal's findings in the *Foremost Tehran, Inc. v. Iran* award, issued on April 10, 1986.

5. The situation reviewed above continues to implicate important diplomatic, financial, and legal interests of the United States and its nationals and presents an unusual challenge to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The Iranian Assets Control Regulations issued pursuant to Executive Order 12170 continue to play an important role in structuring our relationship with Iran and in enabling the United States to implement properly the Algiers Accords. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives,

and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 26.

Remarks at the Thanksgiving Turkey Presentation Ceremony and an Exchange With Reporters

November 26, 1997

The President. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I want to welcome the folks from the National Turkey Federation here, the chairman, Sonny Faison, and the president, Stuart Proctor. And a special word of welcome to all the kids who are here from Horton's Kids in Anacostia and all the rest of you who want to see one more turkey before Thanksgiving. [*Laughter*]

This is a special day in the Rose Garden every year, and let me thank again the National Turkey Federation on their golden anniversary for donating a Thanksgiving turkey to the White House every year for 50 years. That's right. Now, this marks the 50th year when we give one more turkey in Washington a second chance. [*Laughter*]

I want to acknowledge our special guest, this fine tom from the Tarheel State of North Carolina, the number one turkey-producing State in our Nation. President Truman was the first President to pardon a turkey, but in some ways, the tradition actually began 83 years earlier when President Lincoln received a turkey for Christmas holiday. His son, Tad, grew so attached to the turkey that he named him "Jack," and President Lincoln had no choice but to give Jack the full run of the White House. Jack was here, actually, for some monumental events. On election day in 1864 when Mr. Lincoln was running for reelection, a special polling place was actually set up right here on the grounds of the White House so that the soldiers could vote. Well, Jack the turkey actually strutted in front of some of the would-be voters and broke in line. Lincoln asked his son, "Why is your turkey at the polls? Does he vote?" Without hesitation, Tad said, "He's not old enough yet." [*Laughter*]

Tomorrow 45 million turkeys will make the ultimate sacrifice for America's feast—but not this one. I'm granting this turkey a permanent reprieve. After many years in the coop, he's on his way to a farm in Virginia to bask in the sun, collect his hard-earned pension, and enjoy his golden years. And that's one less turkey in Washington. [*Laughter*] Happy Thanksgiving.

Attorney General Janet Reno

Q. Mr. President, how is the Attorney General?

The President. She's fine. I talked to her this morning. She said she was feeling great.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:20 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Statement on Signing the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998

November 26, 1997

Today I have signed into law H.R. 2159, the "Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998."

I am pleased that the Act contains funding for many key international affairs programs at or near the amounts requested. The Act contains vital funding and other needed authorities in support of the Middle East peace process. It also provides for contributions to the multilateral development banks, including a down payment on the clearance of arrears, notably to the International Development Association; assistance to

Eastern Europe and the Baltic States, as well as New Independent States of the former Soviet Union; international narcotics control; development assistance; and migration and refugee assistance. I am also very pleased that the Congress has fully funded my request of $222 million for the Peace Corps.

In addition, I commend the Congress for funding international planning programs without the misguided "Mexico City" restrictions. My Administration continues to oppose these restrictions, which would deny funding to the most experienced and qualified family planning and maternal-child health care providers. I am also pleased that the Congress has reduced the number of other restrictions on assistance, such as earmarks, that have hampered my ability to carry out U.S. foreign policy.

I deeply regret that the Congress did not include funding for the International Monetary Fund's New Arrangements to Borrow (NAB) program. The NAB is needed to ensure that sufficient resources are available to respond to monetary crises in a world of rapidly expanding trade and finance. Recent events in southeast Asia only underscore the threat of shocks to the global financial system and the need for a strong and responsive IMF. The decision by the Congress not to provide this authority is irresponsible. I call on the Congress to provide funding for the NAB, and my Administration stands ready to work with the Congress to overcome obstacles to funding this important program.

My Administration is concerned that Russia's new law on religion be implemented in a manner that is consistent with international obligations and that fully respects religious freedom. We are watching carefully to assess Russian implementation of this law. At the same time, my Administration continues to oppose legislating limits on assistance, especially without the possibility of a presidential waiver. American assistance to Russia, including to the Russian government, serves important U.S. interests. Technical assistance that promotes tax reform and aids in removing obstacles to investment and assistance in nuclear reactor safety are two good examples.

While H.R. 2159 does contain a national security waiver related to Russian assistance to the Iranian missile program, my Administration still opposes in principle legislating limits on assistance to the Russian government because this assistance serves U.S. interests. The United States is conducting critical discussions with Russia on missile technology to Iran, and legislated assistance cutoffs could harm this process.

This Act contains several provisions that raise constitutional concerns, such as requirements that the United States take particular positions in international organizations. I will apply these and other provisions in the Act consistent with my constitutional responsibilities.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

November 26, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2159, approved November 26, was assigned Public Law No. 105–118.

Statement on Signing the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

November 26, 1997

Today I have signed into law H.R. 2267, the "Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998."

This Act provides over $31 billion in discretionary budget authority for vital law enforcement, international affairs, economic development, and environmental programs, I am pleased that the Act supports many of my priorities, particularly in the areas of law enforcement and crime prevention.

For instance, H.R. 2267 provides for my request of $1.4 billion for the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program, helping us to achieve the goal of hiring 100,000 additional police officers by the year 2000. The Act also increases funding for programs to combat violence against women, and, finally, in the

important area of juvenile crime prevention, the Act provides $489 million for juvenile justice, which includes a $250 million juvenile justice block grant. I am pleased that the block grant provides targeted funding for prosecutorial grants, which support prosecutors' efforts to reduce gang violence, as well as targeted funding for violent juvenile court assistance, which helps expedite the handling of juvenile offenders.

I am deeply disappointed, however, that the Congress did not enact legislation to capitalize on all of our work this year to craft a broadly supported package of reforms for the United Nations system and to provide the related arrears funding. Recent events in Iraq have underscored the need for strong U.S. leadership in the United Nations and in other international organizations that would have been supported by this legislation.

I regret that the Act does not contain the multi-year funding of the arrears package consistent with the Balanced Budget Agreement (BBA), and that the first $100 million is not available until Congress passes implementing legislation. Before the current adjournment, the Congress could have passed such legislation, but it was tied to extraneous conditions. With the United Nations making critical decisions this December on reform and funding issues, this implementing legislation would have put the United States in a good position to achieve international agreement on the kind of financial and other reforms we are seeking and to clear our arrears. Our negotiators in New York are now handicapped and must struggle to build majority support for these changes among the more than 185 members of the United Nations without being able to clearly signal the Congress' intention.

I hope that the Congress will work with me to pass swiftly upon its return such implementing legislation that firmly signals to the rest of the world community U.S. commitment to the U.N. system, our intent to honor our international obligations, and our desire to make these organizations more effective and efficient as they work for us on critical issues. Such legislation should be free of extraneous issues.

The Act does provide strong support for the operational accounts of the Department of State, including provisions to put in place the new International Cooperative Administrative Support Services (ICASS) program and to utilize revenues from Machine Readable visa fees. This support will allow the Department to modernize its technology, improve operations that support all U.S. agencies operating overseas, and continue to carry out its role in our Nation's important Border Security Program.

This Act contains provisions that raise serious constitutional concerns. For example, section 609 unconstitutionally constrains the President's authority with respect to the conduct of diplomacy and section 610 unconstitutionally constrains the President's diplomatic authority and Commander in Chief authority. I will apply these provisions consistent with my constitutional responsibilities.

The Act also includes provisions relating to the census. These provisions arose out of a disagreement whether the widely accepted statistical method known as sampling may be used in connection with the decennial census, consistent with the Constitution and the Census Act.

It is my strong conviction, and it is the opinion of the Department of Justice, that sampling complies with both the Constitution and the Census Act. Although H.R. 2267 includes a congressional finding that sampling "poses the risk of an inaccurate, invalid and unconstitutional census," I understand this language to mean only that the Congress believes the use of sampling raises an issue of constitutional interpretation appropriate for judicial review. Any census method, of course, poses a risk of inaccuracy, particularly if the method is not used correctly. But it is precisely to avoid inaccuracies in the census that sampling is justified. Given the history of undercounting children, minorities, and others in the census, inaccuracy and unfairness would result if the Congress prohibited sampling and instead mandated other methods.

I support the Act because it provides the funding necessary for the Department of Commerce to prepare for the 2000 Census and, in particular, to conduct the critically important dress rehearsal scheduled for 1998. This is a dramatic improvement over an earlier version of the bill, which would have effectively banned sampling by delaying planning operations during litigation.

Nonetheless, I have two concerns. First, under the Act the 2000 Census remains, as it must, a one number census for the purposes of apportionment and redistricting. All official documents relating to the census will produce one final, accurate count of the population. In addition, the raw data collected by the Bureau

of the Census will be available to interested parties. These raw data are not usable for apportionment and redistricting.

Second, in providing for a right of action to challenge the use of sampling before completion of the 2000 Census, the Act does not, nor could it, modify the "immutable requirements" of Article III of the Constitution regarding ripeness and standing to sue. Representatives of my Administration informed the Congress while it was considering the census provisions of their doubts whether the right to sue in the Act satisfies Article III requirements. Opponents of sampling in the 2000 Census will have the opportunity to attempt to persuade the courts that it does, but the Department of Justice is obligated to challenge any suits that fail to meet applicable justiciability requirements.

I hope that the Congress will join me, the National Academy of Sciences, the General Accounting Office, the Department of Commerce Inspector General, and the vast majority of the professional statistical community, in supporting the use of sampling in the decennial census. It is our responsibility to count every American, and we must not allow politics to prevent us from living up to that responsibility.

I am pleased with the $4.3 billion in funding for the Department of Commerce, and am grateful that funds for Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment program (GLOBE) program were restored in conference. GLOBE was developed to increase our understanding of the Earth, and has forged partnerships with over 2,500 U.S. schools and 35 other countries, involving thousands of students across the United States and worldwide. I am disappointed, however, that the National Institutes of Standards and Technology is funded $15 million below the level agreed to in the BBA. This cut comes at the expense of the Advanced Technology Program, which supports the development of pre-competitive, basic technology, and helps the United States remain on the cutting edge of the global economy.

Fortunately, H.R. 2267 does not split the Ninth Circuit Court into two separate circuits—as earlier versions of the bill would have—but instead establishes a commission to study the organization of the Federal Courts of Appeals more broadly. This is a far more reasoned approach than the split of the Circuit contained in an earlier version of the appropriations bill, and it will permit all affected parties to voice their views.

I am pleased that H.R. 2267 will continue to permit eligible individuals to obtain lawful permanent resident status without leaving the country. While we sought a permanent extension of section 245(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, in its current form these provisions will help ensue that families remain together and businesses are not disrupted while persons already in the United States go through the immigration process.

The Act also includes authority for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to develop a 3-year pilot program for compensation of non-Special Agents in scientific, technical, and similar positions. In addition, the bill gives the Department of the Treasury authority to implement demonstration programs for such positions in the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, the United States Customs Service, and the United States Secret Service. While I strongly support efforts to ensure the highest quality work force for these critical law enforcement agencies, this new authority does not appear necessary. There is no evidence of recruitment and retention problems for these occupational categories that could not be solved through existing authorities. In addition, the budget impact of implementing these provisions is not known. I am, therefore, directing the two departments to work with the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of Personnel Management to resolve these issues before developing any plan to implement this new authority.

As a number of lower courts have recognized, the automatic stay provision of the Prison Litigation Reform Act raises a significant constitutional issue. Section 123 of H.R. 2267 amends this provision in a manner that may affect the constitutional issue and the position that my Administration will need to take in litigation. The Department of Justice will evaluate the amended provision further, and, if necessary, propose remedies to ameliorate any constitutional problems.

I am pleased that the Congress rejected efforts to reduce funding for the Legal Services Corporation (LSC), thus ensuring that disadvantaged Americans continue to have access to the judicial system. But, I remain concerned about the erosion of financial support for the LSC over time, and I am hopeful that the Congress

will approve increases for this program in the future.

Finally, the Act provides $6 million in contingent Department of Agriculture emergency funding for indemnity payments to farmers and ranchers who suffered livestock losses in the West due to the unusually early and heavy winter snowstorm in October. I will soon transmit a budget request to make these funds available.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,
November 26, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2267, approved November 26, was assigned Public Law No. 105–119.

The President's Radio Address
November 29, 1997

Good morning. This week, millions of Americans have gathered with family and friends to share Thanksgiving. Much has changed for America since George Washington first proclaimed a day of thanksgiving for our new Nation in 1789. But the Thanksgiving spirit—sharing our good fortune with others, coming together to meet our common challenges—that is as important as ever. That's why we must keep that spirit alive throughout the year through citizen service.

Citizen service must be at the heart of our efforts to prepare America for the 21st century, as we work to guarantee all Americans the opportunity and conditions to make the most of their own lives and to help those who need and deserve it with a hand up. My administration's most important contribution to citizen service is AmeriCorps, our national service program that already has given more than 100,000 young Americans the opportunity to serve our country and earn money for a college education. In community after community, AmeriCorps members have proved that service can help us meet our most pressing social needs.

For example, in Simpson County, Kentucky, AmeriCorps members helped second graders jump three grade levels in reading. In boys and girls clubs all across the country, AmeriCorps members are mentors for at-risk young people. Habitat For Humanity relies upon AmeriCorps members to bring in more volunteers and build more houses. In communities beset by floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes, AmeriCorps members have helped to rebuild homes and restore hope.

Now, AmeriCorps members are mobilizing thousands and thousands of college students from 800 campuses in our America Reads program, to make sure that all our young people can read independently by the third grade. AmeriCorps brings people of every background together to work toward common goals. And after years of partisan fighting over it, I'm pleased that Congress now seems ready to come together to support AmeriCorps.

Today I'm proposing legislation to give more Americans the chance to serve by strengthening AmeriCorps and our student and senior citizen service programs and extending them for 5 years. This legislation reflects the spirit of the Presidents' Summit on Service, where last spring thousands of Americans pledged to give our children the support they need to make the most of their lives. As General Colin Powell reported this week, we've made a lot of progress since the summit with more AmeriCorps members, more reading tutors for our children through America Reads, more mentoring programs for young people, more partnerships with private businesses and community groups. At Thanksgiving, I want to thank especially the citizens and businesses who have worked with us to ensure that our Nation's surplus food helps to feed the hungry, not fill up dumpsters.

Now we must create more opportunities for people to serve all year long and, through service, to reach out to one another across the lines that divide us. In honor of the spirit of citizen service embodied in the life of Martin Luther King, Jr., the Congress has designated the Martin Luther King holiday as a day of national service. And I'm pleased to announce that our Corporation for National Service has awarded 73 grants to communities from Boston to Los

Angeles, to help make this day of service a resounding success. Dr. King once said that everybody can be great because anybody can serve; you only need a heart full of grace and a soul generated by love.

As we look forward to a joyous holiday season, let us pledge to live up to those words by making citizen service a part of our lives every day.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6:25 p.m. on November 28 in the Residence at Camp David, MD, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on November 29. In his remarks, the President referred to Gen. Colin Powell, USA (Ret.), chairman, America's Promise—The Alliance For Youth.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Iraq's Compliance With United Nations Security Council Resolutions

November 26, 1997

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

Consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1) and as part of my effort to keep the Congress fully informed, I am reporting on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). This report covers the period from September 23 to the present.

Since my last report, the Government of Iraq attempted to defy the international community by unilaterally imposing unacceptable conditions on the operations of the U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM). On October 29, the Iraqi government announced its intention to expel all U.S. personnel working in Iraq for UNSCOM. Iraq's aim appears to have been to establish an environment under which it could restore its capacity to develop weapons of mass destruction without restriction. For 3 weeks, the Government of Iraq refused to allow American UNSCOM personnel to enter the country or to participate in site inspections, expelled UNSCOM personnel who are U.S. citizens, threatened the safety of the U.S. Air Force U–2 aircraft that flies missions for UNSCOM, tampered with UNSCOM monitoring equipment, removed UNSCOM cameras, moved and concealed significant pieces of dual-use equipment, and imposed additional unacceptable conditions on continued operations of UNSCOM. Two confrontational actions were undertaken in an atmosphere of strident, threatening Iraqi rhetoric, the dispersal of Iraqi armed forces as if in preparation for a military conflict, and the placement of innocent civilian "human shields" at military sites and at many of Saddam Hussein's palaces in violation of international norms of conduct.

On November 20, having obtained no agreement from the U.N. or the United States to alter UNSCOM or the sanctions regime—indeed, having obtained none of its stated objectives—the Iraqi government announced that it would allow UNSCOM inspectors who are U.S. citizens to return to their duties. This encouraging development, however, will be ultimately tested by Saddam Hussein's actions, not his words. It remains to be seen whether the Government of Iraq will now live up to its obligations under all applicable UNSC resolutions, including its commitment to allow UNSCOM to perform its work unhindered.

As expressed unanimously by the five permanent members (P–5) of the Security Council meeting in Geneva November 20, the will of the entire international community is for the unconditional decision of Iraq to allow the return of UNSCOM inspectors to Iraq in their previous composition. I must note that the United States was not briefed on, did not endorse, and is not bound by anything other than the terms of the P–5 statement. Neither the United States nor the U.N. are bound by any bilateral agreement between Russia and Iraq. We will carefully monitor events and will continue to be prepared for any contingency. Iraq's challenge was issued, in part, in response to U.N. Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1134, of October 23, in which the Security Council condemned Iraq's flagrant violations of

relevant Security Council resolutions and expressed its firm intention to impose travel restrictions on the Iraqi leadership if the longstanding pattern of obstruction and harassment of UNSCOM personnel continued. In the debate of UNSCR 1134, not one nation on the Security Council questioned the need to continue sanctions. The only serious debate was over when and how to impose additional sanctions. UNSCR 1134 was based on the UNSCOM and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) 6-month reports to the UNSC that indicated that the Government of Iraq has not provided the "substantial compliance" called for in UNSCR 1115 of June 21, 1997—especially regarding immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to facilities for inspection and to officials for interviews.

On November 12 the resolve of the international community was further demonstrated when the Security Council voted unanimously to adopt UNSCR 1137—the first new sanctions against Iraq since the Gulf War—condemning Iraq's continued violations of its obligations and imposing restrictions on the travel of all Iraqi officials and armed forces members responsible for or participating in noncompliance. The UNSC in a Presidential Statement condemned Iraq again upon the actual expulsion of the American UNSCOM personnel. The UNSC's solidarity was reflected as well in the UNSCOM Executive Chairman's and IAEA Director's decisions that all UNSCOM and IAEA personnel should depart Iraq rather than accede to the Iraqi demand that no American participate in inspection activities.

As a demonstration of our firm resolve to support the U.N., I directed the deployment of the USS GEORGE WASHINGTON, escort ships, and additional combat aircraft to the region. In this regard we take note of and welcome House Resolution 322 expressing the sense of the House that the United States should act to resolve the crisis in a manner that assures full Iraqi compliance with UNSC resolutions regarding the destruction of Iraq's capability to produce and deliver weapons of mass destruction. While the addition of these forces gives us a wide range of military options, should they be necessary, we remain firmly committed to finding a diplomatic solution.

The ongoing crisis is only one chapter in the long history of efforts by the Iraqi regime to flout its obligations under UNSC resolutions. Iraq has persistently failed to disclose fully its programs for weapons of mass destruction. It admits to moving significant pieces of dual-use equipment subject to monitoring. Without full disclosure, UNSCOM and the IAEA cannot effectively conduct the ongoing monitoring and verification mandated by UNSCR's 687, 707, 715, and other relevant resolutions.

Iraqi biological and chemical weapons are currently the most troubling issues for UNSCOM. This is due to the innate dual-use nature of the technology—how easily it can be hidden within civilian industries such as, for biological agents—the pharmaceutical industry, and for chemical agents—the pesticide industry. In both cases, Iraq continues to prevent full and immediate access to sites suspected of chemical or biological warfare activities. Until 2 months ago, for example, major aspects of Iraq's pernicious "VX" program (a powerful nerve agent) were unknown to UNSCOM due to Iraqi concealment. UNSCOM is still unable to verify that all of Iraq's SCUD missile warheads filled with biological agents—anthrax and botulinum toxin—have been destroyed. When UNSCOM says it is making "significant progress" in these areas, it is referring to UNSCOM's progress in ferreting out Iraqi deception, not Iraqi progress in cooperating with UNSCOM.

The Iraqi regime contends that UNSCOM and the IAEA should "close the books" on nuclear and missile inspections. But there are still many uncertainties and questions that need to be resolved. Among the many problems, Iraq has:

- failed to answer critical questions on nuclear weapons design and fabrication, procurement, and centrifuge enrichment;
- failed to detail how far the theoretical and practical aspects of its clandestine nuclear efforts progressed;
- failed to explain in full the interaction between its nuclear warhead and missile design programs;
- failed to provide a written description of its post-war nuclear weapons procurement program;
- failed to account for major engine components, special warheads, missing propellants, and guidance instruments that could be used to assemble fully operational missiles; and

- failed to discuss—on the direct orders of Tariq Aziz—its actions to retain missile launchers.

In accordance with relevant UNSCR's, UNSCOM must continue to investigate the Iraqi nuclear and missile programs until it can verify with absolute certainty that all the equipment has been destroyed and that all the capabilities have been eliminated. Otherwise, Iraq will be able to strike at any city in the Middle East, delivering devastating biological, chemical, and even nuclear weapons.

UNSCOM's work must include vigorous efforts to unveil Iraq's "Concealment Mechanism." Led by elements of its special security services, Iraq has for over 6-years engaged in a massive and elaborate campaign to keep UNSCOM inspectors from finding proscribed equipment, documents, and possibly weapons themselves. Over the years, inspection teams have been prevented from doing their jobs and held—often at gunpoint—outside suspect facilities, providing enough time for evidence to be hidden or destroyed. To rout out Iraq's remaining weapons of mass destruction, UNSCOM must be granted full access to all sites, without exception.

The Iraqi regime contends that it has been forced to defy the international community in this manner out of concern for the well-being of the Iraqi people, claiming that malnutrition and inadequate medical care are the direct result of internationally imposed sanctions. To the contrary, the deep concern of the United States and the international community about the condition of the Iraqi people is evident in the fact that the international sanctions against Iraq have been carefully structured to help ensure that ordinary Iraqis need not suffer. Since their inception, the sanctions against Iraq have had exceptions for the importation into Iraq of foods and medicines. In August 1991, when Iraq claimed that it was unable to pay for its food needs, the Security Council adopted UNSCR 706 (and later 712), authorizing Iraq to sell limited amounts of petroleum on the international market, with the proceeds to be used to purchase humanitarian supplies, and to fund vital U.N. activities regarding Iraq. The Government of Iraq, however, ignored the needs of its own people, by refusing to accept UNSCR's 706 and 712.

In April 1995 the Security Council proposed a new oil-for-food offer to Iraq in UNSCR 986, sponsored by the United States and others. UNSCR 986 authorized the sale of up to $1 billion of oil every 90 days for Iraq to purchase food, medicines, and other "humanitarian items" for its people. The Government of Iraq delayed implementation of UNSCR 986 for a year and a half, until December 1996.

Since December 1996, the Iraqi regime has continued to obstruct the relief plan. It has reduced the food ration for each person, even as more food was flowing into the country. In fact, there are credible reports that as food imports under UNSCR 986 increased, the regime reduced its regular food purchases, potentially freeing up money for other purposes. There are also reports that Iraq may have stockpiled food in warehouses for use by the military and regime supporters—even though the Iraqi people need the food now. Under UNSCR 1111—the 6-month renewal of UNSCR 986 passed in June 1997—the regime delayed oil sales for 2 months, even while it claimed its people were starving. In Baghdad, the regime staged threatening demonstrations against U.N. relief offices. Under both UNSCR's 986 and 1111, the U.N. Sanctions Committee has had to carefully consider each and every import contract because of the possibility that Iraq may slip orders for dual-use items that can be employed to make weapons into long lists of humanitarian goods.

Since 1990—even at the height of the Gulf War—the consistent position of the United States has been that this dispute is with Iraq's regime, not with its people. We have always been open to suggestions on how UNSCR's 986 and 1111 can be improved or expanded to better serve the needs of the people. The confrontational tactics of the Iraqi government have not altered this position.

Sanctions against Iraq were imposed as the result of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. It has been necessary to sustain them because of Iraq's failure to comply with relevant UNSC resolutions, including those to ensure that Saddam Hussein is not allowed to resume the unrestricted development and production of weapons of mass destruction. Prior to the Gulf War, Saddam had already used chemical weapons on the Iraqi people and on Iranian troops, and he threatened to use them on coalition forces and innocent civilians in Saudi Arabia and Israel during the Gulf War. By restricting the amount of oil he can sell to a level that provides for the needs of the Iraqi people but does not allow him to

pursue other, nonhumanitarian objectives, international sanctions make it virtually impossible for Saddam to gear up his weapons programs to full strength.

Saddam could end the suffering of his people tomorrow if he would cease his obstruction of the oil-for-food program and allow it to be implemented properly. He could end sanctions entirely if he would demonstrate peaceful intentions by complying fully with relevant UNSC resolutions. The United States has supported and will continue to support the sanctions against the Iraqi regime until such time as compliance is achieved.

Saddam Hussein remains a threat to his people, to the region, and to the world, and the United States remains determined to contain the threat posed by his regime. The United States looks forward to the day when Iraq rejoins the family of nations as a responsible and law-abiding member but until then, containment must continue.

Regarding military operations, the United States and its coalition partners continue to enforce the no-fly zones over Iraq under Operation Northern Watch and Operation Southern Watch. We have detected myriad intentional Iraqi violations of both no-fly zones. While these incidents (Iraqi violations of the no-fly zones) started several hours after an Iranian air raid on terrorist bases inside Iraq, it was clear that Iraq's purpose was to try and test the coalition to see how far it could go in violating the ban on flights in these regions. A maximum effort by Operation Southern Watch forces complemented by early arrival in theater of the USS NIMITZ battle group, dramatically reduced violations in the southern no-fly zone. An increase in the number of support aircraft participating in Northern Watch allowed increased operating capacity that in turn significantly reduced the number of violations in the north. We have repeatedly made clear to the Government of Iraq and to all other relevant parties that the United States and its partners will continue to enforce both no-fly zones, and that we reserve the right to respond appropriately and decisively to any Iraqi provocations.

United States force levels include land- and carrier-based aircraft, surface warships, a Marine amphibious task force, a Patriot missile battalion, a mechanized battalion task force, and a mix of special operations forces deployed in support of USCINCCENT operations. To enhance force protection throughout the region, additional military security personnel have been deployed for continuous rotation. USCINCCENT continues to monitor closely the security situation in the region to ensure adequate force protection is provided for all deployed forces.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 9491 adopted in October 1994, demands that Iraq not use its military or any other forces to threaten its neighbors or U.N. operations in Iraq and that it not redeploy troops or enhance its military capacity in southern Iraq. In view of Saddam's accumulating record of unreliability, it is prudent to retain a significant U.S. force presence in the region in order to deter Iraq and maintain the capability to respond rapidly to possible Iraqi aggression or threats against its neighbors.

Implementation of UNSCR 1051 continues. It provides for a mechanism to monitor Iraq's efforts to reacquire proscribed weapons capabilities by requiring Iraq to notify a joint unit of UNSCOM and the IAEA in advance of any imports of dual-use items. Similarly, U.N. members must provide timely notification of exports to Iraq of dual-use items.

The human rights situation throughout Iraq remains unchanged. Iraq's repression of its Shi'a population continues, with policies that are destroying the Marsh Arabs' way of life in southern Iraq and the ecology of the southern marshes. The United Nations, in its most recent reports on implementation of Resolution 986, recognized that the Government of Iraq continues forcibly to deport Iraqi citizens from Kirkuk and other areas of northern Iraq still under the Iraqi government's control. Iraq continues to stall and obfuscate rather than work in good faith toward accounting for the hundreds of Kuwaitis and third-country nationals who disappeared at the hands of Iraqi authorities during the occupation of Kuwait. The Government of Iraq shows no signs of complying with UNSC Resolution 688, which demands that Iraq cease the repression of its own people. The U.N. Human Rights Commission's special rapporteur on Iraq reported to the General Assembly of his particular concern that extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions and the practice of torture continue to occur in Iraq.

The INDICT campaign continues to gain momentum. Led by various independent Iraqi opposition groups and nongovernmental organizations, this effort seeks to document crimes

against humanity and other violations of international humanitarian law committed by the Iraqi regime. We applaud the tenacity of the Iraqi opposition in the face of one of the most repressive regimes in history. We also take note of and welcome H.Con.Res. 137 of November 12, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the need for an international criminal tribunal to try members of the Iraqi regime for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Regarding northern Iraq, our efforts to help resolve the differences between Massoud Barzani, leader of the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP) and Jalal Talabani, leader of the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK) have not yet yielded the type of permanent, stable settlement that the people of northern Iraq deserve. The Peace Monitoring Force—sponsored by the United States, Great Britain, and Turkey under the Ankara Process and comprising Iraqi Turkomans and Assyrians—was forced to withdraw from the agreed cease-fire line between the two groups, when PUK forces, joined by the terrorist Kurdish Workers Party (PKK) launched a wide-scale attack on the KDP on October 13. The KDP, supported by airstrikes and ground elements of the Turkish army, launched a counterattack on November 8. We have helped to arrange a number of temporary cease-fires and to restore humanitarian services in the course of this fighting, but the underlying causes for conflict remain. We will continue our efforts to reach a permanent settlement through mediation in order to minimize opportunities for Baghdad and/or Tehran to insert themselves into the conflict and threaten Iraqi citizens in this region.

The Multinational Interception Force (MIF) continues its important mission in the Arabian Gulf. The U.S. Navy provides the bulk of the forces involved in the maritime sanctions enforcement authorized under Resolution 665, although we receive much-needed help from a number of close allies, including during the past year: Belgium, Canada, The Netherlands, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

Illegal smuggling of Iraqi gasoil from the Shatt Al Arab waterway in violation of Resolution 661 has doubled since May of this year—reaching an estimated 180,000 metric tons per month—and continues to increase. The smugglers use the territorial waters of Iran with the complicity of the Iranian government that profits from charging protection fees for these vessels to avoid interception by the MIF in international waters. Cash raised from these illegal operations is used to purchase contraband goods that are then smuggled back into Iraq by the same route. We continue to brief the U.N. Sanctions Committee regarding these operations and have pressed the Committee to compel Iran to give a full accounting of its involvement. We have also worked closely with our MIF partners and Gulf Cooperation Council states to take measures to curb sanctions-breaking operations.

The United Nations Compensation Commission (UNCC), established pursuant to UNSCR 687 and 692, continues to resolve claims against Iraq arising from Iraq's unlawful invasion and occupation of Kuwait. The UNCC has issued almost 1.3 million awards worth approximately $6 billion. Thirty percent of the proceeds from the oil sales permitted by UNSCR's 986 and 1111 have been allocated to the Compensation Fund to pay awards and to finance operations of the UNCC, and these proceeds will continue to be allocated to the Fund under UNSCR 1111. To the extent that money is available in the Compensation Fund, initial payments to each claimant are authorized for awards in the order in which the UNCC has approved them, in installments of $2,500. To date, 455 U.S. claimants have received an initial installment payment, and payment is in process for an additional 487 U.S. claimants.

Iraq remains a serious threat to international peace and security. I remain determined to see Iraq comply fully with all of its obligations under U.N. Security Council resolutions. My Administration will continue to sustain and strengthen sanctions until Iraq demonstrates its peaceful intentions through such compliance.

I appreciate the support of the Congress for our efforts and shall continue to keep the Congress informed about this important issue.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate. In the letter, the President referred to Richard Butler, Executive Chairman, United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM); Hans

Blix, Director General, International Atomic Energy Agency; and Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz of Iraq. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 1.

Remarks on the 1998 Budget and the International Agreement on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and an Exchange With Reporters

December 1, 1997

The President. Today we are planning for the future, and we're working on two issues I wanted to mention briefly.

First, we are about to start a meeting, as you can see, with the economic team, planning for the 1998 budget. This will be the sixth year of our economic plan of invest in our people, cut the deficit, expand America's ability to sell abroad. And as all of you know, the deficit has gone from $290 billion when I took office to $23 billion today. Our economy is the strongest in a generation. And what we are going to be doing now is looking to continue this strategy within the confines of the balanced budget. Keep in mind, we have a balanced budget plan, but we don't have a balanced budget yet. We have to keep that uppermost in our minds.

The second thing we're going to be doing is continuing to work on the challenge of climate change, with the Kyoto conference in Japan opening this week. The conference begins today. I've asked the Vice President to go to Kyoto early next week to present our approach, which is both environmentally strong and economically sound. All of you know that I believe that global warming is one of the great challenges that America must face over the next few decades, and we must begin now. The challenge is not imminent in the sense that most people can't feel it now, but it is clear, and it is very profound. It is a danger that the world community would ignore only at its peril.

There are still significant differences between the parties on key issues at the conference. The question before us is whether the nations of the world, both the developed and the developing nations, can put their rhetoric aside and find common ground in a way that enables us to make real progress in reducing the danger of global warming. And this can be done, I firmly believe, without undermining the capacity of the developing countries to grow or, for that matter, the capacity of the developed countries to grow.

We have set forward a plan that is both aggressive and achievable. It represents our commitment to do what we promised to do and to work very hard to avoid promising to do something that neither we nor others can do.

The Vice President will lay out the essence of our plan, explain its central goals: a strong target, a vigorous domestic program, reliance on market mechanisms to reduce the cost of cutting emissions, and meaningful participation by the developing countries, because the progress that we need to make cannot be made and, indeed, the problem cannot be solved unless all countries are involved. This is a global problem requiring a global solution.

I'm pleased the Vice President is going to Kyoto to present our position. It shows that we consider this to be a profoundly important issue, and we have taken it very seriously. We have worked very hard on it. An outstanding negotiating team, led by Under Secretary of State Stu Eizenstat, will conduct the negotiations. And I believe that if we all work hard, this will be viewed as a landmark meeting on our way to making progress on this critical challenge.

International Agreement on Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Q. Mr. President, does that mean your position is negotiable, and will the Vice President be able to negotiate? Or is he simply stating your position?

The Vice President. Can I answer that, Mr. President? I'm not going to be the negotiator. Stu Eizenstat is going to be leading the negotiations. And I would like to make it clear that, as others have said, we are perfectly prepared to walk away from an agreement that we don't think will work. And so it should be crystal clear to all the parties there that we're going

to present the U.S. position forcefully and clearly. Mr. Eizenstat has the President's authority to negotiate, but the principles the President laid down earlier will be the ones that have to be met in order for the U.S. to participate.

Q. Sounds hostile.

The President. No, we're not hostile. We're going there in good faith, committed to negotiate within our principles. But I think it's very important that we not do something that appears to be politically palatable but that won't produce the results.

We have a good framework here; we've worked very hard. I personally have spent a lot of time talking to world leaders about this since I announced our position. We spent a lot of time talking about it when I was in Canada at the APEC meeting. I spent a lot of time when I was in Latin America talking to leaders about it. I spent a lot of time on the phone talking to others about it. I talked to President Jiang when he was here.

We're certainly going to negotiate in good faith. But we have to negotiate within the framework of our principles, and our principles are not inconsistent with what others say they want to achieve. So I'm very hopeful.

Attorney General Reno's Decision

Q. Mr. President, have you heard from the Attorney General about her decision regarding an independent counsel?

The President. No.

Q. When do you expect to hear from her?

The President. I don't know. I have not heard anything.

International Agreement on Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Q. Mr. President, returning to Kyoto, the United States is proposing one of the more modest proposals of the summit—at the meeting, I should say. What factors led the administration to back away from its earlier proposal to cut greenhouse gases more dramatically?

The President. We didn't have an earlier proposal, that I'm aware of. The Government of the United States in '92, before I became President, signed on to the Rio conference. And we were attempting to come up with a proposal that we thought we could actually meet within the tools available to us and within the realistic options available to me as President and consistent with our desire to maintain our rate of growth but to change the energy basis on which we grow our economy. So we reached a decision we thought was best not only for the United States but that we thought was achievable, and therefore it was responsible, for the world.

I think it's very important—keep in mind, we want to set targets that we can hit. At Rio, I think the world did set some targets in good faith, but there was no real system, no mechanism set up, country by country, to implement that. I'm going to do a much better job of that for the United States now. That is, we're going to have a program to pursue our course, and we're going to do it whatever happens at Kyoto. We're going to really work hard at this now. But I think it's important that we have a goal that makes sense. And I've evaluated where the Europeans are, in fact, with their efforts, where the Asians are, where the Latin Americans are, and what I think we can achieve here.

Also keep in mind, I think we need to be looking at this in terms of not just what happens in 2010 but where are we in 2020, where are we in 2030? What our objective has to be is to dramatically slow, freeze, and then reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the developed countries, and then get the developing countries to do the same thing, so that over the course of the next few decades we avoid what is otherwise certainly going to happen, which is a dramatic warming of the planet.

This is a problem that needs—it's a hard problem for democracies to deal with because we like to deal with things that have quick action and quick payoff. This problem has been developing over decades. If you read the Vice President's book and you look at his charts, you see how much worse it's gotten just in the last few years. But it can't be turned around overnight. And so I think we've reached the right decision.

The Vice President. Mr. President, if I could add just a word on this, I think it's important to note that the position outlined and presented by the President that will be presented formally in Kyoto represents almost a 30 percent cut in emissions that would otherwise take place here in the United States by around the year 2010. That would represent a huge change.

The second point, as the President has said, whether there is an agreement in Kyoto or not, the United States is prepared, under President Clinton's leadership, to unilaterally take the

steps that we believe should be taken in order to deal with this problem.

Third point, we see Kyoto as the beginning of the process, not the end of the process. And whether the agreement is reached at Kyoto or not, we will work to make sure that the world community comes together over the next few years and follows a sensible plan to solve this problem. And I'm going in order to demonstrate the commitment of the administration to solving that problem, regardless of whether or not we end up being able to sign on to the agreement at Kyoto.

The President. Let me make just one other point about that to reinforce what the Vice President has said. The goal we have suggested for Kyoto would require a much greater effort from the United States than from the other developed countries in the next few years because we've had so much more growth in the last 5 years than the other developed countries. So that if you use 1990 as a base year, let's say, instead of 1995, 1997, or some earlier year, it's the year that most clearly puts the burden on us since we've had so much more growth than our other developed partners have since that period.

Now, I'm not complaining about that. We have the most to do; we intend to do it. But I think that to imply that our goals are more modest than others doesn't look at—you ought to look at who has to do what work between now and then.

Q. Your goal is more modest now, though, than it was in 1993, when you proposed a goal for the administration. Is it because of the growth? Is that the reason why you——

The President. Yes, we grew a lot more. Frankly, I don't think we have—if you want to meet something with market mechanisms and technology and you don't favor taxes and regulation, then you have to have a more sophisticated system with more, sort of, buy-in, more organized, disciplined partnerships than we've had by and large with the private sector. I think that I have to do a better job of having a disciplined, coordinated effort here, which we intend to do now.

Q. Why not have the Vice President head the negotiations?

The President. Because, for one thing, we need him to do other things over the next 6 days. Stu Eizenstat is a great negotiator. He's the perfect person to do this. The Vice President is going there to announce our policy and to be there and show how important it is. No other country has got someone at the Vice President's level doing the negotiating; that's not how you negotiate these treaties.

The Vice President. You can be sure that both the President and I will remain very active behind the scenes, but all of the negotiating will be done, as is traditional and customary, by the head of the negotiating team.

The President. Let me say, they're not going to run away with this; we'll get daily reports, maybe several times a day, on what's going on. Don't worry about that.

Assistance to the South Korean Economy

Q. [*Inaudible*]—United States and Japan are considering chipping in as much as $20 billion to the IMF-led—[*inaudible*]—for South Korea. Two questions. Are those numbers in the ballpark? And secondly, are you at all concerned about the moral hazard risk element of this—by persistently bailing out countries you end up leading to the possibility that they will pursue less prudent national policies rather than more prudent ones in the future?

The President. Well, I would be worried about that if that's what we had done, but that's not what we've done. That is, I favor a strong agreement with the IMF that would actually restore financial stability and confidence in South Korea. And if such an agreement could be made, then I would favor the United States participating along with Japan, much the same way we did in the recent matter involving Indonesia.

But if you look at what we did in Indonesia, if you look at what we did in Mexico, you see that the moral hazard argument doesn't come into play because we didn't agree to provide assistance and backup financial support until there was in place a rigorous plan that had a high likelihood of success in restoring long-term health and stability to the country. If you look at the results that were obtained in Mexico, they took a lot of tough medicine, they took a lot of hits to their economy, but it rebounded much more quickly than anyone thought it would, and they paid the money back to us ahead of time and at a profit. And if the plan that was adopted for Indonesia is vigorously implemented in good faith, I believe it will have similar results.

When our finance ministers met in Manila, we agreed that that was the formula that we would try to follow: that the country would reach a strong agreement with the IMF, and then if more funds were needed, at least in a backup situation, if the IMF fund should not be enough, then the United States, Japan, and others, in accordance with their ability, would be there to do that. I think we should be prepared to do that in the case of Korea if there's a strong agreement that has a high likelihood of restoring stability and confidence.

Internet Antipornography Agreement

Q. How do you regard the antipornography agreement—[*inaudible*]—Mr. President—[*inaudible*]——

The President. I hope it works. I encouraged them to do it, and I'm glad they're doing it. I wish them well.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:40 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House prior to a meeting with the economic team. In his remarks, he referred to President Jiang Zemin of China.

Memorandum on Integration of HIV Prevention in Federal Programs Serving Youth

December 1, 1997

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Integration of HIV Prevention in Federal Programs Serving Youth

Adolescence marks a major rite of passage, a transition from childhood to adulthood. It is a period of significant physical, social, and intellectual growth and change. It is also a period of experimentation and risk-taking. The choices that young people make during these years profoundly affect their chances of becoming healthy, responsible, and productive adults.

Unfortunately, too many young people lack the support and self-esteem needed to make sound decisions, and end up putting their lives and their futures at risk. Today, it is estimated that one-quarter of all new HIV infections in the United States occur in young people between the ages of 13 and 21. This means that two Americans under the age of 21 become infected with HIV every hour of every day. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that in some communities as many as one in thirty 18- and 19-year olds may be HIV-positive.

For young people who become infected, there are promising new treatments available to help them live longer and more productive lives. Yet these treatments only forestall the progression of the disease; they do not constitute a cure. In fact, AIDS is the sixth leading cause of death among young people 15–24 years old (and the leading cause of death among African Americans of the same age group). The loss of so many young Americans to this terrible epidemic is a threat to this Nation and should serve as a call to action.

My Administration is firmly committed to doing everything within its power to end the AIDS epidemic. That includes finding a cure for those already infected as well as a vaccine to keep others from developing the disease. This commitment also includes reaching out in new ways to enable young people to protect themselves from acquiring or spreading HIV infection.

Accordingly, I hereby direct:

- That each Federal agency, within 90 days, working with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Office of National AIDS Policy (ONAP) identify all programs under its control that serve young people ages 13–21 and that offer a significant opportunity for preventing HIV infection; and
- That each Federal agency, in collaboration with the HHS and ONAP, develop within 180 days a specific plan through which said programs could increase access to HIV prevention and education information, as well as to supportive services and care for those already infected.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: The related proclamation of December 1 on the observance of World AIDS Day is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Interview With Jodi Enda of Knight-Ridder Newspapers
December 1, 1997

President's Thanksgiving Holiday

The President. How are you doing?

Ms. Enda. Great. How are you?

The President. I'm great. I had a great weekend; I'm in good humor.

Ms. Enda. Got a lot of golf in, I see.

The President. I played twice, and I saw tons of movies. I had my whole, huge—my little extended family was there; both my nephews were there. We had lots of folks there. I liked it. We must have had 20 people at Thanksgiving dinner, and I liked it.

President's Initiative on Race

Ms. Enda. Oh, that's great. Well, I know we don't have a lot of time, so let's get to this race issue.

When we talked about race last, way back in February, you said you wanted to embark on a major initiative that would change the culture of America. Now we're halfway through your one-year program, and there's been a lot of criticism that things have been a little bit slow. And I was wondering what you intend to do in the next 6 months and how you feel about this criticism.

The President. I think some of it's justified. I think it took time to get the board—to get it organized, to get it staffed up, to get started. And that's why I always left open the possibility of having this thing take more than a year. I mean, I may want to do some things—I'm certain that I want to do some things after the year elapses, but we may be able to have the major report to the American people I want within a year's time. But I think some of that's justified.

On the other hand, I think the board now is working very hard. Judy Winston and our staff are working very hard. We're beginning to get some of our specific policy initiatives out. The announcement I made for the scholarship program for people to teach in inner-city areas, the work that Secretary Cuomo is doing on discrimination in housing and trying to find community-based solutions so you won't just be dealing with individual acts of discrimination but you'll be changing the environment—we'll have a lot more of those coming up in civil rights enforcement, in education, in the economy, a lot of other things like that. So I think you'll see a lot more policy initiatives coming out.

We will have—we'll be doing—the second thing we said we would do is to basically talk about what's working, put out—set the facts of racial life, if you will, in America today, put out promising practices, recruit leaders; I think you'll see a lot of that.

And the dialog will become increasingly more public and pitched to a wider national audience, beginning with this townhall meeting. We've been spending a lot of time, and we'll continue to do that, meeting with small groups of people—I have here in the White House and, of course, the board has. But I want to notch up the public dialog, and I think this is a good time to be doing that.

So, on balance, I'm quite pleased with the people that have been involved, with the efforts they're making, and with the number of people who want to be involved and who complain when they're not. I think that's a healthy thing, too. That shows that people are interested in talking about this and working on it and trying to get it right. So, on balance, I'm quite upbeat.

We got off to a little bit of a slow start, but that partly was my fault because I announced it, and then we had to put it together. I mean, we knew what we wanted to do, but we had—it just takes time to put something together. And now I think we're running well now, and I think it will get better.

Ms. Enda. What other kinds of policy initiatives are forthcoming?

The President. Well, I know we'll have one on civil rights enforcement, for example. We're

looking at what we can do not only to adequately fund and beef up the EEOC but what we can do to use the EEOC and perhaps much better coordination with all the other civil rights agencies in Government to find alternative ways of resolving these disputes, so that you not only remedy a specific act of discrimination but you change the climate, the environment. You get people to working together and talking together, and you change the dynamics of workplaces all across America.

We will have some more initiatives in the area of the education and economic opportunity. We've got this ongoing effort now, which I'm very proud of because I think it's going to make a difference, in the economic area to get more of these community development banks out there that will make more loans to minorities to start businesses or to expand small businesses. Because I have always believed that the central thing that our society needed—let me back up and say, I've always believed that ultimately the answer to building one America was to give people the chance to do constructive, positive work or, if you're younger or between jobs, learning as you work—learning and work in a positive environment that was free of racial discrimination. So I think there has got to be an economic and an educational component to all this that we keep uppermost in our minds. So we'll do that.

Affirmative Action

Ms. Enda. In terms of both economics and education, one of the most divisive issues right now in this country is affirmative action. You said earlier this year that you were going to look for an alternative to affirmative action that would accomplish the same goal of diversity without running into problems in the courts and among voters. Have you come up with an idea on that?

The President. Well, I think there are some things that can be done, although—you know, my position on affirmative action is that we should, as I said when I spoke at the National Archives, we should mend it, not end it. That's what the Court in *Adarand* required us to do. The Court imposed some limits on affirmative action in the economic sphere.

Ms. Enda. Right, but a lot of voters seem to want to end it.

The President. Well, some voters do and some voters don't. We just won a big fight in Houston, and the mayor did a superb job, and they asked me to do a radio ad for it—and I did—for their position, to keep the program. And the Supreme Court—what I read from the Supreme Court's declining to take the California case is they basically said, look, we've put the limits, the constitutional limits on affirmative action in *Adarand*. By declining to take this case, they seem to be saying that there is no constitutional duty to have an affirmative action program, so we're going to leave it in the political sphere. It's now going to be up to the people and their elected representatives. That's the way I read the two cases. I think that's a fair reading of it.

And so what I think ought to be done is, number one, we ought to continue to make sure that if we have the programs, they're carefully targeted and they don't amount to quotas and nobody is getting anything they're not qualified for. When they're under attack, I think they ought to be vigorously defended. And then I think we have to look for other ways to increase the access of minorities to educational, housing, and economic opportunities.

But after all, that's what the empowerment zones, that's what the community development financial banks were all about; that's what our Community Reinvestment Act enforcement is all about. Over 70 percent of all the loans made to minorities in the history of the Community Reinvestment Act have been made since I've been President. So we have always looked for alternatives to affirmative action to work.

Now, I noticed Glenn Loury—I don't know if you saw Glenn Loury's column recently about how he had now been excoriated by some of the right because he wasn't simon-pure on all these issues. He made a point about affirmative action that I don't have an answer for. I think that if you look at what we've done in education, we'll soon be at a point where we can tell everybody, if you stay in school and behave yourself and get your grades, you can go to college. But we don't want to have all the public institutions of higher education segregated, I don't think. I know I don't. And Glenn Loury made a point that I have not found a substitute for. I do think we can do more to bring economic opportunity to people; I do think we can do more to bring educational opportunity to people. And I think that will help to create more of an integrated environment.

Loury's point in his article of why he's supported some continuing affirmative action was that networking is important; if you want to build an African-American middle class, if you want Hispanic-Americans to develop a culture where it's unacceptable to drop out of school and they stay in school, and they not only have a good work ethic, they have a good education achievement ethic, and then you want them to be rewarded, you have to develop these networks.

And one of the things that affirmative action does, both in terms of giving people a chance to participate in business, that governments do with private businesses, and in terms of getting into certain institutions of higher education, is to build a networking, the patterns of contact that then help their children, their relatives, their associates on both sides to begin to meld into a more integrated environment. And I don't think—so far I have not seen anything that I thought would fully compensate for that.

Now, in education, there are—Texas has passed and California is looking at this so-called 10 percent rule, or 8 percent rule—that is, 8 percent of the—the top 8 percent of this graduating class can go to any State institution they want to. But that is clearly a way of—another way of achieving the same goal.

Ms. Enda. Do you support those plans?

The President. Well, I think in the case of Texas, since they have gotten rid of direct affirmative action, it's sort of an indirect affirmative action, I think it's all right and it will at least keep them from—it will keep the State from having more segregated institutions of higher education and more segregated professional schools, which I think is a good goal.

And I think most Americans can accept it because there's, by definition, evidence there that people have achieved academically in an environment and therefore are likely to be able to achieve in another and therefore likely to be considered worthy.

Racial Stereotypes and the Media

Ms. Enda. One of the big problems that I've talked to Judy Winston about, and others involved in your initiative, is stereotypes, that stereotypes are so widespread now and this is not something that you can wipe away by passing a law. Do you have some ideas on how to change stereotypes and also how to—do you intend to take the media on in terms of how the media promulgates stereotypes?

The President. Let me answer the question separately. First of all, yes, we do. I think what we want to do to take on stereotypes is get the facts out there. Most stereotypes are wrong, I mean, by definition. And so we need to get the facts out. The American people need to know what the facts of life are about people of different backgrounds and races than themselves. Then we need to get these promising practices out so people can see that there are ways to overcome problems that do exist.

And then what I hope to do by having these televised dialogs is to get people to have them on their own, by families, by communities, by schools, by workplaces, everyplace where they don't now exist, because I think that ultimately that having any positive personal experience with someone of a different race, and having more than one, breaks down the stereotypes that exist, because then you start treating everybody based on how you find him or her. And I think that's a very, very important part of this.

Now, the second thing, on the media, I don't think that it's—there are some portrayals of African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans and Asian-Americans and white southern Americans and others in the media that reinforce preexisting stereotypes. But to be fair, there have also been any number of remarkable portrayals of minorities in ways that shattered stereotypes and allowed people to see each other in terms of their shared values and experiences and perceptions. So I don't think that the media can be fairly singled out for unilateral condemnation. I think that what I'd like to see done in the media is more—first of all, more portrayals of people who go against stereotypes; and secondly, more effort to show people in environments that are working across racial lines to solve real problems and give people what they need, which is a safe environment, a good education, a good job, and then how people can work together in those positive situations to have good lives.

So rather than take—what I'd like to do is to point out maybe some stereotyping that can be destructive, some things that go against stereotypes and be completely enlightening, and then talk about what we can do to actually get people in their personal lives to shatter stereotypes so they're not using the media as a substitute for real-life experience one way or the other.

Interracial Marriage

Ms. Enda. One thing that has happened in people's personal life that a lot of polls show is that there is a lot more interracial dating going on than there used to be, interracial marriages. Do you think that's one way to help resolve this racial problem? How do you feel about that issue?

The President. Oh, absolutely. I think there's no question about it. When people are together as people, they relate to each other as people. Sometimes people who are passionately liberal on racial issues find that they meet people of different races and they don't like them very much. [*Laughter*] They treat them as people—that's good. That's the absence of discrimination, in a funny way. And then sometimes they like each other very much, and sometimes they fall in love. And when they do, they ought to get married. I mean, that's—I think it's a good thing. And I don't think there's any question that it helps to break down stereotypes and build bridges.

I know in the military—and I've spent—obviously, because of my position, I've spent a lot of time with our people in uniform. I've visited a lot of bases; I'm on a lot of ships. But on the bases in particular, or when I go to Camp David on the weekend, I'm with military families a lot. And there are a not unsubstantial number of interracial families. And I was with a couple yesterday in church at Camp David and I saw those beautiful children that were the products of their union, and I thought to myself that everybody people come in contact with, whoever had a problem about race will have less of a problem. I don't think people should get married to make a statement; they ought to get married for the right reasons. But I think that it is a positive thing.

Affirmative Action

Ms. Enda. How do you feel about the Piscataway case being settled out of court?

The President. Well, I think it was—we had, we in the Justice Department and the White House, did not think it was the right case for the Supreme Court to come to grips with the larger issues of affirmative action. The facts were not good. And so I think, on balance, it was a good thing that the Court will not be called upon to make sweeping generalizations about affirmative action on constitutional grounds on a set of facts which are, to put it mildly, atypical.

Because, I mean, that was—I would not have favored some attempt just to keep the Supreme Court from deciding on the case. They've already decided on affirmative action in the context of Government contracts in *Adarand*. But the facts were not—it was an atypical set of facts. And the Supreme Court—it's hard enough for the Supreme Court to make momentous decisions that elicit from, in a general area, the larger principles of the Constitution and how they'll be applied if the facts are unquestionably representative of the class of cases involved—it's hard enough—or if there's just a few variations. Here's a case where the facts were quite different from the normal class of cases involved and therefore the risk of almost unintentional error, I think, was quite great. So I think on balance it was a good thing.

Discrimination in Police Conduct

Ms. Enda. One of the areas where a lot of people agree that there's huge amounts of discrimination remaining is in police—the way police treat people in terms of arrests and the way the courts treat them. Do you intend as part of your race initiative——

The President. Absolutely, yes. One of the things that I think we have to do, first of all, is try to get this out on the table in a way that is both forthright but not threatening.

I had a group of African-American journalists in here a few months ago, and virtually everybody in the room said they had been stopped by a police officer for no apparent reason. I mean, it was chilling to me. And now I just sort of—every time I'm in a room now with a number of African-Americans and Hispanics I'll cite this just to see how many people will speak up and say, "Well, that's exactly what happened to me; it's happened to me a lot." Just today I was meeting with a guy who said, "Oh, yeah," he said, "I got stopped once just waiting for a taxicab, like there was something I was doing wrong, standing there waiting for a taxicab, in my suit."

Ms. Enda. So what do you intend to do about it?

The President. Well, I think one of the things we need to do is to find a—we need to find, I think, a highly visible public forum to try to air this, as I said, in a nonthreatening way, where we just really get people to get the facts

out and talk about it. Because it is something—in some ways I think it eats at some communities in America as much as anything in terms of continuing evidence that discrimination exists, even though we've made a lot of progress. And I just think it's very important to deal with.

Ms. Enda. Is there something that you, as President, can do about it? Is this something that you're going to take on publicly?

The President. Yes, I want to be involved in this. I want this talked about. Of course, there are laws about this. If somebody is actually—this kind of conduct can reach a point where it amounts to a violation of Federal civil rights laws. But what we really want to do is to find a way for police, in good faith, to enforce the law and to prevent crimes, but to do it in a way that doesn't stereotype—to go back to your word—stereotype minorities just because they are minorities in certain places at certain times of the day.

Ms. Enda. So what would you tell police officers, then? Do you have a message for them?

The President. Well, first of all, I would say that the community policing law—if every major area, and even smaller areas, has community-based policing, this is far less likely to occur, because then people are more likely to be stopped or at least questioned in passing because they're strangers in the neighborhoods, rather than because of the color of their skin.

And if the policeman happens to be white and the person stopped and questioned happens to be black or Hispanic or Asian—or the other way around, some variation of that—if there is a real community-based, connected law enforcement program, then people will not all automatically assume it was a race-based deal. They'll say, no, no, this person was stopped because the policeman didn't know him, because he was a stranger to the neighborhood, because there's been a crime down the street in the last 5 minutes, and this is the only person they saw that they didn't know.

This is the flip side of the marriage issue and the dating issue. There will always be—as long as you've got some policemen who are of one race and they work in a neighborhood where some people are of another race, there will always be times when people of different races are in law enforcement and in contact with each other. What you want to do is create an attitude on the part of the law enforcement officer that they don't stop people just because they're black or brown or whatever; and in the community, that people aren't stopped just because of their race, that there is another reason there.

So I think the way policing is done, as well as the attitudes of the people in law enforcement, are both important to getting rid of this problem. I've talked to enough police officers to know that a lot of people have done this and not intentionally done it, not thought they were doing it. Some people have done it and known exactly what they were doing. But this is a complex problem, but it deserves, in my view, a public and honest airing. And I think this race commission can do a lot of good by providing a supportive way for people to come forward and say whatever is on their mind about this.

Ms. Enda. So is that something that you expect them to take on?

The President. Yes. But I expect that I'll be involved in it, too. I really care a lot about it, and I've been quite affected by what people have told me about it.

Capital Punishment

Ms. Enda. It sounds like it. You support the death penalty, but a lot of people claim that in its implementation it's racist. That seems to be sort of a contradiction because you care so much about racial differences.

The President. Yes, but you know, the only—actually, the evidence that troubles me most—first of all, I think the death penalty should be opposed or supported based on whether you believe, A, it's ever appropriate to do it and, B, whether you think it can be done with almost no chance of error if it's done seldom enough and with enough proof.

But the real racial disparity in the death penalty which bothers me a lot that's never talked about—there's only one Supreme Court case on it, came out of Georgia—is that if you look at jury decisions and prosecutorial decisions, the evidence is that there's not so much racial disparity tied to the defendant but, instead, tied to the race of the victim. That's what all the research shows. And that's a subject for another day. But I still support the death penalty, but it really disturbed me.

I never will forget, once in my home State a black teacher was horribly, horribly brutalized and then killed by two students. And the prosecutor—the death penalty was not sought. And

I thought to myself, if the positions were reversed, it would have been. And it wasn't because the boys were white, although they happened to be; if they were black, it would have been the same decision. That's what I believe. I think that all over the country, if you look at the real research, the research shows it's not so much the race of the criminal defendant as it is the race of the victim that determines a lot of decisions.

Ms. Enda. And is there something you can do about that?

The President. I don't know about that. I don't know about that. But since the Supreme Court ruled on it, there hasn't been much done. But that was a close case, even in this Court. It was about 8 or 9 years ago. Do you remember the case?

Ms. Enda. Which case was that?

The President. It was a Georgia case. And I think it was only a 5–4 decision. I think it was. But it's been a long time. It could have been—the years run together too easy, but it was several years ago.

NOTE: The interview began at 6:42 p.m. in the Oval Office. In his remarks, the President referred to Judith A. Winston, Executive Director, President's Advisory Board on Race; Mayor Bob Lanier of Houston, TX; and Glenn C. Loury, professor, Boston University. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner

December 1, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Governor. I want to thank Jeff and Andy for hosting this event tonight, and I thank all of you for being here. I just came in with at least three members of the White House staff. I think Ginny Apuzzo is already here, but I came in with Sandy Thurman, Craig Smith, and Richard Socarides. And if anybody else is here from the White House, I apologize for making an omission.

Let me say to all of you, first, I really appreciate your being here tonight and your support for our party. Five years ago when I became President, I felt very strongly that our country needed a common, unifying vision to get us into the 21st century that included all Americans who were willing to work hard and obey the law, that guaranteed opportunity in return for responsibility, and that maintained the leadership of our Nation in the world.

Five years later I don't think any serious observer could question the fact that our country is in better shape than it was 5 years ago on virtually every front. The economy is in the best shape it's been in in a generation. We have made genuine progress in resolving a lot of our deepest social problems. The crime rate is dropping in virtually every community in the country. The welfare rolls have dropped by more than at any time in history. We have begun to try to reconcile the demands of work and family, which is in some ways the central dilemma that people with school-age children face and with preschool children.

And we have taken on a lot of issues that had not been taken on before: the dangers of tobacco to children, something Mr. Tobias has been on me about since long before he ever thought I could become President—[*laughter*]—the issue of having legal guns in the wrong hands and illegal guns getting into the country when they shouldn't, and also this issue of what it means to be inclusive.

On World AIDS Day I think it's worth pointing out that we've made a lot of dramatic progress in how fast we're moving drugs from the testing stage to approval to market. The increases in investment across the board have helped to lengthen and improve the quality of life of people living with HIV and AIDS. And I still believe that we will be able to find a cure within the next few years if we continue to intensify our efforts.

Now, one of the things that I would like to say, since this is a Democratic Party fundraiser, is that there is a direct chain of events between your support of our efforts and the things which happen in this country. And if you go back over the last 5 years—and I won't mention many, but I'd like to mention just a few—and

you look at the areas where there has been a partisan fight and then you look at the areas in which there has been bipartisan cooperation, in both areas you can see the signal difference it makes to have a strong party representing the values that we represent.

If you look at the partisan fights—I'll just mention two—in the '93 budget fight, we didn't have a single—a single—Republican vote, but before the Balanced Budget Act kicked in, we'd already reduced the deficit by 92 percent because of the work that we did, while increasing investments in medical research, in treatment, in education, in health care, and reducing the budget 92 percent—it was our kind of budget—and reducing income taxes on working families with incomes under $30,000.

If you look at the crime bill debate we had in '94, we had a few—and I thank God for them—we had a few Republican votes on a strategy which is now universally accepted as having a dramatic impact on lowering the crime rate: putting 100,000 police on the street, passing the Brady bill, passing the assault weapons ban, passing preventive programs. In the last session we actually got a lot of—a substantial amount of money through the Congress for after-school programs for kids who would otherwise be wandering on the streets or for work programs for kids who are out of school. Juvenile crime has not dropped as much as regular crime. The overwhelming percentage of juvenile crimes is committed between 3 o'clock in the afternoon and 7 o'clock at night.

So that—on these issues, I think history shows we were right.

Where there was bipartisan cooperation—I'll just mention two—in the welfare reform bill, because I had a party in the Congress that would back me, I was able to veto the bill twice when it tried to take guaranteed health care and food away from poor children in welfare families and because it lacked an adequate commitment to child care for people who were going to work. So when we signed the bill, I think it was a much better bill plainly because of the contribution our party made.

In the balanced budget bill last summer, which I am strongly in favor of, it is true that some of the more liberal members of our caucus didn't vote for it, but over two-thirds of the Democratic caucus voted for that balanced budget for a very good reason: It contained the biggest increase in child health since Medicaid passed in 1965, the biggest increase in aid to public education since 1965, the biggest increase in opening the doors of higher education since the GI bill in 1945, and a huge increase in medical research through the NIH.

So again I say, the parties make a difference because they bring to bear their views on public decisions. And if people didn't help them get elected, they wouldn't be able to do that.

If you look at where we are today—I'd just like to mention one or two things. I believe that we are moving to deal in a more open way with this whole idea of what it means to build one America. The White House hate crimes conference could not have come at a better time. And if you look at some of the terrible things that Governor Romer has been going through in Denver, you see that it is a problem in America in more contexts than one. And I think that's very important.

I hope that the appearance I made at the Human Rights Campaign Fund dinner the other night and the continuing strong support by many Members in Congress, some in both parties, for ENDA is again another manifestation of the fact that we are continuing to try to expand the barriers of our American community. I think it's very important that we continue to do that.

If I might just mention three other things that are very much on my mind tonight that you may want to talk about, or not, as we visit—I have done my best to try to put America in a position to continue to lead the world and to deal with the new security threats and seize the new opportunities of the new century. I intend, therefore, to continue to try to get fast-track authority from the Congress because I think that we have to sell more of our products overseas. And I think only by selling more and by becoming more involved with other countries will we have the leverage to try to elevate international economic, labor, and environmental standards, something that I strongly support. I think we have to do it in a way that our party favors, which is to do more and more quickly for people that are displaced here at home.

I think we have to take a very strong position, but a realistic one we can get other countries to sign on to, at the climate change meeting in Kyoto. The Vice President is going over there to present our views. I think this is a huge, huge issue and will be for at least another generation.

This, in some ways, is the most difficult of all problems for a democracy to confront, because except if you live in a place that has had a lot of extreme weather in the last 5 years, you probably don't have any tangible evidence that the climate is warming more rapidly than it has in 10,000 years. But by the time we could all get tangible evidence, it would be too late to do much about it—first problem. The second problem is, this is not like the balanced budget, which will be done in 4 or 5 years or 6 years from the time we started. This is something we'll have to work on for 20 or 30 years, but we have to begin today. Democracies are not very well organized for this sort of challenge. But it is imperative that we do it. And I would implore all of you to do whatever you can to help us build public support for having an aggressive approach to climate change.

One final issue I wanted to mention is this whole matter involving our dispute with Iraq. This is not about the United States and Iraq, per se, nor is it about an attempt to rehash the Gulf war. This is a question of whether we are going to establish in the world a regime that will limit the capacity of rogue nations and illegal groups to manufacture, store, disseminate, sell, or use dangerous biological and chemical weapons or small-scale nuclear weapons. I think it is imperative that we try.

Now, you saw from what happened in the Tokyo subway with the sarin gas that it's hard to envision a totally risk-free world. But believe me, there are substantial things that can be done to minimize the chance that innocent civilians who travel the world and walk the streets of cities all across the world will be subject to that sort of thing.

So when you see all this stuff playing out in the press, let me assure you that what I am thinking about is whether we can, as part of our responsibilities to the future, create a regime in which we will actually be able to say that—not that there may never be an incident of chemical or biological use by a terrorist group or a drug trafficker or something else but that we have done everything that is humanly possible to know where the stockpiles are, to limit them, and to minimize the chances that they can ever be brought into play against innocent human beings.

This is a huge issue, and it will require enormous discipline by our country and enormous leadership by our country if we're going to prevail. And this is a case when—you know, I care a lot about economics, and I think that it's easy to demean it. The country is in better shape when everybody has a job who wants one. But this is one issue where economic interest in the short run cannot be allowed to override our solemn obligation to the future to try to minimize the chance that we'll have any of this in your future or our children's future.

Now, having said that, again I say the main point I want you to understand is, there is a direct connection between everything I just mentioned and hundreds of things I didn't and your decision to be here supporting our party. And this is a better country today than it was 5 years ago because of the ideas, the values, and the efforts that you helped to make possible.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:50 p.m. at the Renaissance Mayflower Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado, general chair, Democratic National Committee; and Jeffrey Soref and Andy Tobias, dinner cochairs. He also referred to the proposed "Employment Non-Discrimination Act" (ENDA). The proclamation of December 1 on the observance of World AIDS Day is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Dinner Honoring Evan Bayh

December 1, 1997

Thank you very much. Governor, Senator Bayh, Lieutenant Governor Kernan, Senator Kerrey, Senator Torricelli. Ladies and gentlemen, first, thank you very much for being here for Evan Bayh tonight. You could probably tell that—you might have told a lot of things looking

at that. You could probably tell we were good friends. When you heard him speak, you might have been thinking, "There is Joe DiMaggio; why is he introducing Lou Gehrig?" [*Laughter*] And then he started talking about what was on Jefferson's gravestone; I thought, my God, it's not—bad enough that he's younger and better looking, now he's about to write my epitaph. [*Laughter*] But I was spared.

Evan and Susan Bayh have been very close friends of Hillary's and mine for a long time now. I do remember when he was elected the youngest Governor in America, a position that I once held. And I remember how well he served. I remember when Senator Kerrey and I used to sit in the Governors meetings and think about how crazy things were in Washington, and we couldn't imagine how people lived and worked here, what strange decisions were made. We don't have any excuse for being here, Senator Kerrey and I. [*Laughter*] Senator Torricelli was always in the Congress; he didn't know any better. [*Laughter*] We were actually out there in the real world with Evan Bayh. And here is he about to jump off the same cliff.

I want to tell you seriously that, you know, you meet a lot of people in this business and most of them are good people, honest people. They work hard; they try to do the right thing. Governor Bayh is one of the most extraordinarily talented and fundamentally decent people I have ever met in more than two decades in public life now.

He also gets things done. He ran a great State, had a good economy, advanced the cause of education, had the biggest drop in welfare rolls of any State in the United States with a compassionate and commonsense welfare reform. And he embodies what I believe our party, and indeed our country, ought to stand for on the edge of a new century.

I have spent a lot of time these last 5 years, with varying degrees of success—I'm grateful for that which we've had—trying to get our Nation to grasp the nettle before us, to do the things which need to be done in this dramatically new time to get us into a new century with the American dream alive for everybody who is responsible enough to work for it, and with our country coming together as one America when so many other people around the world are divided, and to maintain our leadership in the world for peace and prosperity and freedom.

Evan Bayh embodies the kind of America I am trying to move us toward. I believe he will win next November. I believe he will render great service to our country. I believe you will always be proud that you were here on this night about a year before the election. And I hope that, together, those of us—we four in this room that either are now or I think soon will be serving in the Federal Government—will be able over the next 3 years to continue to move this country forward, based on what we believe in: building up, not tearing down; bringing together, not dividing; embracing the future, not the past.

I've spent a lot of time in the last year going back to read American history. I was glad to—I love to go around with Senator Torricelli; we make a pretty good dog-and-pony show, and I'm always learning something from what he has to say. But I love the reference to the American Revolution and the beginning of our country.

I really think that our country has been blessed by enormous political endurance. No other great democracy is as old as we are now, partly because we've had the good sense to maintain in various guises a two-party system that had consequences because the parties embraced different ideas with different consequences for the American people and partly because one of our parties always, against all the fears and reluctance of the moment, embodied the idea of the Nation and was willing to embrace the logical extension of the plain meaning of the American Constitution in each new time.

In the beginning, it was George Washington and John Marshall and their heirs. In the Civil War, a new party, the Republican Party, was required to stand up for the idea of the Union and the logical extension of the Constitution that slavery could not coexist in a country dedicated to the proposition that all of us were created equal. And that was the position the Republican Party occupied through the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, during which time they reflected great credit on America and did great things for America.

From the time of Woodrow Wilson to the present day, our party, the Democratic Party, has more clearly, more unambiguously, more consistently embodied the idea of the Nation

and extending the Constitution in its logical meaning to the challenges of the moment, from the end of the Progressive Era through the Depression, through World War II, through the beginning of the cold war under Harry Truman, through the New Frontier and the Great Society down to the present day.

I don't think anyone questions the fact that our country is stronger today than it was 5 years ago because we have worked hard, not always succeeding, but succeeding far more often than failing, to bring to the country a new direction consistent with the age-old meaning of our obligation to form a more perfect Union.

I am very proud of that. I am enormously grateful for the chance that I have had to serve. And I am very comforted that someone of Evan Bayh's quality would present himself to serve in the United States Senate, to join Bob Torricelli and Bob Kerrey and our other hardy band, who often stand alone against some honest philosophical differences and some downright political chicanery, from time to time, for what I believe is necessary to move us forward.

I wish we had more like him; then I could get Bill Lee confirmed as head of the Civil Rights Division. I wish we had more like him; then you wouldn't see mainstream judges with impeccable credentials held up purely for political reasons. I wish we had more like him; then we could see the right kind of entitlement reform and the right sort of policies to enable our people to balance work and family and the right sort of policies to expand trade but help people who are left behind put their lives together and become a part of the American mainstream again.

But it's a good thing for our country that Evan Bayh is presenting himself for the Senate. I think he'll be elected. And I think he'll do just as good as that as Joe DiMaggio was at baseball. [*Laughter*]

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:16 p.m. at the Hotel Carlton. In his remarks, he referred to senatorial candidate Evan Bayh, former Indiana Governor, and his wife, Susan; former Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana; and Lt. Gov. Joe Kernan of Indiana.

Remarks Announcing the Appointment of Togo D. West, Jr., as Acting Secretary of Veterans Affairs and an Exchange With Reporters

December 2, 1997

The President. Good morning, everyone. Togo and Gail West, and Hershel Gober and the distinguished representatives of our veterans organizations—we have people here from the American Legion, the VFW, Disabled American Veterans, Am-Vets, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Vietnam Veterans, Gold Star Mothers and Gold Star Wives, Retired Officers Association, and the G.I. Forum. I thank you all for coming.

Before I begin I think it is important that I say just a few words about the tragic killing of the three high school students in Paducah yesterday. Like all Americans, I was shocked and heartbroken by the terrible news, which I followed very closely when it broke. Of course, we still don't know all the facts surrounding the tragedy or why a 14-year-old boy would take a pistol and open fire on his classmates in a prayer group. We may never know, but we must redouble our efforts to protect all our children from violence and to make sure our schools are free from violence and the means to wreak it.

I believe that I speak for every American in sending our thoughts and prayers to the parents of Kayce Steger, Jessica James, Nicole Hadley, and the wounded children and the entire community of West Paducah.

Today I have the pleasure of appointing Togo West to be Acting Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs. When Congress reconvenes, I will nominate him to become Secretary. I know he will bring the same excellence and leadership to the Department we saw under the stewardship of Secretary Jesse Brown and Acting Secretary Hershel Gober. These men are truly dedicated to our Nation's veterans. They help

us every day to do right by the men and women who have served the United States.

Togo West's entire life has been dedicated to excellence and commitment. From his experience as an Army officer, to his work in the Ford and Carter administrations, to his outstanding work as Secretary of the Army, he has always understood the special responsibility we owe to our men and women in uniform both during and after their years of service.

Three years ago, Secretary West told the graduating class at West Point, "You teach the life you live." As long as I have known him he has lived this idea, teaching all around him by his example of his devotion to family, church, and country.

I'm grateful for his exceptional service as Secretary of the Army. So are the men and women in the Army. His leadership helped make the Army part of the greatest, best prepared, most modern fighting force in the world. And he's made sure we take good care of our Army families. They, too, serve with our soldiers.

Having supported our men and women in uniform, Togo West will now turn to the equally important task of taking care of the veterans whose deeds ensured the survival of America's ideals. I'm confident he'll bring a strong voice to the Cabinet on these and other matters and that he will ably champion the enduring interests of our veterans.

Would you like to say a word?

[*At this point, Secretary West thanked the President and made brief remarks.*]

The President. Thank you, Togo.

Attorney General Reno's Decision

Q. Mr. President, have you already been informed of Janet Reno's decision on whether to recommend that an independent counsel be named?

The President. No.

Q. Well, could you tell us how you feel, in these hours before you're officially informed, over this apparent rift between two of your appointees, Janet Reno and the FBI Director, Louis Freeh, who seem to be disagreeing strongly on whether or not there should be an independent counsel?

The President. I don't have any particular feelings about it. All I know about it is what I've seen in the press. I think what I would like to emphasize to you is what I have said all along here: This is a decision of law vested in the Attorney General, which should be made based on the law. I don't believe people outside the Department should attempt to influence the decision, and I have not. And I think that the Attorney General just has to make the decision, consulting with anyone, including the FBI Director, whom she chooses, and then making the decision she believes is right.

That's what a lot of these jobs involve. I've made a lot of decisions that not everybody who works for me agrees with. That's part of life. And I think we should let her make the decision and then, whatever the decision is, we should get on with the business of America, and the Justice Department should get on with the business of protecting the people of America.

Medicare Commission

Q. Mr. President, how do you view this "no new tax" pledge that Speaker Gingrich is demanding of those that he has chosen for the Medicare commission?

The President. Well, I don't know exactly what to make of it and exactly what it covers. In terms of taxes, per se, I personally don't know that we need any taxes to reform the Medicare system. I hate to see the commissioners themselves have their hands tied at the outset, because I think we want them to be free to look at this Medicare system over the long run.

After all, we now have—in the balanced budget agreement and with the savings incurred back in '93, we now have put more than a decade of life on the Medicare system. The Trust Fund is secure now for a decade, and perhaps more, depending on how well the reforms that we enacted this year work. And so what we want this commission to do is take a look at what the impact of the retirement of the baby boomers will be, what the impact of increasing lifespans will be, and the new technologies and all the opportunities also to save money with preventive strategies under Medicare and take a long look at it.

I had not assumed that they would actually recommend any tax increases in Medicare, which, to me, is different from the cost that consumers have when they buy into the program. But I don't want to tie their hands unduly. I want them to look at it and be free to look at it, and I hope that that's what they'll do.

I think we're going to have an interesting commission of a large number of Members of

Congress, because both the Republicans and the Democrats appointed significant numbers of Members of Congress but also some from outside as well. And we've all pretty well had our members, I think, for some time. We've been trying—I haven't named mine yet, by and large, because we were trying to reach agreement on exactly how the chairmanship would be handled. We haven't quite got that done yet, but I expect it to be done within the next day or two.

Attorney General Reno's Decision

Q. Mr. President, when you said you didn't think that any outsiders should impact on Attorney General Reno's decision, whom were you referring to? Were you referring to Freeh or to Members of Congress or——

The President. No, no. No, he's an insider. I mean, he—and of course, there is the Justice Department division; there's a whole division of professionals who deal with these kinds of cases all the time. And I'm sure that—at least I assume that they've made recommendations to her as well. They should all make their recommendations, and then she has to decide.

But I believe it should be a decision based strictly on the law and not outside political pressure. And I have scrupulously avoided saying anything one way or the other, publicly or privately, that would be that kind of thing. I just don't think the rest of us should be involved in this. This is a legal question.

Q. Are you still uncertain on whether you made any calls from the White House—fundraising?

The President. I've met with the Justice Department, as you know; I've answered them all. I don't have anything to add to what I've already said on that.

Press Secretary Mike McCurry. Thank you, Mr. President.

Q. Mr. President, can I just elaborate—despite Mike McCurry's suggestion that I—[*laughter*]—on this relationship that you have with Louis Freeh and with Janet Reno. You've in the past suggested that the strains resulting from all these investigations has hampered your ability as President to deal with the other chief law enforcement authorities in the country. Has this become a real problem, and how will it play out irrespective of Janet Reno's decision?

The President. Well, after the decision is over, when she makes a decision, whatever the decision is, I would expect that things will return to normal because we'll go back to work. I just want everybody to go back to work here. We've got serious law enforcement challenges both beyond our borders and within our country. And the most important thing is that everybody does the people's work up there, that we get back to the business of protecting the American people and dealing with those challenges.

And I think that that's what we're expected to do, that's what we got hired to do, and we shouldn't let anything interfere with that. And I don't intend to let anything interfere with my efforts there. But I thought it was appropriate to limit any personal contacts I had during this period of time because I didn't even want the appearance to be out there that there would be any attempt to influence a decision. I don't think that's right. This is a legal decision; it ought to be made on the facts.

And a lot of the political rhetoric that's been in the press in the last several months I think is entirely inappropriate because there is a legal—there's a statute here, and we cannot get in the position in this country of basically bringing politics to bear on every legal decision that has to be made. That's not the right way to do this.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Kayce Steger, Jessica James, and Nicole Hadley, Heath High School students killed by gunfire following a prayer meeting in West Paducah, KY; and Michael Carneal, the alleged gunman.

Statement on Signing the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997

December 2, 1997

Today I am pleased to sign into law S. 738, the "Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997." This Act represents the first Amtrak reauthorization since 1992 and the most comprehensive restructuring of Amtrak since the early 1980s. Amtrak is a significant component of our national transportation services in densely populated corridors, such as the northeast; on medium- and short-haul routes; and on transcontinental routes linking cities across the Nation. In many areas of rural America it is the only alternative to the automobile. With the enactment of this legislation, we have the opportunity to set Amtrak on a course to continue these services into the 21st Century.

Amtrak has entered a critical stage in its existence. Over the past several years, Amtrak has restructured its operations and streamlined its approach to inter-city rail passenger service. It has improved its organization and created separate strategic business units that are better able to respond to customer needs. It has also significantly reduced its need for Federal operating subsidies. Today, Amtrak recovers a higher percentage of its operating costs from fares—85.1 percent—than any other passenger or commuter railroad in America, and higher than the rail systems in France and Germany. This Act will allow Amtrak to build upon this progress.

With this Act, Amtrak will now be able to access the $2.3 billion capital account created in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997. With these funds, Amtrak will be able to make many needed capital improvements, including replacing its aging car fleet, upgrading its tracks, and rehabilitating stations and maintenance facilities nationwide. With these improvements in place, Amtrak will be able to attract new customers and better serve existing customers. The implementation of new high-speed operations in the northeast corridor between Boston and Washington is a key part of this greatly improved service.

This Act will also free Amtrak to operate in a more businesslike manner by repealing a number of outdated requirements that hampered its ability to operate more like a private entrepreneurial corporation. In particular, S. 738 frees Amtrak to adjust its route structure to meet demand and to respond to competition rather than to congressional directive.

The Act also addresses certain labor relations issues by directing that these issues be negotiated by Amtrak and its unions through collective bargaining, rather than by statute. In this respect, it carries forward the spirit of the reform-oriented labor agreement recently agreed to by Amtrak and one of its unions.

This Act calls for the creation of an Amtrak Reform Council that will bring together individuals with expertise in the fields of corporate management, finance, rail and other transportation operations, labor, economics, and law to assist Amtrak in identifying how to operate more efficiently and effectively.

As a result of these changes, we can all look forward to better rail service. I recognize that this Act represents a compromise of a number of competing concerns and competing visions for Amtrak and its future. I want to compliment the Senators and Representatives who devoted many hours to developing this needed legislation. I also want to commend the many individuals in the Department of Transportation and other Federal agencies who contributed to the development of this Act.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

The White House,

December 2, 1997.

NOTE: S. 738, approved December 2, was assigned Public Law No. 105–134.

Statement on the Attorney General's Decision Not To Call for an Independent Counsel

December 2, 1997

The Attorney General made her decision based on a careful review of the law and the facts, and that's as it should be.

NOTE: On December 2, following preliminary investigations begun in September and October by a Justice Department task force, Attorney General Janet Reno announced her decision that allegations against the President and the Vice President concerning fundraising telephone calls made from the White House did not at that time warrant the appointment of an independent counsel.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Line Item Veto of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

December 2, 1997

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

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel the dollar amount of discretionary budget authority, as specified in the attached report, contained in the "Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998" (H.R. 2267). I have determined that the cancellation of this amount will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachment, constitutes a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. The report detailing the cancellation was published in the *Federal Register* on December 3. H.R. 2267, approved November 26, was assigned Public Law No. 105–119.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Prevention of Nuclear Proliferation

December 2, 1997

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

As required under section 601(a) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–242, 22 U.S.C. 3281(a)), I am transmitting a report on the activities of United States Government departments and agencies relating to the prevention of nuclear proliferation. It covers activities between January 1, 1996, and December 31, 1996.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Opening Remarks in a Townhall Meeting on Race in Akron, Ohio

December 3, 1997

Thank you. Thank you very much. Dr. Ruebel, thank you. We're delighted to be here at the University of Akron. I want to thank my good friend Senator John Glenn and your Congressman, Tom Sawyer; Congressman Lou Stokes; Congressman Sherrod Brown for being here. And Mayor Don Plusquellic, thank you so much for making Akron so available and for doing all you have to help us. I thank the county executive, Tim Davis, and all the people here in Akron who have just been wonderful in helping us to put this together.

I also thank the people who are behind me who have agreed to be a part of our panel today and to kind of put themselves on the line on behalf of all the rest of you, and I hope on behalf of all Americans, in launching this important dialog.

There are 96 watch sites that have been set up around the country by our regional administrators, constituency groups, and others who will be kind of doing what we're doing here in their own way after they watch us.

I'd also like to acknowledge the presence here today of members of our racial advisory board: Dr. John Hope Franklin, our Chair; Linda Chavez-Thompson; Reverend Suzan Johnson Cook; and Judy Winston, our Executive Director.

Ladies and gentlemen, last June at the University of San Diego I challenged all Americans to join me for at least a year in addressing the enormous challenge of making one America out of all of our racial, ethnic diversity in this country. At the time I did it, a lot of people said, "Well, why is he doing this? We're not having any riots in the cities. The economy is the best it's been in a generation." And my answer was, that's precisely why I'm doing it now, because what I have tried to do as your President is to get all of us to think about and work on things that are going to be critical to our future before the wheel runs off, because if we plan together and work together to make the most of our common future, we can avoid some of the terrible things that have happened in other countries, and we can avoid repeating some of the darker chapters of our own history. And, by the way, we can acknowledge that we still have some problems and we need to get them out on the table and deal with them.

Now, to me, this is a critical part of the larger challenge of preparing our country to live in the next century. It's not just a new century in a new millennium. There's a whole different world out there in the way we work and learn and live and relate to each other. All of you know that. And I have done my best to pursue a vision that would create opportunity for everybody responsible enough to work for it and to maintain our country's leadership in the global economy and for world peace and security and freedom, to give everybody a chance to be a part of the winner's circle in America. But I know it can't be done unless we recognize the fact that we are rapidly becoming the most diverse and integrated democracy in the world.

We have to deal with a lot of the older racial issues that have been with us from the beginning—from the time of Africans coming here on slave ships, between blacks and whites; from the time of our moving Indian tribes off the land, between Native Americans and white Americans; from the time of the war with Mexico, between Americans and Mexican-Americans—now increasingly enriched and diversified by all the immigrants that have come to America in the 20th century.

In the school district that's just across the river from my office in Washington, DC, there are now students from over 180 different national groups, with over 100 different native languages, in one school district. We are becoming a very richly multiracial, multiethnic society at a time when, in the last few years, we've read of ethnic and racial hatred and murders and problems and wars from Bosnia to the Middle East to Northern Ireland to Africa to Russia to India—you name it. And we're beating the odds so far, with all of our problems.

But I think it is very important that we understand that this is something that we have to keep dealing with honestly and openly. There are many people today with whom I have great sympathy, who say, "Well, the President shouldn't be talking about race out of context. Most of the problems that minorities have today

are problems of economic and educational opportunity that they share with people who aren't in their ethnic group, and what we really need is an affirmative opportunity agenda to create more jobs for all the dispossessed, create more educational opportunities for everybody that doesn't have them." I basically agree with that. I agree with that. But you have only to look at the rest of the world and your own experience to know that in addition to that, there is something unique about racial difference that affects the way people relate to each other in every society in the world.

It can be wonderful. It can be truly wonderful. We ought not—I don't like it when people say we ought to tolerate our differences; I don't buy that. I think we ought to respect and celebrate our differences. Tolerance is the wrong word here. But we also ought to struggle constantly to identify what unites us; that's more important than what's different about us. And that's why we're having these townhall meetings.

Now let me say, I want to now turn to the people who are here. And I want to ask all of you who won't be talking to carry on this conversation in your mind—and all of those at the other sites around the country. And when this is over, I want you to go out and do this all over again at work or in any other groups that you're in, because what we're trying to do here is drop a pebble in the pond and have it reverberate all across America, because I honestly believe that this is a good country full of good people. There's never been a challenge we've ever faced we haven't been able to overcome. And so I ask all of you to join me and to help us in that.

I also would remind you that if we don't speak frankly about what we believe, then when it's over, we won't feel very good. I told our opening speakers, I said, "You've got to imagine that we're at a cafe downtown, sitting around a table drinking coffee together. Forget about the fact that all these people are staring at you and you're on television." [*Laughter*] "Don't say this in the way you think it's most proper. Say this—whatever you have to say—in the way you think is most honest so that we can move forward together." Again, let me say that this dialog to me is an important part of where we're going.

Now, we have responsibilities in Washington, too. There is an economic responsibility. There is an education responsibility. A few weeks ago I announced that we were going to support scholarships for people who would go out and teach in educationally deprived areas where we needed more teachers. Today we are releasing a proposal to create educational opportunity zones to reward school districts in poor urban and rural areas who undertake the kind of sweeping reform that Chicago has embraced in the last couple of years, closing down failing schools, promoting public school choice, holding students and teachers accountable, involving parents more, providing opportunities for students who have learning problems to learn but ending automatic social promotion and giving people high school diplomas that don't mean anything.

I think that we should support that sort of thing, and we will do that. We have a policy responsibility. I think we should build on our economic efforts to create an affirmative economic opportunity agenda that crosses racial lines, and the same thing with education, the same thing with health care, the same thing with things like our family and medical leave law that helped people balance the demands of work and family. Yes, there is a public responsibility here. But this country, in the end, rises or falls on the day-to-day activities of its ordinary citizens.

Again, let me say that I thank the racial advisory board for the work they have done here. I said I thought three of them were here, but I see Governor Winter is also here. We have four of the five members who are here today, and I received a letter from Angela Oh, the member who could not be here today—is she here? Oh, hello, how are you? I was told you weren't coming. That makes our board more diverse; that's good.

So we're going to do our part, but I don't want anybody for a moment minimizing the importance of this sort of dialog. The reason we came to Akron, as was said earlier, in part is because of this Coming Together Project you've done here. And I believe if we can find constructive ways for people to work together, learn together, talk together, be together, that's the best shot we've got to avoid some of the horrible problems we see in the rest of the world, to avoid some of the difficult problems we've had in our own history, and to make progress on the problems that we still have here today.

Now, I think it's appropriate that we begin this dialog with young people. After all, they've got more time in front of them than behind them. And it is their lives that will be most

directly affected by this incredible explosion of diversity while we become more integrated into a world of global diversity than the rest of us.

So let's begin. Our first student here is McHughson Chambers. And he has an interesting ethnic background himself. I'd like to ask him basically to begin by trying to level with us about what impact, if any, race has on his life and whether he believes it affects any of his relationships with other people and his future prospects in life.

McHughson.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the E.J. Thomas Performing Arts Hall at the University of Akron. In his remarks, he referred to Dr. Marion Ruebel, president, University of Akron; Summit County Executive Tim Davis; and former Governor of Mississippi William F. Winter, member, President's Advisory Board on Race. The discussion was part of "One America: The President's Initiative on Race."

Remarks in a Townhall Meeting on Race in Akron

December 3, 1997

[*University of Akron student McHughson Chambers stated that he was biracial and described his encounters with discrimination.*]

The President. Our second student, Jonathan Morgan. Jonathan, what do you think about what he said? Do you think there is still discrimination here at this school or in this community or in the country? And do you think that most people want to live in an integrated society?

[*Mr. Morgan responded that there were still a lot of prejudiced people, particularly in the older generations.*]

The President. Maybe we need a panel on ageism instead of racism. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Morgan. I apologize. [*Laughter*]

The President. That makes it worse. Don't do that. [*Laughter*]

[*Mr. Morgan said he believed that his own generation had worked out their prejudices.*]

The President. Do you think it's because of personal experiences, do you think it's because you've had more direct personal experience with people from different age groups? Or do you think it's because you grew up in a different time where the climate, the legal and the political and the social climate, was different?

Mr. Morgan. I think it was because I grew up in a different time. We grew up watching television. "The Cosby Show" was my favorite show. [*Laughter*]

The President. So, therefore, if you worked at a bank and a black person came in with a check you wouldn't necessarily think it ought to be held because you saw Bill Cosby, and he was a good role model? [*Laughter*] No, this is important. No, no, this is important.

Mr. Morgan. Yes, I don't think I would give him a hard time. But at the same time, I have my own prejudices, whereas if I'm walking downtown on a street and I see a black man walking towards me that's not dressed as well, I might be a little bit scared. So, I mean, at the same time I have those prejudices.

The President. Do you think that's because of television crime shows, or because of your personal experience?

Mr. Morgan. It would have nothing to do with my personal experience. Just from the media, television shows, and things that I have heard.

The President. Christina Ibarra, what do you think about that? Do you believe that attitudes are better among young people? Do you think that there is still discrimination today? Is it worse for African-Americans than it is for other minority groups; is it different? What do you think?

[*Student Christina Ibarra agreed that older people were more prejudiced but said that young people raised in prejudiced environments changed after they interacted with a more diverse group of people at the university.*]

The President. So do you believe—let me ask you this—do you believe that having an integrated educational environment is the primary reason that young people have better attitudes, more open attitudes than older people—because

they have been able to go to school with people of different races?

[*Ms. Ibarra responded that the educational environment was beneficial, but that an open attitude was a matter of personal choice.*]

The President. Let me ask you just one other question. Then I want to go on to—back to our moderator who's here to talk about the next group of folks. There's a big difference, even in college campuses, between the racial composition of the student body and the daily lives of the students, at least in a lot of places. That is, there are a lot of places where the student body is integrated but social life is largely segregated.

Is that always a bad thing? What about that, what about that here, and what do you think about that? Our institutions of worship are largely segregated on Sunday. Is that a bad thing, or not? Is it a good thing? What should be our—in other words, one of the things that I want to try to get America to think about is, how do we define success here? I don't personally think it's a bad thing that there is—that people in many ways like to be with other people of their own racial and ethnic group any more than their own religious group. But on the other hand, it could become a very bad thing if it goes too far, as we've seen in other countries. So how do you know whether the environment is working for you and for other people? How much integration is enough? How much—what kind of segregation is acceptable if it's voluntary? How do you deal with all that? Have you ever thought about it in that way?

Go ahead.

[*At this point, the discussion continued, and moderator Dave Liebarth then introduced three authors who were the next participants in the discussion.*]

The President. I'd like to just start very briefly by giving the authors a chance to comment on how what they've heard from these students today meshes with what they heard when they were preparing their recent books.

And David, maybe we ought to start with you.

[*David K. Shipler, former New York Times reporter and author of "A Country of Strangers: Black and White in America," stated that discrimination had become more subtle and gave several examples.*]

The President. Let me just briefly—first of all, thank you very much. The reason that I wanted to do this, and a lot of these things, is that I believe there are in any given community literally millions of instances like this where we're not ever fully aware of the motivations behind what we do or where other people will perceive there may be a racial motivation where there isn't one, which is also just as bad because you have the same net bottom-line result, which is the drifting apart of people. And I don't think there is any legal policy answer to this. I think that this is something we've really got to work our way through.

Jonathan, I was really proud of you for saying that if you were walking and spotted Bill Cosby—and all of your classmates—you were walking down the street alone at night and you saw a black man coming at you and you were better dressed than he was, you might be scared, because that's a pretty gutsy thing for you to admit, but that's the kind of stuff we've got to get out on the table. We need to get this out.

But just parenthetically, David, I had a group of African-American journalists in to see me a couple of months ago. Every journalist, all of them with college degrees, all of them quite successful—every single man in the crowd had been stopped by a police officer for no apparent reason, every one of them, 100 percent of them—I asked them. So these are things we have to get out there and discuss.

Abigail. She has a rosier view, and I hope she's got the guts to say it out here now. [*Laughter*] Come on.

[*Abigail Thernstrom, a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute who coauthored "America in Black and White: One Nation Indivisible" with her husband, Steven, the Winthrop professor of history at Harvard, stated that she disliked racial preferences or racial classifications. Saying that African-American progress was here to stay, she gave examples and concluded by quoting Coretta Scott King that Martin Luther King's dream of equality had become deeply embedded in the fabric of America.*]

The President. Thank you. Let me just say, I believe that it's a lot better. I grew up in the segregated South, so I have personal experience of how it's changed, since I'm one of those older people Jonathan talked about. [*Laughter*] I've actually gotten kind of used to it now.

But to me, that makes this effort all the more important because what I want the American people to do is to have confidence. We know now we can make our economy work. We know now we can have the crime rate go down. We know now we can actually reduce the number of people on welfare and have more people at work. We know things that we didn't know just a few years ago, and we do know we can make progress on this whole complex of issues.

But I think it's also important to point out that there is a lot of residue there, like what McHughson told, the little bank story, and that progress should give us energy for the work ahead, not put us into denial about it. That's the only thing that I want to make sure we don't do.

Go ahead. What would you like to say about this?

[*Beverly Daniel Tatum, psychologist and professor at Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA, and author of "Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria, and Other Conversations About Race," described her course on the psychology of racism and other efforts to establish an honest discussion on race, and the role of fear in hampering that dialog.*]

The President. Abigail.

[*Ms. Thernstrom stated that people opposed to racial preferences were often accused of being too optimistic and believing that racism had disappeared. She indicated that while America still had a long way to go, it should proceed on the basis of optimism rather than pessimism.*]

The President. I agree with that. If I could just make one other point. Then I'll call on David.

One reason I think all this talking business is more important than ever before is that if you posit the fact—if you look at the growth in educational attainment, the growth of the middle class among African-Americans or—you can say, well, things have gotten a lot better. And then if you identify what the continuing problems are, like what McHughson said about—and the examples David cited, you can say, these things require changes in human perception, human heart, you've got to have more talking.

I think the thing that's more profound is, when you look at these communities that have—there are several counties in America with people from more than 100 different racial and ethnic groups now, and they're all different in many ways. They have different perceptions and different cultural patterns.

I know, after the Los Angeles riots, I went out and walked the streets, and I was so stunned by the gulf between Korean grocers and their African-American customers. And I've been in other cities where there were Arab-American merchants and their Hispanic customers or African-American customers—all these things are proliferating. That's the kind of thing that you see eating other countries alive from the inside out.

And that's why we have to begin to deal with this, because a lot of you have got to bring the insights you have from your own not only personal but historic experiences to bear on a whole different America. It's a new thing out there where there's somebody from everyplace out there with a family and a community and a culture and a set of perceptions that they will bring to bear on all their interactions.

Go ahead, David.

[*Mr. Shipler said that optimism was too close to complacency and pessimism was too close to resignation. Mr. Liebarth then introduced the next participants. Rev. Knute Larson, white pastor of the Chapel in Akron, described growing up in a racist environment and then introduced his friend Rev. Ronald Fowler, black pastor of the Arlington Church of God. Reverend Fowler stated that whites had always had preferential treatment and therefore the Nation should intentionally provide incentives and opportunities for minorities, as it did for World War II veterans. He concluded that he and Reverend Larson had worked together to create an atmosphere for free discussion of racial issues.*]

The President. Let me ask you something. What impact has your relationship had on the people in your churches? I mean, it's all very well—preachers are supposed to do the right thing. [*Laughter*] I mean, come on. What impact has it had on people in your churches?

[*Reverend Larson stated that the impact had been good but that the effort had to be intentional, and he urged the President to continue to model that kind of behavior. He concluded that humor helps, joking that his church was*

teaching Reverend Fowler's how to sing. Reverend Fowler responded that his church had never done country music well.]

The President. You'll probably get a wire from Charley Pride this afternoon. [*Laughter*]

[*Reverend Fowler continued that the pastors' joint efforts had created a climate of acceptance and an inclusive spirit and that other organizations in Akron were following their example.*]

The President. Let me ask you just one other question and we'll go to the next group. I'll be the cynic now, just for purposes of argument. I'll say, okay this is really nice. You've got two churches, and you pray on Sunday and everybody is nice to each other and you make fun about each other's music. And I know which is the real beneficiary here—that's okay. [*Laughter*] We do all that kind of stuff. How is it changing these people's lives? How is it changing the life in Akron? How does it result in less discrimination in the workplace or in the school or people helping each other to succeed in school or at work? Can you give us any examples about what it's done other than make people feel good for an hour on Sunday or some other church event?

[*Reverend Fowler stated that members of the congregations, though initially doubtful, now were able to discuss issues more openly and disagree without attributing each other's views to racism.*]

The President. That's the big issue, by the way—having people feel free to disagree with people of different races without having somebody draw a racial inference, that's a huge thing. That's one of the benchmarks when you know you're getting where you need to be.

[*Reverend Larson stressed the importance of listening and intentional social interaction. Mr. Liebarth then introduced the topic of interracial relationships, and high school student Erica Sanders expressed her desire to be seen as an individual, rather than as a member of the black community at home and church or as a spokesperson for black America at her white school. Student Erica Wright stressed the importance of her parents' guidance in shaping her choices in life. Mr. Liebarth then introduced D.J. Beatty, a black University of Akron student, who described growing up in a multiracial household and stated that though he shared certain cultural styles with his white social circle, his political views were much more those of the black liberal.*]

The President. Why do you think white people are more conservative than black people?

[*Mr. Beatty stated that economic differences, such as most whites dealing with banks and many blacks dealing with public assistance, resulted in different viewpoints. He stated that without an activist Government and the social movement, blacks would be far behind.*]

The President. I agree with that, but let me say—let me make the more sophisticated argument against affirmative action. Let's deal with that a minute. Hardly anybody thinks that we shouldn't have laws against discrimination on the books, and some people think they should be on the books but not enforced, so I've had a hard time getting Congress to give me the money to clean out the backlog of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. But nonetheless, everybody just about—there is almost—literally over 80 percent of the people in America, if you took a poll, would say, we should enforce the existing civil rights laws against discrimination.

Now, then the question is, what affirmative steps are necessary to really give everybody an equal chance and hopefully to reduce ultimately the racial disparities in income and educational level and all these other things?

The argument against affirmative action is partly that it doesn't even work, that basically the main beneficiaries of it have been middle class minorities who were well educated and could tap into it, and that what we really need to do is to go back to Lyndon Johnson's other emphasis and have an economics-based social program that offers better educational opportunity to everybody, offers more job opportunities to everybody, and tries to get rid of the dramatically increasing economic disparity of the last 20 years.

This is a very important point. The difference for all you younger people—my generation, after World War II until the mid-seventies, all America grew together, and in fact the poorest Americans actually had their income increase by a slightly higher percentage than the wealthiest Americans. Then for about 20 years, because of the globalization of the economy, the loss of manufacturing jobs, the rise of service jobs,

the rise in importance of education, what happened was the people in the upper 20 percent, their incomes rose like crazy for 20 years; the people in the bottom 40 percent were stagnant to dropping—more education-related than anything else, but it had something to do with where people lived and what their connections and ties were.

So there is a lot of argument that, basically, that affirmative action has gotten in trouble for two reasons. One is it's not really answering the real problem, which is the economic problem. The other is that people believe that if someone gets something based on their race, then someone is losing something, someone is not—it's a zero-sum game. Someone is losing out who otherwise would have gotten an opportunity to which they're entitled.

Now, I don't subscribe to this. I believe that you can have properly tailored affirmative action programs which can command broad majority support. We'll get back to that if you want. But I just think that—there is no question, however, that the biggest problems that minorities have in this country today are problems that are shared with disadvantaged white people too—access to education, access to jobs—and that we've got to find a way somehow to talk to each other and to work on this so that we're coming together.

And I think that's what you were trying to say. But I'd like to hear you talk a little bit about that and the affirmative action thing. And then maybe you want to open it up to some other people.

[*Mr. Beatty stated that there was a rising tide of classism in America which was linked to the race issue and that there should be policies to address the class issue as well.*]

The President. Let me just—no, no, I agree with what you said, but let me—[*laughter*]—I don't mean that. I agree with what you said. We have actually seen some evidence in the last 2 years that inequality may be declining again for the first time in 20 years, that incomes are rising—after-tax incomes are rising for the bottom 40 percent and maybe in a way that will not only cause incomes to rise for the first time in 20 years for that group of people, relative to inflation, but to diminish inequality a little.

And we've had a strategy of changing the tax system, changing the investment incentives, increasing educational opportunity, giving more—spending a lot more money to help retrain people who lose their jobs, that I think are contributing to that.

So I think the real issue is—although we haven't done nearly as much as I would like to, and we're going to work on that some more—the real issue is, if you had, to use the modern jargon, a class-based affirmative opportunity agenda, not race-based but class-based, which might disproportionately benefit minorities if they were disproportionately poor, for example, or disproportionately isolated or disproportionately in bad schools—if you had that, would there still be an argument for any kind of affirmative action admissions policies to various colleges and universities or any kind of affirmative action problems when it comes to Government contracting because there are so few African-Americans in certain kinds of businesses? I think that's the question.

I want to let you go on and call on some more people, but I think that's really the nub of the affirmative action debate. If you get rid of the—politically and substantively you'll help more people and build more unity by having an economic basis for social policy now.

[*Mr. Liebarth introduced University of Akron pre-med student Anna Arroyo, who said that as a light-skinned Puerto Rican, she was often perceived as white, but then treated differently after disclosing her race. She concluded that people should realize the range of diversity among Hispanic-Americans, discard preconceived notions about racial characteristics, and accept others for who they are.*]

The President. Let me ask you a question. Do you believe that most non-Hispanics understand the real difference between Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans, for example?

[*Ms. Arroyo responded that people generally did not understand that each Hispanic country had its own unique culture. Mr. Liebarth then introduced University of Akron student Jason Kessler, who complained about some religions teaching that poor is bad, thus placing a stigma on poor people.*]

The President. Let me push this a little more. They don't really do that—and what they really act like is that if you're poor it's your own fault, right?

Mr. Kessler. In a way. And it's like a sign that God is putting something bad on you. At least—maybe this is just an isolated incident, but I have come in contact with this—that this is a sign from God that because you're poor, you are going to hell.

[*Mr. Liebarth introduced family violence program coordinator Vanesa Cordero, who noted that America was no longer just black and white but a cultural mix including Hispanic-Americans. She stated that blacks and Hispanics were treated differently in court than whites, and having an advocate made a difference, particularly for non-English speakers.*]

The President. Wait, wait, wait. You mean, if they have an advocate, they do better?

Ms. Cordero. Yes, they do.

The President. But are they treated differently in what the judges do to them by race, or are they just treated differently in terms of how they're treated in the court setting?

[*Ms. Cordero said that in her experience, the system was often harder on Hispanic juveniles than on whites.*]

The President. But you do think that Hispanic kids have a harder time in the court system.

[*Ms. Cordero responded that her son was discriminated against because he was Hispanic and said that she also felt discrimination before she worked her way up from welfare to being a professional with a college degree.*]

The President. Let me just say very briefly, one of the things that I like about the Chicago school experience—you heard me mention the Chicago school experiment—is they used to be known for one thing only: They had a teachers' strike every year whether they needed one or not. At the beginning of every school year, there was always a teachers' strike, and there was a picture of the Governor's school-age child crawling around on the floor, playing games in the Governor's office while the teachers' strike went on.

Now, what they're trying to do is to change—I think maybe the most important thing they're trying to do is to change the expectations, school by school, so that they have the same high expectations of all children without regard to their racial or ethnic group. If they get that done, I predict they'll change the performance results as well. But that's—anyway, I just wanted to support you for what you did.

[*Noting that the last part of the discussion was to focus on looking forward, Mr. Liebarth introduced Samir Gibara, chairman and chief executive officer, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. Mr. Gibara indicated that a diverse workplace population pursuing common business goals and objectives and sharing success or failure would create bonds that went beyond racial tensions; stated that diversity provided a competitive advantage for expansion to other countries; and listed his company's values: integrity and honesty, a diverse work force, and training and education.*]

The President. Let me just follow up. I believe myself that what you just said is not only true but is the answer to a lot of the next steps. That is, just as you heard all these young people say they thought that there was less discrimination among young people, partly because they all go to school together, the more people we have working together, succeeding together, doing something constructive together, helping their own families together, the less problems we're going to have. I don't think there is any question about that.

Let me ask you, before we run out of time—and I'll call on you next because you've been having your hand up—but I want you to think about this, and I want you to be blunt and brief—blunt and brief. What do you think is the most important thing we should be doing about this issue today? Whether you think I should do it, or you should do it, or somebody else should do it—I'll try to call on as many people as I can, as quickly as I can. Raise your hand, the most important thing. You go first.

[*At this point, participants offered suggestions, including confronting family members who make racist comments and addressing the Hispanic high school dropout rate.*]

The President. We're going to run out of time. We don't have time to talk about this, but I want all of you to think about it, especially the Hispanics here. For the last 30 years, Hispanics had higher work force participation rates than African-Americans, and often left school to go to work to support the family. It was a real cultural thing. Now African-American high school graduation rates are almost equal to whites; they're almost statistically indistinguishable. But the high school dropout rate among

Hispanics is still very high. Apparently, for good cultural reasons, they think they've got to get out and help the family and all, but it's a disaster in the modern economy. We need to figure out what to do about it.

But what's the most important thing to do? Go ahead. Let's go back to the main question. Go ahead.

[*Other participants suggested establishing education opportunity zones, taking the risk of an honest dialog, avoiding racial jokes and slurs, and including the underclass in the racial dialog.*]

The President. So what's the most important thing we can do for the underclass?

Participant. Well, that's what I was hoping to get from you. That was my question I was going to ask. [*Laughter*]

The President. I'll tell you what I think. What we're trying to do is to reestablish vibrant living communities where really poor people live. We're trying to mix housing now between middle class and poor people in the neighborhoods. We're trying to give special tax incentives for people who invest to put jobs back there. We're trying to make bank loans more available, and we're trying to overhaul the schools.

I think you've got to put life back together. This is an economic problem, and it does not exclusively affect minorities, so it is not a race-based problem although minorities are disproportionately affected by the large underclass in America. It's very hard to keep a country together if 20 percent of the people, no matter how hard they work, are still going to fall further and further behind.

Go ahead.

[*A participant suggested culturally specific programs to overcome the perceptions of white superiority and black inferiority.*]

The President. Before we run out of time, is there any Asian-American who wants to be heard? Go ahead.

[*Participant David Flores stressed the importance of education, moral values, and the family.*]

The President. Very briefly—since I have been President, my Education Secretary, Secretary Riley, who is here with us today, has done a lot of work to try to support schools that introduce character education programs into the curriculum. Do you think that's a good thing? I gather what you say is you not only think it's a good thing, but you think that the absence of prejudice is one of the virtues we ought to be trying to promote on a uniform basis throughout the country, and it ought to be part of the school curriculum.

Mr. Flores. Yes, exactly.

The President. You agree with that.

[*Mr. Flores agreed but pointed out that money was limited and school buildings were old.*]

The President. Briefly—I tried to pass a school construction initiative, and we'll come back to that in some forum. But the other thing I wanted to say is there was money appropriated by the Congress in two different bills this year to give the school districts for after-school programs, partly because the vast majority of juvenile crime is committed between 3 o'clock in the afternoon and 7 o'clock at night. And young people need something positive to do, and this could be a part of what could be done.

So all of you who are here from school districts, look at what the Congress did. I just signed two bills with two different pots of money to help the schools stay open after hours so you could do positive things and get young people involved in constructive activities.

[*An Asian-American student stated that schools should promote cultural diversity, because often families could not, and advocated more roundtable discussions. Mr. Liebarth then asked the President to summarize the discussion.*]

The President. My summary is going to be, I'll hear from two more people. Go ahead. [*Laughter*] And the lady with the gloves, I like your gloves. Go ahead.

[*Other participants suggested fostering leadership among multiracial youth and including multicultural education as part of the history curriculum. Mayor Donald Plusquellic of Akron then thanked the President for his example in holding the meeting.*]

The President. I believe that education is a big part of this. And I believe that the economics is a big part of this. And I've spent most of my public life—more than 20 years—working on those two things. But let me also tell you, there are a lot of highly intelligent people with a lot of money who still have bigoted hearts or who at least are insensitive to it. This is

more than education and economics. That's why we're here. That's why I asked the two ministers to talk more than once—because I believe that—I agree with you.

You know, it's easy—people get preoccupied with their own problems. But when this is over, you guys got to keep doing this. And the people at these other 100 sites have got to keep doing this. This is not a day's battle. We have to change the way we live in America and the way we relate to each other because of the global economy, because of the workplace, and because of the people that are in our own neighborhoods. We can't possibly answer all this.

This sort of thing needs to become a normal part of daily life in every community in America that crosses political and racial and ethnic and religious and every other lines. The society is too complex, too diverse, and it's changing too fast for anybody to be able to sit off in a corner and give everybody else a bunch of rules about how we're going to do things. This is what we have to do in America. We have to change the way we govern ourselves, literally, at the grassroots level, to do this.

I'm convinced if you have more of this—I'm convinced if we had 4 hours, I could sit here and listen to you all, and I'd never get tired of it, and we would go on and on, and then you'd want to do more. And that ought to tell you something. Everybody has still got their hand up. That ought to tell you something. We should be doing this in America on a systematic, disciplined basis, community by community. That's the way we ought to run our lives.

So, one more. Go ahead. Quick. Everybody's got to be quick. Go ahead.

[*Participants suggested following the Golden Rule and educating someone else about one's own culture and heritage.*]

The President. Our moderator will either have a heart attack or cut me off in a minute here. [*Laughter*] Be quick, everybody.

[*Participants advocated teaching love, respect, and manners in the home, and basic workplace attitudes of reliability, teamwork, communication, and willingness to continue learning.*]

The President. I guess what I would—I'd like to go back to what he said, though. I think you've got to help us do that. There is a huge labor shortage today of people in the technical skills. We could do a lot—if you think there's an economic basis to racial differences in America today, there ought to be a national effort to train people who are poor and who are isolated to take these jobs. This is maddening to me. Even though the unemployment rate is 4.7 percent, there are hundreds of thousands of jobs going begging in America today that would immediately make people middle class people.

Go ahead.

[*Fannie Brown, director, Coming Together Project, said the answer was in the pain of talking about differences and giving each side the opportunity to present their viewpoint. Other participants then explained how their home environment prepared them to be tolerant and understanding adults.*]

The President. Let me say, I'm very sympathetic with what all of you have said about your home environment. It had a big impact on me. So—I mean, I had a grandfather with a sixth-grade education who was a poor white Southerner who believed in integration. I don't know why. But he did, and he had a big impact on me. So I agree with that.

But I want to say again, when you look to the future, you must—and we do all that—you must find a way to organize—that's why I like this Coming Together Project—you must find a way to organize a continuing mechanism where people of good will can come together and deal with this.

Let me just give you an example. We talked about old people, young people—Denver is plagued—you've probably seen—with these horrible recent killings by skinheads of people because of their race. Now, Denver is a city that's only 12 percent black, that's got a black mayor. It is not a racist city. It's a remarkable thing. But even there they have this problem. Now, they've got to figure out how they're going to deal with this—and not just go prosecute the people that committed the crime but what's going on in the community, how are they going to deal with it, and how are they going to come together.

I'm exhilarated by what I see from all of you today, but you have to make a commitment in some form or fashion to continue this in a disciplined way, because something will come up, things will continue to come up, and this is an ongoing effort. It's not just a one-shot deal. Yes.

[*A participant raised the issue of social segregation, saying that people should not be comfortable about only associating with members of their own race. Another participant said he hoped for progress to the point that his grandchildren would not relate to the term "hate crime."*]

The President. And what's the most important thing we can do about it?

Participant. I think that we have to make it possible for all individuals, whatever race, to be part of our neighborhoods and know them as human beings.

[*Marion Ruebel, president, University of Akron, emphasized that universities have an obligation to open minds and teach students teamwork, respect, civility, justice, and tolerance, in addition to high-tech skills.*]

Mr. Liebarth. Mr. President, we're being asked for your closing remarks on this program now. [*Laughter*]

The President. I don't have any—my closing remarks are, this is the beginning, not the end. My closing remarks are that—there ought to be a strategy to deal with the economic underclass; there ought to be a middle class strategy, too, that embraces people across different races. We have left open the question of affirmative action.

Just curiously, how many of you believe we should continue some sort of affirmative action policy with regard to admissions to colleges and universities? [*Applause*] Okay, how many of you don't believe we should? What about out here? [*Applause*]

Ms. Thernstrom. Change it to preferences. Racial preferences is different than affirmative action.

The President. That's right—racial preferences are. It's a loaded word.

Ms. Thernstrom. Americans believe in affirmative action. They don't believe in preferences.

The President. Abigail, do you favor the United States Army abolishing the affirmative action program that produced Colin Powell—yes or no? Yes or no? I get asked all these hard questions all the time. I want to do it.

Ms. Thernstrom. I do not think that it is racial preferences that made Colin Powell——

The President. He thinks he was helped by it.

Ms. Thernstrom. ——the overwhelming majority of Americans want American citizens to be treated as individuals. And we've heard the voice here of——

The President. Should we abolish the Army's affirmative action program, yes or no?

Ms. Thernstrom. We should—the Army does one thing very, very right; it prepares kids—it takes kids before the Army, and it prepares them to compete equally. That's what you're talking about when you're talking about American education.

Let us have real equality of education. These preferences disguise the problem. The real problem is the racial skills gap, and we ignore it when we——

The President. Well, then the real problem may be the criteria for why we admit people to college, too—how we do it.

One more here and then Congressman Sawyer.

[*A participant stated that there was an opportunity gap, not a racial skills gap, and encouraged people to be aware of racism in their communities and to help those hurt by it.*]

The President. I agree with that, but let me—to be fair to Abigail—now, let me explain. Now, wait a minute. I think it's important—I'm going to call on Congressman Sawyer, but I think you all need to understand about this, because this affirmative action debate, you know, that's all the press wants to write about anyway. They'll probably ignore the fact that we did the rest of this here, which was—and the rest of this is the important part that we did here.

But let me explain what the difference is. The military affirmative action program does try to get results by race. But it simultaneously prepares people. So that if—what they try to do is they have these education and training programs, and then they hope when you go from lieutenant to captain that there will be a group of the captain pool, of potential captains, that reflect the racial composition of the lower rank as well. But they do prepare people.

The problem is that you have different schools. When you go from high school to college, the college doesn't have control over the seniors in high school to do that. If they did that, you could have exactly the same program and we wouldn't have this anxiety. Instead we have a system where we assume that the only reliable predictor of success in college is how

you did on the SAT or how you did on the grades. So the trick is, since I think our schools would be much poorer if there were no racial diversity—look around here at the schools here—the trick is to find a way of doing this that people believe is merit-based and that—so they don't think someone is getting something they're not entitled to and, not only that, knocking somebody out of a spot to which they are entitled.

But I think it's very important. A lot of people haven't analyzed this—no one criticizes—very few people criticize the Army program. It's given us the highest quality Army in the world. The only real differences between the Army program and college admissions is that you're in continuously in the Army program, whereas you go from a high school that may or may not be adequate into college with the affirmative action program. We need to really think this through as a country. And that's why I dropped the bomb at the end, because we can't possibly resolve it today anyway.

Congressman, do you want to go? And then we'll quit.

[*Representative Thomas Sawyer thanked the President for participating in the discussion and stated that the initiative was an important start to the process of improving race relations in the country.*]

The President. Thank you.

I would like to—I'd like to thank our scholars, David and Abigail and Beverly. I would like to thank the students who spoke in the beginning and all the people on the panel.

To me this is a simple issue that has all kinds of complex manifestations. But the simple issue is, we live in a country that is the longest lasting democracy in human history, founded on the elementary proposition that we are created equal by God. That's what the Constitution says. And we have never lived that way perfectly, but the whole history of America is in large measure the story of our attempt to give a more perfect meaning to the thing we started with, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

And now we have been given this enormous new world to live in with these enormous opportunities, in which, as you heard our business executive say, we do not have a person to waste. We're given a world that is much more interesting and exciting if we know and relate to people of different racial and other backgrounds. And it's up to us to decide what to do with it.

Our country has never really dealt with the race issue before except in an atmosphere of crisis and conflict and riots in the cities. So a lot of people, I will say again, think I am nuts to be doing this. You know, what's the end, what's the point? The point is, making a more perfect Union. The point is, proving we can have one America. The point is, it will be a lot more interesting, a lot more fun, and far more noble if we do it right.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 12:10 p.m. in the E.J. Thomas Performing Arts Hall at the University of Akron. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Wellington E. Webb of Denver, CO; and Gen. Colin L. Powell, USA (Ret.), former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Remarks to the Community in Akron
December 3, 1997

Thank you very much, Dee Hammonds, for that introduction and for the welcome to the University of Akron. I have enjoyed being here very much, and I'm very grateful to President Ruebel and to all the officials and the students who did such a good job today. Mr. Mayor, County Executive Davis, Senator Glenn, Congressman Sawyer, Congressman Stokes, members of the city council, the State legislators and other officials, I hope you were proud of your fellow Ohioans today. I thought they were great on the town meeting.

I want to say a special word of appreciation to all the people in Akron who have been a part of the Coming Together Project because it's one of the reasons we came here. We wanted to come to a place in the heartland of America which could embody the best of America's

past, present, and potential for the future and where people have been honest in dealing with issues of racial difference, and I compliment you on that.

Let me also say that I really was very moved, as I have frequently been in such settings—but I was so impressed by the people who were part of our town meeting today, by their conviction, by their sincerity, by their passion, by the life they've lived, and by the good things they want for our country. And you must have been proud of them as well. I hope they spoke for all of you.

I want to say again that this dialog, as part of our initiative on race, is something I decided to do because I think that we ought to be thinking about this not only today but what we're going to look like over the next 30 to 40 years. Most Americans have not even come to grips with the fact that we already have 5—next year we'll have 12—school districts with students from over 100 different racial and ethnic groups; that we will soon have our largest State, California, where Americans of European descent are not in the majority; that within 50 years at the outside, there will be no single racial or ethnic group that will be in a majority in the United States. We have always said we were a nation built on the values of the Constitution, we were a nation of ideas, not of race or place. We are about to find out.

And therefore, every effort made in every community across the country not only to stand up against discrimination but to reach out for understanding, for the resolution of honest differences, even to celebrate honest argument, is a very positive and important thing. And I want to say again, I want to urge you to continue this.

If nothing else comes out of this meeting today we had, this townhall meeting, I hope it will be that other communities will think that they need some sort of permanent process like the Coming Together effort here that will go on and on and on and provide a forum for dialog for people to come in and be a part of, because all of our communities are changing so rapidly and the issues are changing that, in this case, the process really is a part of the solution. There has to be a way that people of good will can be heard on matters pertaining to racial difference and misunderstanding and problems as they come up.

Let me say one other thing to all the students who are here. You heard a lot of people say today that they thought that education was a big part of the answer to this, and you also heard a lot of people say that there were nonracial problems in America that had a disproportionate impact on racial minorities—the lack of educational opportunity, the lack of economic opportunity. One of the things that I'm proudest of, and I wanted to say this while we have Senator Glenn and Congressman Sawyer and Congressman Stokes here—and Congressman Brown may or may not still be here; I don't know if he is—but this last Congress, when they passed the Balanced Budget Act, among other things, passed the biggest increase in support for people to go on to college since the GI bill was passed 50 years ago, the biggest increase in 50 years.

I do believe it will make it possible for us to guarantee at least 2 years of college to virtually every American. Here's what they did. First of all, they raised the maximum Pell grant to $3,000 a year and made more people eligible for it, more independent students. Secondly, nationwide, in a 2-year period, we've gone from 700,000 to one million work-study positions, adding 300,000 over 2 years. The third thing we did was to provide for families to invest in their IRA's and make it easier for people to invest in an individual retirement account and then withdraw from it tax-free if the money is being used to pay for education of a child or of the saver himself or herself. And finally, the bill provides for a $1,500 tax credit—not deduction, credit—for the cost of the first 2 years of college and a 20 percent credit for the cost of the third and fourth years, of graduate school. Or if working people lose their jobs and need to come back and get further education and training, they can get tax credits to do it.

So when you look at all this together, I think we can really say now that when you put that with the student loan changes we've made, which make it easier to pay those loans back over a longer period of time, that you can really say now there's no reason that anybody should not at least have 2 years of college in America, between the scholarships, the loans, and the tax credits. And that's an important thing that I want to see sweep the country.

So the last thing I'd like to say is—I think the second speaker in our townhall meeting was

a young student who said, "You know, this racial deal, it's basically a problem for older people, you know, people in their thirties and forties and fifties." [*Laughter*] And he got a lot of laughs out of it, but that may well be true. One thing is certainly true: Those of you in this audience who are students in this university, or even younger, will live the vast majority of your lives in a new century. Your children will have no direct experience with the things that have consumed the lives of all of us who are 50 or older. And in a profound way, whether we can come together across all the racial, religious, ethnic, and other lines that divide us, celebrating our diversity, being glad about it, being happy—we're a more interesting country because we are so different from one another—but still saying there are things that bind us together that are more important, that we can preserve our country as one America in the 21st century as a beacon of hope and freedom and opportunity, that will affect your lives far more profoundly than many of the other things that may grab the headlines today or tomorrow or the next day.

So again I say, I hope you will continue the spirit and the dialog manifest in this town meeting today permanently, because we will always benefit from understanding one another, from knowing more about one another, and from feeling like we can be honest with one another when we're mad or if we have an honest disagreement or we don't think we're being treated fairly. And if we do it, then the chances are very high that we will be one America and that we will be a stunning rebuke to all those countries that have tragically taken the lives and the fortunes and the futures away from their children because they could not bridge their racial, their ethnic, their religious divides. That is not our America, and it never will be if people like you will act on what you saw and felt today.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:22 p.m. in the James A. Rhodes Arena at the University of Akron. In his remarks, he referred to Derwin (Dee) Hammonds, president, associated student government, University of Akron; Mayor Donald L. Plusquellic of Akron; and Summitt County Executive Tim Davis.

Remarks at a Democratic Party Reception in Chicago, Illinois
December 3, 1997

Thank you. Thank you for being here, and thank you for being in such good spirits. I want to begin by saying a very special word of appreciation to Gary LaPaille for 8 years of leadership of the Illinois Democratic Party, during which time, among other things, the State of Illinois voted by large margins, twice, for Bill Clinton and Al Gore. We are very grateful for Gary and for all of you.

I want to thank Senator Dick Durbin for many things, but especially I want to thank him for his leadership in the fight to protect our children from their illegal and often deadly exposure to tobacco. We are going to win that fight next year, thanks to Dick Durbin. And we thank him for that.

And I want to thank Senator Carol Moseley-Braun for many things, but I want you to remember when we approach this election how much difference a vote can make. There were no votes to spare in 1993 when the economic future of our country hung in the balance. Don't forget what it was like when I was elected in 1992 and why I was elected: 20 years of stagnant wages, a long recession, despair that we had any kind of plan for dealing with the global economy. And when I presented my economic plan, I said, "Look, the first thing we've got to do is get the deficit down. But we can't cut education or health care or investment in the environment. And by the way, we ought to give a tax cut to the lowest income working people with families." And we did. And when I presented my plan, the members of the other party said it would be an end to the world; we'd have a terrible recession; everything was horrible. We passed it by one vote. If Carol Moseley-Braun hadn't been representing Illinois in the Senate, I doubt very seriously that we would be able to say, today, after 5 years, we've

got the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years, 13.5 million new jobs, and the strongest American economy in a generation. You have a lot of reasons to reelect Carol Moseley-Braun to the United States Senate.

And then in 1994, I asked repeatedly, for 3 years, the police officers of this country and the prosecutors and the community leaders who work with young people, what kind of crime bill do we need to bring the crime rate down in America again? And keep in mind, when I ran for office in '92, if you had told the American people that we'd have 5 years of declining crime, people would have said, "Yeah, and I'd like to sell you the Brooklyn Bridge." No one would have believed it. But we know there were places in America where the crime rate was already going down. And so I presented to the Congress a crime bill to put 100,000 police on the street, the Brady bill to keep guns out of the hands of people with crime or mental health problems that should disqualify them, an assault weapons ban to keep guns that intended to kill people out of the hands of young people and gangs on the streets, and preventive funds to keep our kids out of trouble. And the other side said, oh, this was the end of the world; why, the crime would go up, and we were going to take guns away from law-abiding citizens. It was the awfullest squalling you ever heard. And we barely broke the filibuster in the Senate. And if Carol Moseley-Braun hadn't been representing Illinois in the Senate, we might not have 5 years of declining crime in the United States of America. That's a good reason to reelect her.

And tomorrow, what about tomorrow? All elections are about the future. Arguably, if she did a good job, that's what you paid her to do. What about tomorrow? We have other challenges. Yes, our Democratic Party has led this country in getting the best economy in a generation, the lowest crime rate in 24 years, the biggest drop in welfare in history, while protecting the children of people on welfare with health care and nutrition and child care and support for people to go into the workplace. Yes, I'm proud of that. What about tomorrow? Tomorrow we have to give a commitment to educational excellence to every child in this country, and we have to have more cities doing what Chicago has done to overhaul their school system and stand for high standards.

I presented a plan last year in the State of the Union Address to do what Carol Moseley-Braun first asked me to do, to try to provide some national help to the crumbling school buildings of this country. I was in Philadelphia the other day; the average school is 65 years old. I was in Akron today at one of our race townhall meetings; three different people said, please give us some help to make our schools places that our kids can be proud of, where learning can occur. We're going to get that done if Carol Moseley-Braun from Illinois is reelected, so the message is sent to the American Congress that the American people want education to be our top national domestic priority. So I want you to help her.

And finally let me say, I owe a special debt of gratitude to the people of Illinois. When I started running for President, people said to me when I picked Al Gore in the summer of '92—one of my better decisions, I might add—when I picked Al Gore, I remember before—the first time we talked, I was the fifth best-known candidate in New Hampshire. Nobody knew who I was. And he and I met at the Tennessee Governor's mansion once. And this was before—much before I had offered him—nobody thought I was going to be the nominee, so I couldn't ask him to run with me. And he said, "You know, I ran for President 4 years ago, and I had a problem. I did real well in the South, and I had no place to go. How are you going to be nominated?" And I said, "I have a one-word answer: Illinois." And he said, "Why?" And I said, "Because Hillary is from Chicago and half the other people who live there were born in Arkansas, and I am going to win Illinois."

And you heard Gary talking about it—December of '91, or October of '91, I appeared before the Democratic chairs who were here. David Wilhelm from Chicago became my campaign manager, went to become chairman of our party. Many people from Illinois have come in and out of our administration. A lot of them are here today—Minyon Moore from Chicago, here with me today, who set up our race townhall meeting in Akron; and of course, Secretary Daley, our Secretary of Commerce, who is doing a terrific job; and Rahm Emanuel and my old friends Kevin O'Keefe and Avis LaVelle and others who were in the administration who are here.

Illinois has been very special to me. What Chicago did for Hillary on her 50th birthday almost made her forget her age. [*Laughter*] It was an act of uncommon kindness and generosity. And I want you to know that we're looking to you; we're looking to you.

Illinois is better than it was 5 years ago. And all the fights we had and all the compromise we made that were principled reflected the values, the ideas, and the future of the Democratic Party. When we passed this balanced budget last year, which party do you think it was that was arguing the hardest to target our tax cuts to education and kids, rather than to those of us who were doing well already? When we passed that balanced budget last year, we guaranteed a $1,500-a-year—a year—tax credit for the first 2 years of college, tax deductions for the last 2 years of college, for graduate school, and for working people that have to go back and get further training. We opened the doors of college to all Americans, the biggest increase since the GI bill 50 years ago. Who do you think was doing that? It was the Democrats that were fighting for that, and I'm proud of that. When we agreed over the next few years to add 5 million more children in working families to the ranks of those with health insurance, who was really fighting for that? Our Democratic Party was fighting for that.

So I say to you, you've got most of the Democratic candidates for Governor here. I know there's a lot of them, but you've got to be patient with them. I had that job for 12 years; that's a good job. [*Laughter*] I don't blame them for running. It's a good job. And it's more important than ever before, for the Governors shape how we cover children and health insurance; the Governors shape how we implement welfare reform; the Governors shape how we pursue the economic and educational initiatives that I'm trying to lead the country toward. It's a big deal. So I want you to be for whomever you choose, but when it's over, unite behind the one who wins and give Illinois a Democratic Governor in this next election year.

Lastly, let me say, I know that I will not be on the ballot again, but I will be working for our party and our candidates and, more importantly, for our ideas and our values, till the last minute of the last day of my Presidency and beyond. We have done a lot in the last 5 years, but we have 3 years more to go, and I believe we can get more done in the next 3 years than we have in the last 5 if we will stay together, walk hand in hand, remember who sent us there, and keep working to make America what it ought to be, a land of opportunity for every single citizen.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:35 p.m. in Festival Hall at Navy Pier at a combined Illinois State Democratic Party and Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee reception. In his remarks, he referred to Kevin O'Keefe, former Deputy Assistant to the President; and Avis LaVelle, former Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services (Public Affairs).

Remarks to the Democratic Business Council in Chicago
December 3, 1997

Thank you very much. Lew, that was so nice I felt almost like it was a eulogy. [*Laughter*] I started to say, I'm not done yet; I'm not done yet.

I want to thank Lew and Susan for their role in this tonight. And thank you, Phil, and thanks to all of the people here at this table and all the rest of you who helped to put together this wonderfully successful evening for our party.

Lew and Susan, we go back a long time in this, and I can't help but—just listening to them reminisce, I'd like to say something I said when Gary LaPaille and I were down at the other event with Senator Moseley-Braun and Senator Durbin, and I don't know if Congressmen Davis and Rush are here, but they were with us at the other event.

I'll never forget the first conversation I had with Al Gore after I became a candidate for President. Now, this was when I was the fifth-

best known candidate in New Hampshire. [*Laughter*] And only my mother really thought I had a chance to win. [*Laughter*] And I was over in Tennessee with my friend, the then-Governor of Tennessee, Ned Ray McWherter, who is a marvelous old-fashioned political leader and was a great Governor. And he wanted to get me and Al Gore together. And Al had run for President in '88 and decided not to run in '92. And so we were sitting alone in this room.

And he said, "You know what happened to me? I did real well in the South on Super Tuesday, but," he said, "I didn't do so well after that." He said, "What's your theory about how you're going to become the nominee of the Democratic Party?" And I looked at him and I gave him a one-word answer. I said, "Illinois." And he said, "Why?" And I said, "Well, because of Hillary, because southern Illinois is south of Richmond and looks just like north Arkansas." [*Laughter*] "And I've been there, and it feels just like north Arkansas." [*Laughter*] And I said, "And besides that, half the people who live in Chicago are from Arkansas"—[*laughter*]—"Danny Davis, John Stroger, John Johnson—need I go on—Scottie Pippen, yeah." [*Laughter*] I'm not sure he was in the picture in the same way there as he is now. [*Laughter*]

But anyway—and, you know, I came here in October of '91 and spoke. Gary hosted the chairs of the Democratic Party, and I spoke. And then we went to Navy Pier and announced that David Wilhelm was going to be my campaign manager. And then I just kept getting people from Chicago in my operation—Kevin O'Keefe, Rahm Emanuel, Laura and Bridget Hartigan, Minyon Moore—there's a lot of other people—Avis LaVelle; Dave and Deegee both worked for me; Bill Daley's now the Secretary of Commerce.

And of course, when Chicago turned out for Hillary's 50th birthday the other day, it almost made it bearable for her. [*Laughter*] No one here will ever know what it meant to her, what was done.

But I want to say, before I get into anything substantive at all, you will never know, none of you can ever know, what knowing that Illinois would always be there for us has meant to us, to Al Gore and to Hillary and to me, in two Presidential campaigns and the administrations and the times when we were down as well as when we were up, and how it changed the entire landscape of electoral politics of the last several years, knowing that it would always be there. I cannot thank you enough.

I also want to say a special word of thanks to Gary LaPaille as he ends 8 years as head of the Democratic Party here. That's a hard job. I can't imagine anybody doing that job for 8 years; that's what people say to me. [*Laughter*] If I weren't term-limited, I'd probably run again. [*Laughter*] But Gary's done a great job, and I thank him for what he's done and also for his leadership as the head of all the State party chairs in the country.

I want to thank Steve Grossman, who spoke so beautifully here earlier, for his leadership. This was—he was not exactly buying high when he agreed to become chairman of the Democratic Party in America, and he's done a superb job. And his friend and our good friend Alan Solomont, for being our finance director. And I want to thank Senator Durbin for many things, but especially—all of you know this, but I want to reiterate it—I hope and believe that next year, even though it's an election year, we will pass legislation which will embody the best parts of that settlement in the tobacco case and do some other things which will go beyond what the settlement does to dramatically reduce the exposure of young children to tobacco, which is still our number one public health problem. And if we are successful in that, it will be in no small measure due to the year-in and year-out, dogged determination of Dick Durbin. And I really appreciate that.

I'd also like to say a special word, put in a special plug for Carol Moseley-Braun. I expect to be back here campaigning for her on several occasions in this next year. But I could say many things, but I'd like to ask you to think of three things when you think of this election—two in the past and one in the future—that are very important.

One is, all the good fortune that has come to our administration because the American people are better off than they were 5 years ago had at its root the announcement we made after the election and before I took office that we were going to dramatically reduce the deficit. We were not going—America had quadrupled the debt in 12 years. We were choking on debt. Interest rates were too high. Investment was to low. The economy was stagnant. And we were going to turn it around.

And when we presented a plan to do it, we could not get a single person from the other party to vote for it. They said it was going to be a terrible thing for the economy; it would bring on a recession. We passed the bill by one vote in both Houses. If it hadn't been for Carol Moseley-Braun's vote, I don't think we'd have the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years and 13½ million new jobs. And I hope you'll all remember that.

Lew mentioned the crime issue. Maybe it was because I was out there living in the country and not in Washington; I never knew crime was a Republican issue. [*Laughter*] I never knew a policeman who asked a victim of a crime for their party I.D. before they filled out a report. I was unaware of this until I got to Washington, and I realized that talk too often supplemented for action, and if you talked long enough, you got credit for something whether you did anything or not.

What we did was to try to give the American people a crime bill that was written, in effect, by police officers, prosecutors, and community leaders that worked with kids to try to keep them out of trouble in the first place and that was based on the experiences that I'd seen in places that, even before I became President, where the crime rate was already going down because of community policing and a better distribution in the number of police officers and more work at prevention.

So we came up with this crime bill. We were afraid we couldn't pass it because there was a bitter Republican filibuster in the Senate, and we didn't have a vote to spare. When the Republicans filibuster, you have to get 60 votes. And thank goodness there were enough brave Republican Senators to give us one more vote than we needed. But if we hadn't had the Democrats we had, including Carol Moseley-Braun, I don't think we'd have the lowest crime rate this country has had in 24 years. And that's something that I think is worth remembering.

At some point, you know, we all have to take responsibility when we're wrong. And I've made some mistakes, and I've tried to assume responsibility for them—you take the consequences. But when someone is right, it ought to be noticed. On those two great issues, which had a great deal to do with shaping where America is today, Carol Moseley-Braun was not only right, her vote was decisive. And the people of Illinois should remember and reward, I believe, at election time.

The third thing I'd like to say is about the future. Carol was the first Member of Congress who came to me and said that she thought we ought to reconsider the historic reluctance of the Federal Government to support any sort of capital expenditures for our public schools, any kind of fiscal expenditures. There is a good reason for that. We only provide about 7 percent of the total funding for our schools in America. Most of it comes from State and local level, and so most of the building has been done from local funds. Most States don't contribute to school buildings either. Most States just do it locally.

But she made a case, and I looked into it. And I discovered, for example, in the city of Philadelphia the average school building is 65 years old. And in many of our cities the percentage of people living in the city and paying taxes in the school district, with children, has gone down dramatically so that the tax base, the effective tax base for maintaining these physical facilities has shrunk.

I was in a little town called Jupiter, Florida, the other day where I counted—I believe there were 12—12 trailers full of kids in classrooms, supplemental classrooms on the outside of the school building, because of the growth of the student population.

Now, I want to say a little more about Chicago's reforms in a moment, but it was because of that that I made a proposal to Congress, which did not pass last time, but I think we still have to keep working on this, because if you want these schools to work right, they don't have to be modern—they can be old buildings—but the windows don't need to be broken, and the kids don't need to be in danger. And they at least need to be clean and fixed up and shiny and adequate so that you send a message to our children that they matter, that they're important, that they're not some second-rate ancillary concern to us. So I think there's quite a good chance that we'll be able to do something to support local efforts on school construction in a way that also furthers school reform. And I want to say a little more about that in a minute.

But you just remember, when that comes up on the national screen—today I was in Akron, as Steve Grossman said, at our first big national townhall meeting on race relations and building

one America for the 21st century. Three of the people—of the 65 people in the audience brought it up to me and said, "I wish you would do something to help get our broken-down or overcrowded schools in a position where they can do the job for the kids without regard to their race." Carol Moseley-Braun made that a national issue for the first time in the history of the Republic. And she deserves a lot of credit for it, and we ought to keep fighting to make our schools better. And I hope the people of Illinois will back her up in this coming year on that issue, because it's very important. And I thank her for it.

Now, let me go back to the beginning of this. Six years ago, when I came to Illinois for the first time, I was convinced that our country had its best days in front of it if, but only if, we actually tried to prepare for the future. I did not think we could simply stumble into the 21st century. Nor did I think we could get very far by denying the significant challenges we faced.

By 1992, it had been nearly 20 years since the bottom 60 percent of the work force had had an increase in their real wages, because of global competition and because of the premium that had been put on higher skills in the global economy and the growth of technology. Unemployment was high, growth was low, interest rates were high. And like I said, we had quadrupled the debt. Crime was going up every year. The welfare rolls were rising. And most people didn't think that this country worked very well anymore.

I believed very strongly that if we had new ideas and we implemented them with discipline, we could turn the country around, not because I would be President—because the President is only one actor in a very big system—but because this country has enormous capacity to solve any problem before it if the people make up their mind to go in the right direction and actually do it.

So I took to the people a new direction. And we said it was a new Democratic approach not because we were running from the Democratic Party's values in history but because at every time when there's change, you have to change your approach to be relevant to the times. You can't stick with an approach that no longer works. So what we said was we want new ideas and old-fashioned values, opportunity for everybody, responsibility from everybody, a community that includes everybody in America. We want a different kind of Government. We don't pretend that the Government can solve all the problems, but we don't think it should sit on the sidelines. We think we ought to have a Government that's primary focus is to create the conditions and give people the tools to solve their own problems and build strong careers, strong families, and strong communities. And that's what we've done.

Five years later there are 300,000 people fewer working for the Federal Government. It's the smallest it was—your Federal Government today is the same size it was when John Kennedy was President. And this is a much bigger country.

The percentage of the economy being taken by the Federal Government is smaller than it was 5 years ago. Of all the advanced economies in the world, the percentage of our wealth that goes to taxes at the State, national, and local level is lower than every other one except Japan; we're about even with Japan. And yet, we have still been able to invest more in things that are critical to our future, like education and environmental technology and cleanup and medical research and the expansion of health care coverage, things that bring us together and make us all stronger.

And the consequence of that is that we've not only reduced the debt by 92 percent—the deficit—by 92 percent before the balanced budget law triggered in, because of the 1993 vote, but we're now going to balance the budget and at the same time have the biggest increased investment in health care for kids since '65, in public schools since '65, and in helping people go to college since 1945, since the GI bill.

We are seeing the crime rate drop to a 24-year low, and the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history—3.8 million fewer people on welfare than when I took office—with a program that is tough in the sense that it requires able-bodied people to go to work, but compassionate for children because it guarantees medical care and nutrition for the kids and child care for the mothers if they go to work. So you don't ask people to choose between their children and their jobs.

And if I might say, I think that's one of the largest questions still facing the United States. Even upper income people I know who have school-aged kids, almost every one of them can cite one example in the last few weeks when

they felt torn between their obligations to their children and their obligations at work. And I think one of the single achievements the Democratic Party should make to 21st century America is helping to reconcile the conflict between work and family so that people who do work do not feel that they have to sacrifice being good parents to do it.

What does that mean? That's what the family and medical leave law was about. When we doubled the earned-income tax credit—I'll tell you what that means; nobody knows what this is, the earned-income tax credit—it means that if you make less than $30,000 a year and you have one or two children, you get a lower income tax as a result. It's worth about $1,000 a family, over and above the children's tax credit and the other cuts that we've done in taxes.

We raised the minimum wage because of it; we increased child support collection by 50 percent; we reformed the adoption laws and gave a tax credit for people who would adopt children—all trying to strengthen families and help people balance the demands of work and family. And then Hillary and I sponsored the first White House conference ever on child care, and we're looking at what our options are within the budget limitations to try to expand the availability of affordable, quality, safe child care to working families. Because I think that the most important job any of us will ever have—and I guess I'm more mindful of that now because our daughter just went off to college and I don't sense it every day like I used to—but raising kids is the most important work of any society, ever. In all history, it's always the same. There is nothing more important.

So we cannot ask our people to choose between success in the emerging economy and success at home. What we have to do is to find a way for us to achieve both. And that's something that we have to keep working on, but I'm proud of the progress we've made.

I'm proud of the fact that the environment is cleaner than it was; the air is cleaner; the water is cleaner; there are fewer toxic waste dumps; and the food supply is safer than it was 5 years ago. Do we still have new challenges? We do. But we proved that those who said we should break down environmental regulations and weaken our commitment to a clean environment so we could grow the economy—I think we have proved conclusively that they were wrong and that our idea is right, that you can protect the environment and grow the economy, and we need to keep on doing it.

And as you look to the future, that means, among other things, taking on the challenge of global warming and climate change. The Vice President is going to Kyoto, Japan, to present our position there, and it's somewhat controversial now because a lot of people believe that there is no way to reduce our amount of greenhouse gas emissions caused primarily from burning coal and oil without hurting the economy. I do not believe that. I think the evidence is all to the contrary. And we're determined to find a way to continue to clean the environment while growing the economy.

Let me just remind you that in the last few years we have taken the chlorofluorocarbons out of the air—the spray, the stuff that's in the spray cans—to stop the thinning of the ozone layer. Everybody said it was going to be a big problem for our economy. It all happened while we were having this unprecedented boom. We have dramatically reduced sulfur dioxide emissions primarily from powerplants. We were told it was going to cost a fortune and take forever. We're now running 40 percent ahead of schedule at less than half the predicted cost, in the midst of this economic boom, cleaning up our air, because we did it in a way that supported business, supported free markets, gave people the incentives to do the right thing, but said in the end we've got to give our children a cleaner environment. We still have—there are lots of cities in this country where asthma is the number one public health problem for young children because of air pollution. So we're doing the right things, and we need to keep on doing it.

In health care, we need to find ways to continue to expand health coverage, and without sacrificing quality in the name of controlling costs. Our side has embraced a health care bill of rights that has been endorsed by health care providers, by medical professionals not in the business end of it, by significant portions of the business and labor community. We may have a big argument about it between the parties next year, but I think the Democratic Party should be on the side of quality health care as well as affordable health care. And I think that's what people want us to do. I know that's what Susan wants me to do. She was almost clapping there. [*Laughter*]

So these are things that I want you to think about. There are honest differences. I regret sometimes that all the political stories seem to be about, you know—Lew made some remark about the fundraising—you have to understand, when you contribute to a party, if that party advances things that you believe in and there is a difference, especially if there is a difference between your party's position and the other one, you are doing something that is not only all right, it is a good thing because if you don't, then your side won't be heard.

And there is a direct line that will run from this dinner tonight to the actions that we will take and the fights we will be able to make to defend what we do when we try to raise school standards in every city in the country, like you're trying to do here in Chicago; when we try to get every school system to do what you say here, more homework, more parental involvement, more responsibility, more accountability, no more social promotion. The kinds of things you're doing here ought to be done everywhere in America. We believe that. That's part of our policy. We've got to have somebody sticking up for us and giving us the wherewithal to get that message out there. That's what you're doing. And you ought to be proud of that and feel good about it.

Today at this townhall meeting on race, the one substantive announcement I made was that we were going to create 25 to 30 education opportunity zones to give 25 to 30 other communities—to give a chance to do what Chicago's trying to do, to put accountability and high standards and high expectations and real, effective commitment to excellence into the schools. This is important.

And the last thing I'll say is this. One of the reasons that I'm very proud to be a Democrat is we still believe that we don't have a person to waste; we believe that people that don't have as many material resources as we do are as good as we are in the eyes of God and that we need them to develop to the fullest of their abilities. And we want everybody to be part of our American future. That's what we want, and that's what that townhall meeting in Akron was all about.

I'll just leave you with that thought. A lot of Americans have thought about what the 21st century will be like in terms of, oh, biomedical research in 30 years. A lot of Americans have thought about what's going to happen in terms of the communications technology in 30 years. A lot of Americans have thought about will there be relatively more people riding on airplanes or more people doing video conferences transatlantic when all the telephones have video screens. But what we have not thought enough about is what's it going to be like when there's no majority race in America in 50 years? It will happen within the decade in California, our biggest State, where 13 percent of the people live. How are we going to continue to prove that, no matter what happens in Bosnia or Northern Ireland or the Middle East or all these places where we're trying to help them make progress toward peace, that we're going to stay on the side of reconciling ourselves to one another across our racial and religious and ethnic differences so that we will be richer by it?

How are we going to prove that we understand that the ethnic diversity that you see in Cook County is our meal ticket to the 21st century, and we are not going to let old-fashioned hatreds and newfound fears get in the way of that? I want our party—I want this to be a nonpartisan issue, but I want our party to be in the forefront of getting the American people to solve this problem community by community as well as the national level.

So these are the things that we have stood for. I don't think there's any question that America is better off than it was 5 years ago. I don't think there's any question that I could not have done this if it hadn't been for the Democratic Members of the Congress and the voices in the mayors' offices and the Governorships around the country who stuck up for what we were trying to do. I could not have done this alone. We did this together. It is an achievement of our party.

Do we have some differences of opinion? We sure do. We still have a big difference over trade, and I think I'm right, and I think that the people that think that we don't have to expand trade are not right. On the other hand, I believe that one of the things that all Democrats believe that is right is that no country has yet solved the problem—no rich country—of how do you get the benefits of the global economy, trade, technology, and investment, and still help the people that will get displaced from the global economy in an adequate and rapid way, so that they can immediately return to the winner's circle. No country has solved that problem.

And I think you should see the debate within our party on trade in those terms. That is the positive way to see it, because all of us care about that. And I believe we'll get it worked out in a way that will enable us to continue to expand the frontiers of trade and prove that we can do a better job of returning hardworking Americans to the winner's circle.

Apart from that, I think we're completely at one on things that really have made a difference to America. So you go home tonight, and you think about that. You think about that: the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years; the lowest crime rate in 24 years; the biggest drop in welfare in history; the family leave law; dramatic overhaul of the adoption laws; a dramatic overhaul of the food and drug law so we can move drugs into the workplace more quickly and people can get cures for terrible problems. The kinds of things we're doing will change the future of America for the better.

And I want you to stay with us. I want you to stay with Carol Moseley-Braun. I want you to stay with your other candidates here in Illinois. But most of all, I want you to stay with the notion that you have the right and the responsibility to support those things that reflect what you believe are right for America. And because you and people like you all over this country have done it, we're in better shape than we were 5 years ago. And when we go into the 21st century and I ride off into the sunset, we'll be in better shape still.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:40 p.m. at Lino's Restaurant. In his remarks, he referred to Lewis Manilow, who introduced the President, and his wife, Susan, cochairs of the dinner; Phil Stefani, owner of the restaurant; Steve Grossman, national chair, and Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee; John Stroger, president, Cook County board of commissioners; John H. Johnson, chief executive officer, Johnson Publishing Co.; NBA Chicago Bulls player Scottie Pippen; David Wilhelm, former chair, Democratic National Committee, and his wife, Deegee; and Laura Hartigan, former finance director, Clinton/Gore '96, and her sister Bridget.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)

December 3, 1997

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

On May 30, 1992, by Executive Order 12808, President Bush declared a national emergency to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States constituted by the actions and policies of the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro, blocking all property and interests in property of those Governments. President Bush took additional measures to prohibit trade and other transactions with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) by Executive Orders 12810 and 12831, issued on June 5, 1992, and January 15, 1993, respectively.

On April 25, 1993, I issued Executive Order 12846, blocking the property and interests in property of all commercial, industrial, or public utility undertakings or entities organized or located in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (the "FRY (S&M)"), and prohibiting trade-related transactions by United States persons involving those areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina controlled by the Bosnian Serb forces and the United Nations Protected Areas in the Republic of Croatia. On October 25, 1994, because of the actions and policies of the Bosnian Serbs, I expanded the scope of the national emergency by issuance of Executive Order 12934 to block the property of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they controlled within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as the property of any entity organized or located in, or controlled by any person in, or resident in, those areas.

On November 22, 1995, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1022

(UNSCR or "Resolution 1022"), immediately and indefinitely suspending economic sanctions against the FRY (S&M). Sanctions were subsequently lifted by the United Nations Security Council pursuant to Resolution 1074 on October 1, 1996. Resolution 1022, however, continues to provide for the release of funds and assets previously blocked pursuant to sanctions against the FRY (S&M), provided that such funds and assets that are subject to claims and encumbrances, or that are the property of persons deemed insolvent, remain blocked until "released in accordance with applicable law." This provision was implemented in the United States on December 27, 1995, by Presidential Determination No. 96–7. The Determination, in conformity with Resolution 1022, directed the Secretary of the Treasury, *inter alia*, to suspend the application of sanctions imposed on the FRY (S&M) pursuant to the above-referenced Executive orders and to continue to block property previously blocked until provision is made to address claims or encumbrances, including the claims of the other successor states of the former Yugoslavia. This sanctions relief was an essential factor motivating Serbia and Montenegro's acceptance of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina initialed by the parties in Dayton on November 21, 1995 (the "Peace Agreement") and signed in Paris on December 14, 1995. The sanctions imposed on the FRY (S&M) and on the United Nations Protected Areas in the Republic of Croatia were accordingly suspended prospectively, effective January 16, 1996. Sanctions imposed on the Bosnian Serb forces and authorities and on the territory that they controlled within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina were subsequently suspended prospectively, effective May 10, 1996, in conformity with UNSCR 1022. On October 1, 1996, the United Nations passed UNSCR 1074, terminating U.N. sanctions against the FRY (S&M) and the Bosnian Serbs in light of the elections that took place in Bosnia and Herzegovina on September 14, 1996. UNSCR 1074, however, reaffirms the provisions of UNSCR 1022 with respect to the release of blocked assets, as set forth above.

The present report is submitted pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 1703(c) and covers the period from May 30 through November 29, 1997. It discusses Administration actions and expenses directly related to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order 12808 as expanded with respect to the Bosnian Serbs in Executive Order 12934, and against the FRY (S&M) contained in Executive Orders 12810, 12831, and 12846.

1. The declaration of the national emergency on May 30, 1992, was made pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. The emergency declaration was reported to the Congress on May 30, 1992, pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and the expansion of that national emergency under the same authorities was reported to the Congress on October 25, 1994. The additional sanctions set forth in related Executive orders were imposed pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the statutes cited above, section 1114 of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. App. 1514), and section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287c).

2. The Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC), acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury, implemented the sanctions imposed under the foregoing statutes in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and Bosnian Serb-Controlled Areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 585 (the "Regulations"). To implement Presidential Determination No. 96–7, the Regulations were amended to authorize prospectively all transactions with respect to the FRY (S&M) otherwise prohibited (61 *FR* 1282, January 19, 1996). Property and interests in property of the FRY (S&M) previously blocked within the jurisdiction of the United States remain blocked, in conformity with the Peace Agreement and UNSCR 1022, until provision is made to address claims or encumbrances, including the claims of the other successor states of the former Yugoslavia.

On May 10, 1996, OFAC amended the Regulations to authorize prospectively all transactions with respect to the Bosnian Serbs otherwise prohibited, except with respect to property previously blocked (61 *FR* 24696, May 16, 1996).

On December 4, 1996, OFAC amended Appendices A and B to 31 C.F.R. chapter V, containing the names of entities and individuals in alphabetical order and by location that are subject to the various economic sanctions programs administered by OFAC, to remove the entries for individuals and entities that were determined to be acting for or on behalf of the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). These assets were blocked on the basis of these persons' activities in support of the FRY (S&M)—activities no longer prohibited—not because the Government of the FRY (S&M) or entities located in or controlled from the FRY (S&M) had any interest in those assets (61 *FR* 64289, December 4, 1996).

On April 18, 1997, the Regulations were amended by adding new section 585.528, authorizing all transactions after 30 days with respect to the following vessels that remained blocked pursuant to the Regulations, effective at 10:00 a.m. local time in the location of the vessel on May 19, 1997: the M/V MOSLAVINA, M/V ZETA, M/V LOVCEN, M/V DURMITOR and M/V BAR (a/k/a M/V INVIKEN) (62 *FR* 19672, April 23, 1997). During the 30-day period, United States persons were authorized to negotiate settlements of their outstanding claims with respect to the vessels with the vessels' owners or agents and were generally licensed to seek and obtain judicial warrants of maritime arrest. If claims remained unresolved 10 days prior to the vessels' unblocking (May 8, 1997), service of the warrants could be effected at that time through the U.S. Marshal's Office in the district where the vessel was located to ensure that U.S. creditors of a vessel had the opportunity to assert their claims. Appendix C to 31 CFR, chapter V, containing the names of vessels blocked pursuant to the various economic sanctions programs administered by OFAC (61 *FR* 32936, June 26, 1996), was also amended to remove these vessels from the list effective May 19, 1997.

There has been one amendment to the Regulations since my report of May 30, 1997. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and Bosnian Serb-Controlled Areas of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 585, were amended on August 25, 1997. General reporting, recordkeeping, licensing, and other procedural regulations were moved from the Regulations to a separate part (31 CFR Part 501) dealing solely with such procedural matters. (62 *FR* 45098, August 25, 1997). No substantive changes to the Regulations were made. A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

3. Over the past year and a half, the Departments of State and the Treasury have worked closely with European Union member states and other U.N. member nations to implement the provisions of UNSCR 1022. In the United States, retention of blocking authority pursuant to the extension of a national emergency provides a framework for administration of an orderly claims settlement. This accords with past policy and practice with respect to the suspension of sanctions regimes.

4. During this reporting period, OFAC issued six specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to the FRY (S&M) or property in which it has an interest. Specific licenses were issued (1) to authorize the unblocking of certain funds and other administrative transactions involving assets previously blocked; (2) to authorize the transfer of presanctions ownership interests in certain blocked property from one U.S. person to another; and (3) to authorize litigation against the Government of the FRY (S&M) by a United States person for recovery of presanctions obligations.

During the past 6 months, OFAC has continued to oversee the maintenance of blocked FRY (S&M) accounts; and records with respect to: (1) liquidated tangible assets and personalty of the 15 blocked U.S. subsidiaries of entities organized in the FRY (S&M); (2) the blocked personalty, files, and records of the two Serbian banking institutions in New York previously placed in secure storage; (3) remaining blocked FRY (S&M) tangible property, including real estate; and (4) the five Yugoslav-owned vessels recently unblocked in the United States.

On September 29, 1997, the United States filed Statements of Interest in cases being litigated in the Southern District of New York: *Beogradska Banka A.D. Belgrade v. Interenergo, Inc.,* 97 Civ. 2065 (JGK) and *Jugobanka A.D. Belgrade v. U.C.F. International Trading, Inc. et al.,* 97 Civ. 3912, 3913 and 6748 (LAK). These cases involve actions by blocked New York Serbian bank agencies and their parent offices in Belgrade, Serbia, to collect on defaulted loans made prior to the imposition of economic sanctions and dispensed, in one case, to the U.S. subsidiary of a Bosnian firm and, in the other cases, to various foreign subsidiaries

of a Slovenian firm. Because these loan receivables are a form of property that was blocked prior to December 27, 1995, any funds collected as a consequence of these actions would remain blocked and subject to United States jurisdiction. Defendants asserted that the loans had been made from the currency reserves of the central bank of the former Yugoslavia to which all successor states had contributed, and that the loan funds represent assets of the former Yugoslavia and are therefore subject to claims by all five successor states. The Department of State, in consultation with the Department of the Treasury, concluded that the collection of blocked receivables through the actions by the bank and the placement of those collected funds into a blocked account did not prejudice the claims of successor states nor compromise outstanding claims on the part of any creditor of the bank, since any monies collected would remain in a blocked status and available to satisfy obligations to United States and foreign creditors and other claimants—including possible distribution to successor states under a settlement arising from the negotiations on the division of assets and liabilities of the former Yugoslavia.

5. Despite the prospective authorization of transactions with the FRY (S&M), OFAC has continued to work closely with the U.S. Customs Service and other cooperating agencies to investigate alleged violations that occurred while sanctions were in force. On February 13, 1997, a Federal grand jury in the Southern District of Florida, Miami, returned a 13-count indictment against one U.S. citizen and two nationals of the FRY (S&M). The indictment charges that the subjects participated and conspired to purchase three Cessna propeller aircraft, a Cessna jet aircraft, and various aircraft parts in the United States and to export them to the FRY (S&M) in violation of U.S. sanctions and the Regulations. Timely interdiction action prevented the aircraft from being exported from the United States. A trial date has not yet been scheduled but is anticipated in late October.

Since my last report, OFAC has collected four civil monetary penalties totaling nearly $176,000 for violations of the sanctions. These violations involved prohibited exports of goods and services, contract dealings, and payments either to the Government of the FRY (S&M), persons in the FRY (S&M), or to blocked entities owned or controlled by the FRY (S&M). The violators include two U.S. companies, one law firm, and a U.S. financial institution.

6. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from May 30 through November 29, 1997, that are directly attributable to the declaration of a national emergency with respect to the FRY (S&M) and the Bosnian Serb forces and authorities are estimated at approximately $400,000, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in OFAC and its Chief Counsel's Office, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, the National Security Council, and the Department of Commerce.

7. In the last 2 years, substantial progress has been achieved to bring about a settlement of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia acceptable to the parties. UNSCR 1074 terminates sanctions in view of the first free and fair elections to occur in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as provided for in the Peace Agreement. In reaffirming Resolution 1022, however, UNSCR 1074 contemplates the continued blocking of assets potentially subject to conflicting claims and encumbrances until provision is made to address them under applicable law, including claims of the other successor states of the former Yugoslavia.

The resolution of the crisis and conflict in the former Yugoslavia that has resulted from the actions and policies of the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), and of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they controlled, will not be complete until such time as the Peace Agreement is implemented and the terms of UNSCR 1022 have been met. Therefore, I have continued for another year the national emergency declared on May 30, 1992, as expanded in scope on October 25, 1994, and will continue to enforce the measures adopted pursuant thereto.

I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal with respect to the measures against the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), and the Bosnian Serb forces, civil authorities, and entities, as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

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

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on the Operation of the Andean Trade Preference Act

December 4, 1997

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

I hereby submit the second report on the Operation of the Andean Trade Preference Act. This report is prepared pursuant to the requirements of section 203 of the Andean Trade Preference Act of 1991. The report concludes that the Andean Trade Preference Act continues to advance U.S. counternarcotics goals in the Andean region.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Remarks on Lighting the National Christmas Tree

December 4, 1997

Thank you very much. I think, in the spirit of Christmas, the best gift I could give is a very brief Christmas message. [*Laughter*] Let me say to all of you, we've been doing this now for 85 years; for Hillary and me, Christmas begins with this wonderful ceremony. I want to thank all those responsible, and a special word of thanks to those who made it possible for the last 3 years for this beautiful Colorado spruce to be lit by solar energy.

Now I want to call up Whitney and Joseph, and ask them to stand with me, and put their hands on the switch. And I'm going to count down three, two, one, and they'll flip the switch, and the Christmas tree will come on.

Merry Christmas to all of you. Three, two, one, light the tree.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:50 p.m. on the Ellipse during the annual Christmas Pageant of Peace. In his remarks, he referred to Campfire Girl Whitney Symone Powell and Campfire Boy Joseph Sherren, who helped the President light the National Christmas Tree.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With European Union Leaders and an Exchange With Reporters

December 5, 1997

The President. Let me say very briefly that we are delighted to have another one of our EU summits, and it's particularly interesting because we now have two Luxembourgers here instead of one, which gives them, I think, the highest percentage of world leadership compared to population of any country in the world by a good long ways. [*Laughter*] And we have

a lot to discuss, but I just want to thank President Santer and Prime Minister Juncker for the work that we have done together with the EU in the last 6 months under the presidency of Luxembourg, and I look forward to the discussions today.

International Agreement on Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Q. Are you changing your position, softening on global warming?

The President. Softening or toughening?

Q. Whichever. You tell us.

The President. Well, we're working in Kyoto to try to get an agreement, and we'll see if we can. We hope we can.

Q. Is a compromise impossible considering the distance between the two positions, the EU on one side, the U.S. on the other side?

The President. Not if everybody wants an agreement. Our position is that it's a global issue, we want to get global involvement, and we want this to be the beginning of a process which eventually will have everyone in the world involved in dealing with this issue. And I think that the chances that we can get an agreement are reasonably good if everybody there really wants an agreement and we want to see countries bound to targets which will lead us to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. That's the real test.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Did you give Secretary Albright any new marching orders on the Middle East?

The President. Well, we had a good meeting on things that we think will move the ball forward. And she's going with the instructions that I gave her to talk to Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat, and I'm very hopeful. I think it's in the nature of this process that the less I say, the better chance we have of making progress, so I don't think I want to talk about it too much.

Q. But these are new ideas?

The President. Oh, yes, we have some new ideas at least about the process, about where to go from here, or at least the different approaches. And we hope that it will move the ball forward. I think that they both understand that this is a time when something needs to be done to show concrete progress. I'm encouraged by that. We'll just have to see what happens.

Assistant Attorney General Nominee

Q. Are you planning to make a recess appointment of Bill Lee?

The President. I don't have anything to say about that now.

Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt

Q. How about your conversation with Gephardt? Did you fight?

The President. I had a good talk with him, and we had a good visit. We agreed that we needed to focus on 1998, not only in terms of the politics of '98 but also in terms of the substance of what we can do to serve the people here. It was a very satisfactory talk.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:56 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. The President met with Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker of Luxembourg in his capacity as President of the European Council and President Jacques Santer of the European Commission. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Announcing Appointments to the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare and an Exchange With Reporters

December 5, 1997

The President. Today I want to discuss our continued economic progress and important steps we must take to continue it. For the last 5 years we have pursued a comprehensive economic strategy to spur growth, to increase income, to create jobs and keep the American dream alive and well in a new century. Today we see the latest evidence that our economy

is growing steady and strong, that the American dream is, in fact, alive and well.

Last month the economy created 400,000 new jobs. Unemployment is now 4.6 percent, the lowest in a quarter century. There were more new manufacturing jobs in the past year than in any year in three decades. Inflation remains low and appears to be poised to continue at its low rate. And after lagging for years, wages finally are rising again. Our economy is the strongest in a generation.

This continuing prosperity is due to the ingenuity and the enterprise and the hard work of the American people who are creating the economy of the future. It is also the result of our economic strategy of cutting the deficit, investing in education and our future, and expanding our exports through trade agreements. This year's balanced budget law both honors our values and continues that progress. It extends opportunity to our children with the most significant new investment in health care in a generation and in education in a generation. It offers tax cuts for college and provides for health insurance for up to 5 million children. It honors our duty to our parents by extending the lifetime of the Medicare Trust Fund until 2010.

Now we have more to do to strengthen Medicare while preserving its commitment to older Americans. Medicare is at the core of our historic social compact, our recognition of the duty we owe to one another. It has been one of the great achievements of this century, and now we have an obligation to strengthen it for the next century, to ensure that it is as strong for our children as it has been for our parents, and to ensure that the baby boomers have access to quality affordable health care when we retire.

The Medicare reforms I signed into law this year were the product of strong cooperation among Democrats and Republicans, the President and the Congress. The balanced budget law establishes also a commission to continue this bipartisan progress and draft comprehensive reform.

Today I am pleased to announce my appointees to the commission. They include Stuart Altman, a highly respected health care expert who has worked for Presidents of both parties; Dr. Laura Tyson, who served our Nation well as Chair of the National Economic Council and Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers in our administration; Bruce Vladeck, who directed the Medicare program for 4 years as Administrator of the Health Care Financing Agency; and Anthony Watson, the CEO of a major progressive managed care plan in New York that has pioneered support for fair treatment of patients while providing quality care.

These are distinguished, respected, highly skilled experts. They understand health care and share our unshakable commitment to the values represented by Medicare. I expect them to work as strong partners with the other commissioners, and I look forward to their proposals to keep Medicare at the core of the American dream in the new century.

Thank you.

Q. Will you recess-appoint Bill Lann Lee next week?

Q. [*Inaudible*]—economy is so great——

The President. One at a time.

Economy and Tax Reform Proposals

Q. Are you really thinking of a tax cut?

The President. No, I don't believe that's a fair interpretation of what I said yesterday in my comments. What I said was—I was asked about proposals for tax reform, and what I said was that I thought any tax reform that was adopted had to be fair, good for the economy, not burden the deficit, and make the system simpler. That was the context in which that discussion occurred.

Then there was a separate discussion about the discussion that is going around town here about what ought to be done with the surplus. Some people say we should have a tax cut with the surplus; some people say we should spend more money with the surplus; some people say we should apply it to the debt. What I tried to point out yesterday is there is not a surplus. The people who say there is a surplus are talking about the difference in the projected line of deficit to 2002 when we adopted the balanced budget law and I signed it, and the projected line now.

Now, no doubt this news today is good news. It augers for stronger growth in this quarter, and it may well mean that we will have a better prediction in terms of the size of the deficit and eliminating it altogether now than we did at the time the balanced budget law was passed, at the time of the midsession review last August. The only point I tried to make is all those are still estimates. And it's good to have a good estimate, but we don't want to spend money we don't yet have.

The thing that has driven this economic recovery is getting interest rates down, getting investment up, creating a framework in which the American economy could grow, and bringing down the deficit from $300 billion a year to $23 billion a year is a big part of that. So before we make any unduly rash decisions about the future, let's make sure that we're taking care of the economy because that's—the best thing you can do for Americans' incomes is to give them a strong economy.

Assistant Attorney General Nominee

Q. Will you recess-appoint Bill Lann Lee next week?

Q. Are you looking at a flat tax, Mr. President?

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned——

The President. I can't hear all of you.

Q. Will you recess-appoint Bill Lann Lee next week?

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned that the Southeast Asia financial crisis will affect the U.S. economy?

The President. I'll answer this, but let me answer this one first. What I would like to say today, and all I am going to say today, is Bill Lann Lee's personal story, his work experience, his integrity, and his fitness for this job are absolutely beyond question. He should not be denied the job because he disagrees with the Republicans in the Senate on whether affirmative action is or is not good policy. The only thing he's required to do is to enforce the law as the Supreme Court hands it down or as the Congress passes it, and to recuse in the case of any kind of personal conflict, which he said he would do in the case of the California law, which is now moot.

So I believe—I will say again—he is entitled to a vote. The Senators ought to vote on him. No one has put forward a credible reason for why this man should not be appointed. Surely the fact that he agrees with the President who wishes to appoint him on the question of what kind of affirmative action programs we should or shouldn't have, surely that should not disqualify him for this position. That is the point I have made. I still think that he ought to be able to serve.

Yes, now go ahead.

Asian Economies

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned that the Southeast Asia financial blowout, which seems to be ongoing still, is going to eat into these economic growth figures that you revealed today?

The President. Well, first of all, I think we all have to acknowledge that our economies are interrelated. About a third of our growth over the last 5 years has been due to our ability to sell more American products around the world—about a third. And anything which undermines our ability to continue to sell more American products around the world, any action taken abroad or at home, is not good for our future growth prospects.

Now, that's one of the reasons that I have moved so aggressively to work with our allies in Asia and in Europe and with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to try to stabilize the situation.

On the other hand, let me remind you that there is enormous productive power in these Asian economies. They have some financial difficulties now, which have to be addressed in a disciplined way. If you see the rapid recovery that Mexico had within the space of 2 years, you see that these strong Asian economies can do exactly the same thing in perhaps less time if they face their challenges directly. So I think that the appropriate response is to do what was done in Indonesia, to do what was done in South Korea.

The Japanese statements of the last few days are heartening about what they intend to do with their own financial institutions and protecting the depositors. All this is basically good news. So they've hit a rough patch in their financial institutions and markets, but underlying productivity and potential in Asia is enormous. Yes, I'm concerned about its impact on Americans, and that's one of the reasons I've been so actively involved in trying to deal with it, but I don't think we should become pessimistic. I think we should just be determined to work through these things as quickly as possible.

Q. Mr. President——

Q. Mr. President——

The President. One at a time, one at a time. Go ahead.

Arlington Interment of Ambassador M. Larry Lawrence

Q. Mr. President, should Larry Lawrence have been buried in Arlington National Cemetery?

The President. Well, that depends on what the facts are. The questions which have been raised are serious, and I have asked the State Department to conduct an inquiry to find out whether, in fact, the basis of his eligibility is true or not. That's a fact question. And let's wait until we see what the facts are, and then we can all draw our conclusions from that. But the questions themselves are serious.

I think the other question you might ask is, were the people involved in the decision in any way at fault? I don't think they were. They acted on the facts as they knew them. The original inquiry into the background check was done—for the Ambassador—was done by the State Department. I've asked them, therefore, to follow up, try to find out the facts. When we get the facts, then I think we can make our judgments on it.

Haiti

Q. Have you made an indefinite commitment to keep American troops in Haiti?

The President. Have I made an indefinite commitment? No. But I have made a definite commitment to continue to be involved there in ways that I think are appropriate. Keep in mind, we have a very modest troop presence there now, and we are participating as a minority partner, if you will, in the civilian police. With the withdrawal of the United Nations forces, the primary work of maintaining security has shifted to the international police force working with the Haitian police. Our military presence there—it largely involves a lot of public works. We are doing some public works projects there which we've been asked to continue and to finish, try to accelerate. And of course, I think it does contribute to the stability of the area. But our presence there cannot be indefinite, and it will not be indefinite. But I think that we should have these withdrawals in a staged fashion, and we should know what the next stage is before we take any precipitous action. The American people should know it's not a military operation.

Go ahead.

Situation in Iraq

Q. Mr. President, Saddam Hussein seems not to be satisfied with the way—this arrangement of the U.N. Security Council. What do you feel and what do you think can be done about it?

The President. Well, I certainly think he's exposed his motives and his real concerns to the entire world today. You know, it wasn't very long ago—how many days ago was it that he had this symbolic funeral for children, blaming the world community in general and the United States in particular for the death of Iraqi children. Let me remind you, when we got the United Nations resolution passed, we and the others who supported it—986—to allow him to sell oil to get food and medicine for his people, even while he was continuing to resist getting rid of his entire chemical and biological weapons arsenal, he delayed the full implementation of that for a year and a half. He is in no position to point the finger at anyone else in the world for the suffering of his own people. And once again today he has proved that he is responsible for the suffering of his own people.

The rest of us are more than happy to let him sell oil in amounts necessary to generate the cash to alleviate the human suffering of the people of Iraq. That's what 986 was all about. This is not about 986. This is about some other way that he can manipulate the feelings of people beyond the borders of Iraq, even if he has to let innocent children die to do it, so he can continue to pursue a weapons of mass destruction program. And it's wrong, and the world community should not let him get away with it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:25 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq.

Statement on the National Economy
December 5, 1997

The November employment report shows the economy is the strongest it has been in a generation, with the lowest unemployment rate in a quarter century, nearly 14 million new jobs in the last 5 years, and real wages rising again. Today's good news—strong job creation and higher incomes—shows that the American economy continues to work for working families. It is clear that our three-part economic strategy—reducing the deficit, investing in people, and opening foreign markets to American goods—is the right strategy for America.

Most importantly, this economic prosperity is helping all Americans; for example, the unemployment rate among Hispanics fell to one of its lowest levels ever recorded. And over the past year we had more new manufacturing jobs than during any other year in nearly three decades. While the economy is growing steady and strong, we still have more to do to keep our Nation on the right track and ensure that all Americans have the opportunity to benefit from this growth.

The President's Radio Address
December 6, 1997

Good morning. Yesterday the community of West Paducah, Kentucky, came together to remember the three young girls struck down at school in a terrifying act of violence. Our entire Nation has been shaken by this tragedy. West Paducah, on the southern shore of the Ohio River, is at the center of our circle of prayers. America has lost three beautiful daughters. We mourn deeply with the Steger, James, and Hadley families, with those students who were wounded and their families, and with all those whose lives were changed forever by a 14-year-old with a stolen gun.

We may never know what drove the son of a respected church elder to extinguish the lives of classmates bowed in prayer. But in the aftermath we've seen great heroism, generosity, and love: a courageous act by a classmate to head off more violence, an outpouring of understanding for the sister of the alleged killer, the donation of organs for patients desperately in need, an entire nation reaching out in support. One terrible act could not poison the deep well of goodness West Paducah has drawn upon in this moment of grief.

Now the rest of us must do everything in our power to prevent such things from happening again. At a time when we're trying to prepare our children for the opportunities of the 21st century, high school seniors are more likely to take weapons to school than to take calculus in school. This is unacceptable. We simply cannot educate our children, and they cannot learn and live up to their full potential, when violence and drugs threaten their safety in school.

One thing we must do right away is to gain a much clearer view of the problem. Sadly, our national picture of school violence is neither complete, nor up to date. We know more about the overall patterns of car theft in America than we do about the harm that comes to our children at school.

So today I'm directing Attorney General Reno and Education Secretary Riley to launch a major initiative to produce for the first time an annual report card on school violence. This report card will contain the data we all need in order to boost efforts to prevent violence from happening in the first place.

School safety is a challenge not only for police and parents, teachers and school officials; the scourge of young violence poses a challenge to every American. It demands that we do everything possible to find safe places for our children to learn and play and grow. It demands that schools follow a policy of zero tolerance for guns. It demands that we teach our children basic values, the unblinking distinction between right and wrong. It demands that we exercise responsibility when we create images for our

children to see. Most urgently, it demands that whenever possible, we reach out to those who may be troubled, angry, or alone before they do something destructive and perhaps irreversible to themselves or others.

Youth violence represents an insistent, angry wake-up call to every parent, every teacher, every religious leader, every student. If we answer that call, we can ensure that the memory of Kayce, Nicole, and Jessica will help us to prevent other such tragedies. In the words of the girls' final prayer, we can ensure that their light will shine forevermore.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:18 p.m. on December 5 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on December 6. In his remarks, the President referred to Kayce Steger, Nicole Hadley, and Jessica James, Heath High School students killed by gunfire following a prayer meeting; Michael Carneal, the alleged gunman, and his sister Kelly; and Ben Strong, a student who acted to end the shooting.

Remarks at the Metropolitan Baptist Church
December 7, 1997

Thank you. Thank you, Reverend Hicks, Mrs. Hicks, members of the ministry. Thank you, Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton, for telling me I should come here today, thank you. I must say, I would rather be in the choir than in the pulpit. [*Laughter*] They were wonderful. Thank you. Mr. Mayor, City Council Chair Cropp, and members of the council; Dr. Swygert and Mrs. Swygert; my good friend Maya Angelou, thank you for being here; David Du Bois. I thank three members of my Cabinet—Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman; the Secretary of Transportation, Rodney Slater; and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Frank Raines—for coming with me, and many members of the White House staff and friends. We're all glad to be here, and we have a happy heart after hearing all the wonderful music and seeing the people here, and especially the children.

Sean and Ahjah and the other children gave me the letters and the drawings; I was back there reading them. One letter said, "Can Project Spirit come and visit the White House and see the Christmas tree?" [*Laughter*] Yes. As a matter of fact, Dr. Hicks, anybody, any of these children in your youth group you want to bring, just bus them on in. We'd be glad to see them, and we'll arrange it. I'd like that.

Now, the letters contain some interesting things. One young man wrote, "I'm not trying to get myself in trouble, but I've always had a crush on Hillary." [*Laughter*] Now, I can certainly understand that. [*Laughter*] A lot of the letters were serious. They said, can I do more to get rid of violence, guns. A lot of them said very specific things about what they'd like to do to make their schools better.

Why are we here today? Or, at least, why am I here today, instead of down the street at Foundry, where I normally am on Sunday? Ephesians says we should speak the truth with our neighbors, for we are members, one of another. I believe that. I think that is the single most important political insight, or social insight, in the Bible. And I think it is what should drive us as we behave together. We have to decide whether we are members, one of the other: Is my destiny caught up in yours; are your children my children; do you care about my daughter; are we part of the same family of God? It's not enough to say that we are all equal in the eyes of God. We are all also connected in the eyes of God.

Now, just because we have responsibilities one to another doesn't mean we don't have a primary responsibility to ourselves. God helps those who help themselves. One great athlete once said, "You know, it's amazing, the more I practice, the luckier I get." [*Laughter*] So we have responsibilities to ourselves, but we owe a lot to each other.

I come here to say that I don't believe our National Government has always been the best neighbor to the City of Washington, Mr. Mayor, Ms. Cropp, Congresswoman Norton, but we are

committed to becoming a better neighbor. Washington has gotten a lot of lectures from people in national politics about being more responsible, from making the schools work better, to the streets become safer, to the neighborhoods having more hope and economic opportunity. But in the essence of our Constitution is the idea that responsibility requires freedom.

And so I believe in the independence of Washington, DC. I want Washington, DC, to be able to run its own affairs. I want the crime to go down and the schools to go up and the neighborhoods to be strong and full. We are trying to do better. In this last meeting of Congress we did more things to take loads off of Washington that it should not have and to give Washington responsibilities that it should have. And we must do more. I met with the mayor, the city council, the control board, and a lot of community leaders just a few days ago, a meeting that the Congresswoman requested. And we talked about what we could do together.

But I want to say to you that I come here at this Christmas season to say that I hope one of the gifts that I and our administration can leave for the 21st century is a National Capital that is a shining city on the hill for all America, that every American is proud of. I want a National Capital where every child looks like the children that I heard sing and who brought me those letters today, where they're all filled with a spirit of their own goodness, where they all believe they are children of God, where they all are animated to believe that they can have hope to live out their dreams. And this place symbolizes that. Wouldn't you like it if your city and your country worked the way this church did? Wouldn't you like that? [*Applause*]

And I'm not violating the first amendment by saying that. [*Laughter*] This has nothing to do with the separation of church and state. This has to do with the values we all share. Most people who are not even Christians, who are Jewish people, who are Muslims, who are Buddhist, who are all the different religions we have in our country today, they'd still like it if our country worked more the way this church does—and often the way their houses of worship do.

And so I say to you, it begins when we speak the truth to one another, when we feel free to disagree, when we don't hide what we feel—but if you go on down in that chapter, when we don't let the sun go down on our anger, when we are genuinely kind to one another, for we are members, one of another. Now, on Christmas, we celebrate the birth of a child born in poverty, who never got elected to anything, never had a nickel to his name, and has more followers than any politician who ever lived for simply reminding us that we are children of God and that we are members, one of another.

So let us go out of here resolved to keep working together until every child is in a good school, until every family can be safe in their neighborhoods, until every grownup has a place to go to work in the morning. And we'll all be better off when we are selfishly selfless, recognizing that we are members, one of another.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:50 a.m. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. H. Beecher Hicks, Jr., senior minister, Metropolitan Baptist Church, and his wife, Elizabeth; Mayor Marion S. Barry, Jr., of Washington, DC; Linda W. Cropp, chair, District of Columbia City Council; Dr. H. Patrick Swygert, president, Howard University, and his wife, Sonja; poet Maya Angelou; David Du Bois, grandson of W.E.B. Du Bois; Sean Nalle and Ahjah Prom, who presented a book of children's letters to the President; and Ian Jackson, who wrote the letter regarding the First Lady.

Remarks at the Kennedy Center Honors Reception

December 7, 1997

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, tonight the stars shine over the White House. Tonight we honor artists who in all seasons have lit up generations of our national life.

Ezra Pound once said that artists are the antennae of society, always probing, sensing, guiding us through the terrain of the human mind and spirit. I'm proud to salute five artists whose

sensitivity, vision, and talent have challenged our minds and made our spirits soar.

Especially since Edward Villella danced here in the East Room at the invitation of President and Mrs. Kennedy, the performing arts have increasingly found a home in this, the Nation's house. But the belief that arts are vital to our democracy goes back to our very beginnings, to the first President to live in the White House, John Adams, who envisioned an America that would study not just politics but painting, poetry, and music.

The ultimate worth of our Nation will never be measured fully by the size of our treasury or the might of our military but instead in the endurance of our gifts to the human spirit. Already, our films, our music, our plays, our dance have inspired performers and captured audiences around the globe. Worldwide, they've spurred not only the forces of creativity but also, and especially recently, the cause of freedom. The arts are now, to borrow a phrase from one of our honorees, perhaps the strongest currents blowing in the wind.

Tonight we pay tribute to five men and women who have spent their lives listening to their hearts and lifting ours, whose work and talent make them American originals.

It all began with the look—[*laughter*]—and I can still hardly stand it—[*laughter*]—a downward cast of the chin, a shy, yet sly upward glance of the eye. The look captured Bogey and made Lauren Bacall a legend. After seeing her for the first time in "To Have and Have Not," all America recognized that Lauren Bacall had it. The great James Agee wrote, "She has cinema personality to burn, something completely new to the screen."

Bogey and Bacall gave us a series of classic films: "The Big Sleep," "Dark Passage," "Key Largo." Then she showed us "How To Marry a Millionaire" and established herself as a master of stylish comedy. She conquered Broadway in "Cactus Flower," was discovered all over again as a musical star in "Applause," and won a second Tony Award for "Woman of the Year." Just last year, more than half a century after her first film, she won rave reviews and an Oscar nomination for "The Mirror Has Two Faces." I'm grateful that she took time out from being a legend to campaign a little for me last year, too. [*Laughter*] Tonight, on behalf of all Americans, I salute you, Lauren Bacall, as our woman of the year and an actress for all time.

As a young boy growing up in Minnesota, Bob Dylan spent a lot of time in his room writing poems. Then at the age of 14 he bought a guitar. With it, he would set his poems to music, striking the chords of American history and infusing American popular music, from rock-and-roll to country, with new depth and emotion. With searing lyrics and unpredictable beats, he captured the mood of a generation. Everything he saw—the pain, the promise, the yearning, the injustice—turned to song. He probably had more impact on the people of my generation than any other creative artist.

His voice and lyrics haven't always been easy on the ear, but throughout his career Bob Dylan has never aimed to please. He's disturbed the peace and discomforted the powerful. President Kennedy could easily have been talking about Bob Dylan when he said that "If sometimes our great artists have been most critical of our society, it is because their concern for justice makes them aware that our Nation falls short of its highest potential." "Like a Rolling Stone," Bob Dylan has kept moving forward, musically and spiritually, challenging all of us to move forward with him. Thank you, Bob Dylan, for a lifetime of stirring the conscience of our Nation.

I think our next honoree would want me to acknowledge that I can't thank him for campaigning for me. [*Laughter*] Now, with that disclaimer—[*laughter*]—I do have a lot to thank him for. For when I was a young boy in Arkansas and movies were my main source of inspiration, Charlton Heston showed me how to part the Red Sea, drive a Roman chariot, save medieval Spain—even after he was slain—[*laughter*]—and hold off a siege for "55 Days at Peking." In more than 75 films, Charlton Heston has guided millions of movie lovers through nearly every great era of Western civilization, bringing to life a host of heroes, from Moses to Michelangelo to Buffalo Bill. He's even played Democrats. [*Laughter*] But he was, to be fair, selective; they were Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. [*Laughter*]

If the big screen didn't exist, they would have had to invent it for Charlton Heston. A film hero for and of the ages, he's won an Oscar from the Academy, accolades from his peers, admiration from his audiences. But most of all, the characters he created, the courage and integrity and commitment they embody, remind all of us of the limitless possibility of the human

spirit. He has been and always will be larger than life.

The first song she ever performed in public was "God Will Take Care of You." Well, God was taking care of all us when he gave us Jessye Norman's wondrous voice. From a church choir in Georgia to center stage at the Met, Jessye Norman has brought joy to music lovers and critics to their feet. Her voice has been called the greatest instrument in the world. Her greatness, however, lies not just in her sound but in her soul. She has that rare gift for capturing in musical truths of the human experience, truths that can never be fully expressed in words alone. Having brought new meaning to Mozart and Wagner, Berlioz and Stravinsky, Jessye Norman remains an American diva. Indeed, when she sang "The Star-Spangled Banner" at my Inauguration earlier this year, I thought the flag was buoyed by the waves of her voice. I must say, Jessye, you were a tough act to follow. [*Laughter*]

After 40 albums, Grammy Awards, and the standing ovation of the entire world, she stands at the pinnacle of her art. Jessye Norman once said she wasn't the kind of woman to walk into a room unnoticed. [*Laughter*] And I can testify that that is true, having been in many rooms with her and never failing to notice. Since she first burst on the scene, her brilliance has held our attention, year-in and year-out. May the supernova of Jessye Norman shine forever.

As a young man, Edward Villella was a varsity baseball player and a welterweight boxing champion. He might have made the big leagues, but his heart led him into a different world. He was a major league dancer from the moment he joined the New York City Ballet. As graceful as he was athletic, he mesmerized audiences and choreographers alike. Balanchine and Robbins created dances that only Villella could dance. The art rose to meet the man, and the man was always flying. He dominated the stage with space-swallowing charisma and leaps as effortless as they were breathtaking. He toured the Soviet Union at the height of the cold war and became the only American dancer ever to be demanded to give an encore. Today he brings the same energy and creativity to the shaping of the Miami City Ballet into America's next great dance company.

Long before Michael Jordan, Edward Villella showed us that man indeed could fly. [*Laughter*] Thank you for taking American dance to new heights.

Lauren Bacall, Bob Dylan, Charlton Heston, Jessye Norman, Edward Villella: artists and Americans who have made indelible imprints on the performing arts and on our national character. It is quite a tribute to them that all of you have come for them tonight. In them we find the sass, the raw emotion, the heroic strength, the passionate voice, the soaring aspirations of our Nation.

America salutes each and every one of you. Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:40 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to choreographers Jerome Robbins and the late George Balanchine; and NBA basketball player Michael Jordan.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Most-Favored-Nation Trade Status for Certain Former Eastern Bloc States

December 5, 1997

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

I hereby transmit a report concerning emigration laws and policies of Albania, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan as required by subsections 402(b) and 409(b) of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act"). I have determined that Albania, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan are in full compliance with subsections 402(a) and 409(a) of the Act. As required by title IV, I will provide the Congress with periodic reports regarding the compliance of Albania, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan with these emigration standards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 8. The related memorandum of December 5 on emigration policies of Albania, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Text of a Letter to Shelia Davis Lawrence

December 8, 1997

It is with a deep sense of personal sadness that I received your letter this afternoon. I will of course ensure that the Department of Defense accommodates your wishes.

I will always remember Larry for his friendship and for his service to his community and our country. And I will never forget Larry's remarkable success as a businessman, his generosity as a philanthropist and his skill as a diplomat.

I know this has been a difficult time for you and I sincerely hope that you find peace in the days ahead.

NOTE: The letter referred to Mrs. Lawrence's late husband, M. Larry Lawrence, former Ambassador to Switzerland. An original was not available for verification of the content of this letter.

Statement on the Death of Jeanette E. Rockefeller

December 9, 1997

Hillary joins me in extending our condolences to the family of the late Jeanette E. Rockefeller, who died yesterday at the age of 79. As the wife of former Governor Winthrop Rockefeller, she was a pioneering First Lady of Arkansas, helping her former husband bring the "New South" to our State and leading women into the mainstream of political and public life. She spearheaded education and cultural outreach across the State through the Arkansas Arts Center. As a tireless campaigner, Mrs. Rockefeller was a strong voice against discrimination, with an uncanny ability to relate to the common man and woman. And, at a particularly tense time in the wake of Martin Luther King's assassination, she organized a memorial service in his honor on the steps of the State Capitol.

The people of Arkansas have lost a true and valued friend.

Statement on the 40th Anniversary of the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division

December 9, 1997

I congratulate the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice on its 40th anniversary. For 40 years, the Civil Rights Division has protected the American dream for all our people. By diligently and faithfully enforcing our civil rights laws, the lawyers and members of this division have helped all of us live closer to the ideals that lie at the heart of that dream—freedom and equality of opportunity to work, to learn, to live, and to raise our children in communities where they can thrive and grow.

Today, the task of fulfilling the promise of our civil rights laws, of keeping the American dream alive for all citizens is far from over.

That is why I have nominated an eminently qualified person to lead this division into the 21st century. Bill Lann Lee has lived the American dream, and he has dedicated his life to making the dream come alive for all Americans. Bill Lann Lee deserves to be America's next Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Burma

December 9, 1997

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

I hereby report to the Congress on developments concerning the national emergency with respect to Burma that I declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997, pursuant to section 570 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act (the "Act") and the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA). This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of IEEPA, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c). This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared in Executive Order 13047.

On May 20, 1997, I issued Executive Order 13047 (62 FR 28301, May 22, 1997), effective on May 21, 1997, to declare a national emergency with respect to Burma and to prohibit new investment in Burma by United States persons, except to the extent provided in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued in conformity with section 570 of the Act. The order also prohibits any approval or other facilitation by a United States person, wherever located, of a transaction by a foreign person where the transaction would constitute new investment in Burma prohibited by the order if engaged in by a United States person or within the United States. This action was taken in response to the large-scale repression of the democratic opposition by the Government of Burma since September 30, 1996. A copy of the order was provided to the Congress on May 20, 1997.

By its terms, nothing in Executive Order 13047 is to be construed to prohibit the entry into, performance of, or financing of a contract to sell or purchase goods, services, or technology, except: (1) where the entry into such contract on or after May 21, 1997, is for the general supervision and guarantee of another person's performance of a contract for the economic development of resources located in Burma; or (2) where such contract provides for payment, in whole or in part, in (i) shares of ownership, including an equity interest, in the economic development of resources located in Burma; or (ii) participation in royalties, earnings, or profits in the economic development of resources located in Burma.

The prohibitions of Executive Order 13047 apply to United States persons, defined to include U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens wherever they are located, entities organized under U.S. law (including their foreign branches), and entities and individuals actually located in the United States. The sanctions do not apply directly to foreign subsidiaries of U.S. firms, although foreign firms' activities may be affected by the restriction on United States persons' facilitation of a foreign person's investment transactions in Burma.

The term "new investment" means any of the following activities, if such an activity is undertaken pursuant to an agreement, or pursuant to the exercise of rights under such an agreement, that is entered into with the Government of Burma, or a nongovernmental entity in Burma, on or after May 21, 1997: (a) The entry into a contract that includes the economic development of resources located in Burma; (b) the entry into a contract providing for the general supervision and guarantee of another person's performance of a contract that includes the economic development of resources located in Burma; (c) the purchase of a share of ownership, including an equity interest, in the economic development of resources located

in Burma; or (d) the entry into a contract providing for the participation in royalties, earnings, or profits in the economic development of resources located in Burma, without regard to the form of participation.

Since the issuance of Executive Order 13047 on May 20, 1997, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC), acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury, has implemented sanctions against Burma imposed by the order. During the current 6-month period, OFAC issued several determinations with respect to transactions provided for by agreements and/or rights pursuant to contracts entered into by United States persons prior to May 21, 1997. One license was granted authorizing a United States person's disinvestment in Burma, since this transaction necessarily facilitated a foreign person's investment in Burma.

On May 21, 1997, OFAC disseminated details of this program to the financial, securities, and international trade communities by both electronic and conventional media. This included posting notices on the Internet and on 10 computer bulletin boards and 2 fax-on-demand services, and providing the material to the U.S. Embassy in Rangoon for distribution to U.S. companies operating in Burma. In addition, in early July, OFAC sent notification letters to approximately 50 U.S. firms with operations in or ties to Burma informing them of the restrictions on new investment. The letters included copies of Executive Order 13047, provided clarification of several technical issues, and urged firms to contact OFAC if they had specific questions on the application of the Executive order to their particular circumstances.

The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from May 20 through November 19, 1997, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Burma are estimated at approximately $300,000, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), and the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, and the Office of the Legal Adviser).

The situation reviewed above continues to represent an extraordinary and unusual threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. The declaration of the national emergency with respect to Burma contained in Executive Order 13047 in response to the large-scale repression of the democratic opposition by the Government of Burma since September 30, 1996, reflected the belief that it is in the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States to seek an end to abuses of human rights in Burma, to support efforts to achieve democratic reform that would promote regional peace and stability and to urge effective counternarcotics policies.

In the past 6 months, the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) has shown no sign of willingness to cede its hold on absolute power. Since refusing to recognize the results of the free and fair 1990 elections in which the National League for Democracy won a vast majority of both the popular vote and the parliamentary seats, the ruling junta has continued to refuse to negotiate with pro-democracy forces and ethnic groups for a genuine political settlement to allow a return to the rule of law and respect for basic human rights. Burma has taken limited but insufficient steps to counter narcotics production and trafficking.

The net effect of U.S. and international measures to pressure the SLORC to end its repression and move toward democratic government has been a further decline in investor confidence in Burma and deeper stagnation of the Burmese economy. Observers agree that the Burmese economy appears to be further weakening and that the government has a serious shortage of foreign exchange reserves with which to pay for imports. While Burma's economic crisis is largely a result of the SLORC's own heavy-handed mismanagement, the SLORC is unlikely to find a way out of the crisis unless political developments permit an easing of international pressure. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Remarks in New York City Commemorating the 50th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

December 9, 1997

Thank you very much, Gay, for your introduction and for your superlative work. Thank you, Ambassador Richardson, for your distinguished representation of our country and for the campaign speech you gave for Gay—[*laughter*]—proving that diplomacy and politics can never be fully separated and shouldn't be. Thank you, Mr. Morgenthau, for all you have done for the people of New York and for the contributions that you and your family have made which are memorialized in this wonderful place. And I thank you and David Altshuler for the tour I had before we started tonight.

I'd like to thank the others who are here in our administration who have worked on areas of human rights: OAS Ambassador Victor Marrero; ECOSOC Ambassador Betty King; Ambassador Nancy Rubin, our representative to the U.N. Human Rights Commission. And I'd like to say a special word of thanks to John Shattuck, the Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, who has really worked hard for a very long time under enormously adverse circumstances, sometimes when his President couldn't do everything he wanted him to do. Thank you, and God bless you.

I thank Congresswoman Nita Lowey for being here and for her alert leadership on so many issues. And we thank the President of the General Assembly and all the members of the diplomatic corps who are here as we launch the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

As human rights advocates, defenders, and educators, more than anyone else, the people in this room and those whom you represent give life to the words of the Universal Declaration. You shine the light of freedom on oppression, speak on behalf of the voiceless, spark the conscience of the world. Again I want to thank Gay for her tireless commitment to justice and equality. But I thank all of you for the work you do every day to make human rights a human reality.

The idea of a global declaration of rights emerged from the trauma of global war in which human rights were the first casualty. Here at the Museum of Jewish Heritage, we remember the evil of the Holocaust. But thanks to the marvelous conception of this unique place, we can also celebrate the strength of the human spirit, the will to endure and to preserve human dignity.

Under the wise, compassionate leadership of Eleanor Roosevelt, half a century ago 18 delegates from China to Lebanon, Chile to Ukraine forged the first international agreement on the rights of humankind. On December 10th, 1948, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration without a single dissenting vote. I am very proud that the First Lady, who has traveled the world to advance human rights, especially for women and young girls, will take part in tomorrow's United Nations commemoration.

Over the past half-century, the declaration's 30 articles have formed a constellation of principles to which all people can aspire. They have entered the consciousness of people all around the world. They're now invoked routinely in constitutions and courts. They set a yardstick of humanity's best practices against which we must all now measure ourselves.

But as Eleanor Roosevelt said, words on paper bring no guarantees, and I quote, "unless the people know them, unless the people understand them, unless the people demand that they be lived." Promoting respect for human rights is a fulfilling, but never fulfilled, obligation. Fifty years since the charter was forged, communism has been discredited, but threats to freedom and human rights still persist. Human rights are still at risk from Burma to Nigeria, from Belarus to China. Although more than half the world's people now live under governments of their own choosing, democracy's roots are still fragile in some countries. Others are besieged by forces ranging from drug cartels to organized crime. And even in democracies, human rights, which so often mean minority rights, are not guaranteed.

And while we celebrate the end of communism and the fact that it's enabled so many people to affirm their special differences, religious, ethnic, and cultural, we have also seen

from Bosnia to Rwanda that old hatreds can become the newest human rights abuses. And let us remember in this museum that having a people who are well-educated and prosperous, even having a government that is popularly elected are not in themselves sufficient to guarantee human rights.

But let us also remember that being educated by Western standards and prosperous are not necessary conditions for human rights or for people who want them. Men and women from Cambodia to Romania, Argentina, South Africa, and Russia have shown that, regardless of the economic condition of a nation, freedom is not—contrary to what the critics of the declaration say—an American or a Western or a wealthy nation right; it is a human right and a universal aspiration.

Advancing human rights must always be a central pillar of America's foreign policy. Looking back over the last 5 years, we see notable achievements; we also see missed opportunities. And looking ahead, we see an enormous amount of work still to be done.

I am proud that we stood down a brutal dictatorship and restored Haiti's destiny to its own people, but there is more to be done there if democracy and economic prosperity and basic human rights are to be safeguarded. I am proud of the role of the United States in stopping the unspeakable slaughter in Bosnia, the bloodiest conflict in Europe since World War II, a veritable case of human rights abuses. But now we have to persevere in strengthening Bosnia's democratic institutions, promoting its reconstruction, enabling refugees to return to their homes, helping those who can't, building institutions of democracy that have real integrity and durability. This year, the United States resettled 22,000 Bosnians. Next year, there will be more.

We also have to keep striving to bring to justice to those who caused the bloodshed, not only because it's right but because it is necessary for full reconciliation. Our Nation is now the major contributor to the international war crimes tribunals. We'll increase our support next year. We must bring Bosnia's war criminals to justice. And I believe strongly that before this decade and this century end, we should establish a permanent international court to prosecute crimes against humanity. This week delegates from many nations are meeting to undertake that task. The United States strongly supports them.

We have led in strengthening international institutions, including the creation of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights. Now, we have to ensure that Mary Robinson has the resources to do her job, and I am committed to increasing substantially America's support for that effort.

We've put the promotion of women's rights in the mainstream of American foreign policy, and I am very proud of that. This was highlighted, of course, by the First Lady's speech in Beijing, but I want to emphasize its major elements. We want to lead the world's efforts in combating trafficking in women. We want to steer more of our assistance to women and young girls. We want to recognize women's roles as democracy builders by encouraging full political participation.

Now, as I urged a year ago, I call on the Senate to ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. Surely, this is not an issue of party but of principle. It is time to show the world that America joins those 161 countries which have gone on record to oppose discrimination and violence against women around the world.

We continue speaking out for human rights without arrogance or apology, through our annual human rights reports, in meetings with foreign officials, in intensified advocacy for religious freedom around the world. As long as America is determined to stand for human rights, then free people all around the world will choose to stand with America.

But for all our efforts to prevent abuses, promote accountability, and push for reform, enduring progress must come from changes within the nations themselves. Democracy, the rule of law, civil society: Those things are the best guarantees of human rights over the long run. We have helped democracies on every continent solidify their reforms. We are working with China to promote the rule of law and institutions which will regularize it. We're helping post-conflict societies, like El Salvador, Bosnia, Rwanda, Mozambique, to build a durable foundation for peace. We support NGO's working to support human rights and political liberalization. And we want to expand these efforts.

Supporting the spread of democracy, with respect for human rights, advances the values that make life worth living. It also helps nations in the information age to achieve their true wealth, for it lies now in people's ability to create, to

communicate, to innovate. Fully developing those kinds of human resources requires people who are free to speak, free to associate, free to worship, and feel free to do those things. It requires, therefore, accountable, open, consistent governments that earn people's trust.

The key to progress on all these issues is for government and civic groups to work together. The NGO community is a vital source of knowledge and inspiration and action. We will keep faith with those working around the world, often at tremendous personal risk, for change within their societies. And in this 50th anniversary year, Amnesty International has asked world leaders to affirm that we will do all we can to uphold the principles of the Universal Declaration. I make that pledge to you today.

Finally, I commend the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation for their efforts to teach a new generation of Americans that the future of human rights is in their hands. Eleanor Roosevelt understood that our greatest strength abroad was the power of our example at home, our commitment to work together, across the divides, to create one from many and opportunity for all.

I believe our Founding Fathers knew a long time ago that their dedication to form a more perfect Union was an intentional statement of the English language; that is, they knew that there would never be a perfect Union but that we would always have opportunities to make it more perfect in every age and time. And so let us here who are citizens of the United States honor this 50th anniversary by promising ourselves that we will always strive to make a more perfect Union here at home; to be a better model of liberty and justice; to be living proof to the cynics and the tyrants of the world that economic growth and constitutional democracy not only can go together but in the end must go together; to prove that diversity is not a source of weakness but a source of strength and joy; to prove that out of harmony of different views, there can be a coherence of loyalty to a nation stronger than anything that can ever be enforced from above.

America has its own challenges today. We have our hate crimes; we have continuing discrimination. But we also see across party lines and across the region broader support for the "Employment Non-Discrimination Act," a new determination to eliminate all last vestiges of discrimination against women, a genuine depth of popular interest in resolving the racial divides which continue to bedevil us, and a genuine interest and understanding in the increasing racial diversity that is shaping our country for the 21st century in ways that present not only racial but cultural and religious challenges and opportunities we have never known before.

There is plenty for us to do. And it is our responsibility to do it, to dedicate ourselves, in other words, to the eternal quest of a more perfect Union and the lasting goals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:55 p.m. in the Museum of Jewish Heritage. In his remarks, he referred to Gay J. McDougall, executive director, International Human Rights Law Group, and candidate for membership on the U.N. Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination; U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Bill Richardson; Robert M. Morgenthau and David Altshuler, chairman of the board and director of the museum; Ambassador Betty E. King, U.S. Representative to the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC); and Minister of Foreign Affairs Hennadiy Udovenko of Ukraine, U.N. General Assembly President.

Remarks to the Bronx Community in New York City

December 10, 1997

Thank you. Carmen was great, wasn't she? Let's give her another hand. [*Applause*] I thought she was great. Thank you. Thank you, Genny Brooks, for your vision and for your persistence. Thank you, Paul Grogan, for your vision and your persistence. The whole approach of LISC was years and years and years ahead of Government, and what we have essentially tried to do is to get all of our Government

policies to follow the model that LISC was based on all along, and we thank you.

I'd also like to acknowledge the presence here of three people from the city of New York who are very important now to the future of America: our brilliant HUD Secretary, Andrew Cuomo; the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, from Brooklyn, Aida Alvarez; and the Assistant to the President for Public Liaison—I don't know where she is, but she's from the Bronx—Maria Echaveste. Where are you, Maria? Thank you.

I also want to join in congratulating my good friend, your borough president, Freddy Ferrer, on Bronx being an All-American City. Stand up. [*Applause*] Thank you. I want to thank the deputy mayor for being here, and Senator Rosado and Assemblyman Diaz and the other members of the assembly and city council who are here. I'd like to thank the Boys and Girls Club—the boys and girls of Clara Barton School. I think they made this for me, and it's quite beautiful, isn't it? [*Applause*] And I thank the Madison Square Boys and Girls Club for hosting us. I want to thank all the financial institutions who have helped, who were mentioned earlier. I understand that Frank Duma, the chairman of Bankers Trust, and Walter Shipley, the chairman and CEO of Chase Manhattan, are here.

I'd also like to say—you know, I got my little tour of Charlotte Street on the way up here and it was—to show you what a small world it is, it was given to me by the current president of the Mid-Bronx Desperadoes, Ralph Porter. And I want you to know that—to show you what a small place this is, he will probably have to testify about this now—[*laughter*]—we grew up in the same town in Arkansas, and his wife worked with my mother for many years in the hospital there. And when he came here, he decided to pitch in—instead of walk away—like the rest of you. And I appreciate that, what all of you have done.

Let me say, more than anything else I want to begin by thanking the people of the Bronx not only for the example you have set here but for the support that you have given to me and to the First Lady and to the Vice President so that we can continue to work to try to make this example real in the lives of people all over this city, all over this country, because my one message here is: Look at where the Bronx was when President Carter came here in despair. Look at where the Bronx was when President Reagan came here and compared it to London in the Blitz. And look at the Bronx today. If you can do it, everybody else can do it. And we are determined to see that it be done.

What we have got to do is to take what you have shown us works and help more neighborhoods all across America do it. And we have seen that this did not happen by accident. It happened, first and foremost, because of visionary, committed, determined leadership at the local level—people who just wanted a good life. Citizen leaders like Genny, citizens like Carmen said, "This is not complicated; why shouldn't I be able to get married and have children in my hometown? Why shouldn't people be able to work there? Why shouldn't people be able to live in decent housing there? Why shouldn't our children be able to walk the streets there? Why shouldn't our children be able to go to decent schools there? Why? There is no reason why."

They started by asking the right questions. And over time, they got the right answers. This didn't happen in a year or two. No single person can claim credit for it. But over time, you got it right. Now we have to take what you have done here, show the before and after—if I could have any wish out of this, it is not that my speech would be reported tonight on the evening news or in the press tomorrow; I would just like one thing. I would like for every single American to see before and after. And they would know.

And then I would like for them to say, "How did this happen?" and tell your story. Because what I have tried to do relentlessly for 5 years is to reorganize the National Government, to reinvent and reinvigorate it so that we would be organized in a way that would support what you have done.

When I became President, I had been a Governor for 12 years in a State that had a lot of the same problems that the South Bronx had. We never had an unemployment rate under the national average the whole time I was Governor, for 10 years, until I started running for President and a lot of things we had been working on began to manifest themselves.

But I know what it does to people, good people, if they think they can't live in decent housing, in strong neighborhoods, and grownups can't get up and go to a job that makes them proud in the daytime, and the kids can't get up and go to a school that makes them proud

in the daytime, and they're scared going to and from work and school anyway. I know what that does to people, and it doesn't have to be that way.

And the debate that was going on in 1992 when I first came to the Bronx—and President Ferrer and I were reminiscing about it today—the debate that was going on in the country was a crazy debate. The debate was, one side said the Federal Government should do more just like we're doing it, give people money, but we know how in Washington they should live and what they ought to do, and put a lot of strings on it, have a lot of rules and regulations, set up a bureaucracy, and just pat people on the head and tell them we would take care of it. That didn't work very well. Then there were other people who said the Government has messed it up so much, the Government is the problem; if we would just get out of the way and go home, everything would be hunky-dory. No money—this is really not a money problem at all.

One of my rules of politics over more than 20 years has been, if you ever hear a politician say it's not a money problem, he's talking about somebody else's problem. [*Laughter*] Then when you see a politician interested in an issue, all of a sudden it becomes a money problem when he's interested in it, or she is.

I say that because that was a phony debate. You can't have Government in Washington dictating the solution; you can't have Government in Washington sitting on the sidelines. Government has to be a partner and has to get it right. And what is getting it right? Getting it right is saying, there is nothing we can do for you you won't do for yourselves, but if you're willing to do for yourselves, we will give you the tools and help to create the conditions so that you can have the power to change your own lives. That is the right message.

And that is what we are trying to do. And we've worked at it hard for 5 years. That's what we've tried to do with HUD under Secretary Cuomo. That's what we've tried to do with the SBA under Aida Alvarez. That's what we've tried to do with our whole approach to law enforcement. And it is producing results, not by creating programs that foster dependency and not by looking the other way but by giving people the tools to create their own lives through empowerment and investment.

Now, that's what Charlotte Gardens represents to me. That's the picture I want America to see; that's the message I want America to get. There is an urban renaissance occurring all across America today, but we know we need to do more. Unemployment is still higher in many inner-city neighborhoods than it is in the country as a whole. Only a small percentage of the new jobs which have been created in this last boom—nearly 14 million now—only a small percentage of them have come in the inner-city neighborhoods.

That's why we want more empowerment zones like the one we have in Manhattan and the South Bronx, and why we want more of them around the country, why we want more enterprise communities where if people will do what you've done here, we will give them more help.

And we're trying to do our part. We have reformed the Community Reinvestment Act, which basically says what guidelines there ought to be for reinvesting in areas that have been underinvested in; that brought $270 billion in commitments from financial institutions to help people in distressed areas improve their communities. This is a little-known action of the Federal Government, the way we've changed the Community Reinvestment Act. That act has been on the books for 20 years. Seventy percent of all the money loaned under the Community Reinvestment Act in 20 years has been loaned in the last 5 years—7 times as much, on an annual basis, as before. I am very proud of that. And that's just as important—in fact, it is more important than the public tax dollars coming in.

We have got to get the private sector to look at people like you all over America and say, this is an opportunity. If people are underemployed, if they're underhoused, if we are underinvesting in them, that's where America's growth can come. That's where America's future is. We don't have a person to waste. We don't have a community to waste. We're trying to get the unemployment down more and the growth up higher. Go look for the people who have growth potential. That's what happened here, and that's what we have to do everywhere else in America.

We're helping to fund community development financial institutions. That's a fancy term for community banks that loan money to people that otherwise might not be able to get loans

but are good risks and honorable people and have good ideas for businesses. Your country has spent lots of money setting up these kinds of banks all over the world—all over the world. We spent money to try to help poor village women in places like Bangladesh get loans—hundreds of thousands of them—and yet there have only been a few communities in America that have aggressively adopted this philosophy. If it's helping to revive people in countries that are a lot poorer than the South Bronx, then we ought to make those same kinds of institutions and that same kind of capital available to the American people to give them a chance to revive their fortunes.

Secretary Cuomo is modernizing HUD's Federal housing administration to make homeownership a reality. We now have two-thirds of the American people in their own homes for the first time in the history of the country, and we want to do better, and we can.

We did, as Genny said—one of the things that really has helped here is the low income housing tax credit. It gets people to invest for a tax credit to make housing more affordable and more available than it would otherwise be. Finally, in this last budget we made it permanent. You don't have to worry about whether Congress is going to do it now year-in and year-out. It is now a permanent part of the Tax Code, so that investors can know if they stake their future in neighborhoods like this one, that will be there. They know what the economic rules are and they don't have to worry about someone changing the rules in the middle of the game. And that has made a big difference as well.

One other thing I want to say—we also have to recognize that our country is going through a period of economic transition that every wealthy country in the world is facing, where there are relatively fewer low-skilled, good-wage jobs; relatively more low-skilled, low-wage jobs; but many more higher-skilled, high-wage jobs. Now, the most important thing we can do is to set up a system of lifetime training to give everybody access to continually improving their skills.

I live in Washington, DC. It breaks my heart when I drive around what is now my hometown and I see people who don't have work, and then I pick up the newspaper and read that in every county around Washington, DC, there is a vast shortage of technical workers. And businesses are constrained in their growth because they can't hire people because there is not anybody available that knows what they need. So we need to do that. And in the meanwhile, we need to do what we can to improve the incomes of people who are working hard every day and doing their best.

That's why we raised the minimum wage; that's why we lowered income taxes on working families with incomes below $30,000 and we doubled the earned-income tax credit—it amounts to about $1,000 a year, a family, for a family with two kids with an income of under $30,000. That's why we are doing what we can to expand health insurance to 5 million uninsured children in the last balanced budget bill, and why we provided a $500-a-year tax credit per child to help working families on modest incomes actually raise their incomes by having the Government take less and provide more help to them for their children's health care. These things are important.

In the welfare reform bill—now, we had the welfare rolls go down by 3.8 million, but we left people with the guarantee of health care and nutrition for their kids, more money for child care. And now we've provided $3 billion to cities like New York to try to make sure that there are public funds available for work for people if they're required to go to work and there are no private sector jobs.

All this is to help people through a transition, but the goal is to have everybody living in a place like this place, with a job and a neighborhood and a house and a school you can be proud of.

Finally, let me say—I was so glad to hear it mentioned earlier by Mr. Grogan—we can't get investments in the places that people don't think are safe. You cannot get people to invest money if people don't think it's safe. I'm trying to get people—I'm trying to make peace in the Middle East. You know, I've spent a lot of time on it. And you can't make—in the end there won't be any peace if those people don't have something to do. And 5 years ago, or over 4 years ago, I assembled 600 Arab-American and Jewish-American business people that said, "We will invest there when it's safe." Because there is no point in putting money in if it won't produce any result. Everyone understands that in the context of foreign policy. We must understand that here at home.

That's why we have—again, our whole law enforcement policy is a community empowerment policy. The crime bill we passed in 1994, in effect, was written by police officers and community leaders and prosecutors and others who said this is what we can do to lower the crime rate: put 100,000 more police on the street; give the kids something to do after school, give them something to do to stay out of trouble; take assault weapons off the street; don't sell guns to people with a criminal record. And we've had 5 years of declining crime in the country as a whole, the lowest crime rate in 24 years in the United States.

It has to be that way in every neighborhood. The lower you get the crime rate, the higher the investment will be, the more jobs there will be, the more opportunity there will be. I say that because we still have work to do. There are still too many of our kids getting in trouble. And I won't rest until we know that every single child has someplace to go and something positive to do when they get out of school. Most of the juvenile crime occurs after school.

Now, we have more to do. Let me just say a few things that I can say today that will affect the people in this room and throughout this city. We are going to release $96 million to help create affordable housing here in New York through the Innovative Home Program, the same HUD program that helped to stimulate the revitalization we're celebrating today.

Second, Administrator Alvarez and the SBA have approved the Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation as the first certified development company in New York. Here's what that means. It means that over the next 5 years, the Bronx Overall Economic Development Company—or BOEDC, I guess, is the way you say it—will make $50 million worth of fixed-rate loans to small businesses in the Bronx to help them make the investments in building the machinery they need to succeed. Most of the new jobs in this country are being created by small business—$50 million coming into the Bronx to help these folks stay in business, hire more people, and grow the economy right here in your backyard.

The third thing I am doing is to put $45 million more in my next budget to expand the Community Development Financial Bank, so we can make more loans to individuals who can start their own businesses or hire people to create an economy where very often there isn't one.

And, finally, let me say I am very pleased that LISC and the Enterprise Foundation have gotten another $250 million in corporate investments to help build affordable housing in New York City over the next 3 years. Thank you all very much.

Now, what does all this mean? I'll say it one more time. There is nothing that can be done for any neighborhood that people will not do for themselves. But people who are willing to do for themselves deserve a hand up; they deserve a partner; they deserve a Government committed to giving them the tools they need to succeed. That's what empowerment is. A lot of people think it's a buzzword; it is not a buzzword. Come to the South Bronx if you want to see empowerment. Go down these streets if you want to see empowerment. Look at the Mid-Bronx Desperadoes if you want to see empowerment. That is what it means. It is not some funny word; it's about people taking control of their lives and building a better future for their children. That's what we're going to do together.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:47 a.m. at the Madison Square Boys and Girls Club. In his remarks, he referred to Charlotte Gardens resident Carmen Ceballo, who introduced the President; Genevieve Brooks, deputy president, Borough of the Bronx; Paul S. Grogan, president and chief executive officer, Local Initiatives Support Corp. (LISC); Deputy Mayor Randy M. Mastro of New York City; New York State Senator David Rosado; New York State Assemblyman Ruben Diaz, Jr.; and Ralph Porter, executive director, Mid-Bronx Desperadoes, a local community development corporation.

Remarks at a Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Dinner in New York City

December 10, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank Congressman Gephardt and Congressman Frost. Martin Frost is the most dogged person I know. Sometimes I show up at these events just to get him to stop calling me. [*Laughter*] Most of the time I show up because I want to be here.

I thank Congressmen Pallone and Engel and Congresswoman Maloney, and I think Congresswoman Lowey is here now. I thank them all for their wonderful leadership. Hello, Nita.

I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Andrew Cuomo, from New York, who is doing a brilliant job. And I want to talk more about that in a minute.

I thank my friend James Taylor for coming here to sing tonight. Two of the truly great evenings in my family's life together, our family life, have come in no small measure because of James Taylor. When we were vacationing on Martha's Vineyard, on two different occasions, we went sailing off Martha's Vineyard and James Taylor was a member of the crew. Now, it wasn't such a great thing watching him work the ropes and the sails, although that's truly impressive. But when we got to a calm sea, he sang for us, and with the stars out and the moon out and the water calm, it's something that none of us will ever forget. And it was a great gift we cannot repay, but we thank you for being a good man and a good friend and a good citizen of this country.

Let me try to explain very briefly what I think is going on in this country now and ask you to remember where we are now as compared with where we were in 1992. We had a stagnant economy, increasing inequality. We seemed to be drifting toward the future. And the operative philosophy in this country for 12 years had been that problems were to be talked about, but not very much was to be done about them; the deficit was to be decried, but it was okay if it got bigger—you just tried to blame the other person; and that, essentially, Government was the problem so it should sit on the sidelines.

Now, that was the governing philosophy. And for it we had to show a $290 billion deficit, a high unemployment rate, and nothing done to address 20 years of wage stagnation in the middle class, a growing underclass, and a lot of profound challenges caused by the globalization of the economy and the society.

Could we grow the economy and improve the environment? Could we take advantage of trade to get more new high-wage jobs in America and retrain people who were dislocated quickly enough? Could we deal with what I think is maybe the most prominently mentioned complaint I hear all the time, the conflict that families increasingly in all income levels make that they don't feel they can do right by their job and spend enough time with their children? In short, could we get the benefits of the world toward which we were moving and meet the challenges? It seemed to me that we certainly couldn't do that if we stayed with the economic policy, the social policy, or the philosophy of government that dominated the 12 years before I became President.

And today, before I came here, I had one of those days that reminded me of why, when I was a young man, I wanted to be in public service, because along with former Congressman Garcia, who is out here, and a number of others, I went back to the Bronx. And I went to those streets that were featured when Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan walked the streets of the Bronx, and President Carter said it was devastating, and President Reagan said it reminded him of London during the Blitz.

Today it reminds me of the American dream because of what people can do together when Government is neither a savior nor sitting on the sidelines but a constructive partner with community leaders who want to build strong families and strong communities and safe streets and good schools and a bright future. That's what I saw in the Bronx today. Everybody in New York ought to be proud of it, and it ought to basically reinforce your determination that you're doing the right thing here tonight because that's the kind of America we want to build in every neighborhood in this country.

Does it matter who's in the Congress? Does it matter how they vote? You bet it does. By

one vote in the Senate and one vote in the House—and the vote in the Senate was the Vice President's; as he always says, "Whenever I vote we win," because he only gets to vote in the case of a tie; if someday we lose, I'll be in trouble, sure enough—[*laughter*]—we passed an economic plan that had reduced the deficit 92 percent before the balanced budget bill was passed last year—nearly 14 million new jobs in our economy, the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years, and the lowest crime rate in 24 years.

Mr. Gephardt mentioned the crime bill. Does it matter? You bet it does. There were hardly any Republican votes for the crime bill. We had more in the House, I think, than the Senate in the end. Why? Because they did not want to offend people who said that we shouldn't keep assault weapons off the streets. There were people who said it wouldn't make any difference if we put another 100,000 police on the street, people who said it was a waste of your tax money for us to give children something to say yes to when they got out of school. But we know most juvenile crime is committed between 3 o'clock in the afternoon and 7 o'clock at night. Well, we got the lowest crime rate in 24 years. The Democrats were right, and those who fought them were wrong.

They said the economic plan would bring on a recession; it would be unfair; it was going to raise taxes on middle class people. They were wrong. We now have the evidence. You don't have to—this is not a matter of debate. And I would have to admit it if the reverse were true; I'd have to say I was wrong. Our position was right, and they were wrong. And I am tired of seeing them get rewarded at elections because they have more money or they can divide the American electorate in some better way. And you being here is going to give a chance to the American people to vote for the people who have been right about the last 5 years and who are right about America's future. And that's why you're here, and I'm glad to see you.

Now, let me give you another example: The air is cleaner; the water is cleaner; the food supply is safer; and there are fewer toxic waste dumps today than there were 5 years ago. And there is always a big debate—we had a huge debate. One of the reasons the Government got shut down in 1995 is that we Democrats thought we could continue to improve the economy and clean up the environment. And they said it was a nice thing to have a clean environment, but it was a burdensome economic impediment, and it was an ugly big old Government on everybody's shoulders.

Well, we have evidence now. This is no longer subject to serious debate. What is the subject of debate, what we should be debating is, what is the best way to combat global warming; what is the most efficient way to clean up these toxic waste dumps; what is the most health-conscious way to guarantee the safety of a food supply that inevitably will have more imported food? That's a debate worth having.

But to debate whether it is right to protect the integrity of the environment and to improve it and grow the economy—that debate is over. Our side has been proved right. We have 5 years of clear evidence. And I would like to see people who are committed to environmental protection and responsible growth voted into the House of Representatives next year. That's why I'm glad you're here, and I hope you will follow James Taylor and help us to do that. This is not a subject of debate.

We passed the family and medical leave law. There were a lot of Republicans who voted for that—I'll give them credit for that—far more Democrats. My predecessor had vetoed it twice. Why? Because their theology said—their theology said it's a nice thing if people can spend a little time with their new-born babies or if someone in their family gets sick, but we couldn't think of requiring it because it would hurt the economy and the economy is always the most important thing.

We said the most important thing in any society is raising healthy children and keeping families together. And when you permit people to do the right thing when their parents are sick or their babies are born, you will make them stronger and healthier and happier, and they will be better in the workplace, and it will help the economy to do the right thing about the family unit.

Well, there's no longer subject to serious doubt—we passed the family and medical leave law. We've had study after study after study; hardly anybody affected by it has reported any problem with it. We were right. I think we should expand it. I think people ought to get time off to go to regular parent-teacher conferences at the school. I think people ought to get time off if they have to take a parent or a child to a regular doctor's appointment. I think the more we can help people balance

family and work, the better off we're going to be. And I think the evidence is clear.

Now, let me move to—there is a second category of issues where Democrats and Republicans have voted for and against certain bills. I'd like to talk about them because you can also see what matters there.

You look at this balanced budget bill. It's got the biggest increase in health care for children since 1965. We're going to get enough money to insure 5 million more children. Does anybody doubt which party in the bipartisan coalition in that balanced budget bill contributed that? This balanced budget bill contains the biggest increase in help for people that go on to college in 50 years, since the GI bill passed, a $1,500-a-year tax credit for the first 2 years of college, tax credits for the third and fourth years, for graduate schools, for workers who have to go back and get retraining. Does anybody doubt which party contributed that? Finishing our determination to double the amount of job training money we're giving to people who are dislocated or underemployed over the last 5 years—does anybody doubt which party contributed that? It matters. And we have been right about these issues. That's why I'm here.

We were right to take on the NRA. Even though they took some of our Members out, the light of American history will shine brightly on them.

We were right to take on the tobacco issue because it's the biggest public health problem in America, and it's illegal for kids to do. And if we get a bill out of the Congress that's a bipartisan bill, just remember, we ought to give credit to everybody who votes for it, Republican or Democrat, if it's a good bill—but remember how it got started. It never would have happened without the progressive party in this country taking it on.

And finally let me say, there are lots of challenges in the future like that. I think we ought to have a health care bill of rights. We put a commission together, a quality health care commission. More and more people in managed care plans—I think on balance they've done a lot more good than harm. But the more you lose control over your own life, the more you want to know you've got some protection, some recourse, some guarantee. It's not just the cost, it's the quality and availability of health care that matter. So we put this coalition together, and we had health care providers and business people, employers, and consumers of health care on it. And they came up with this health care bill of rights.

The leader of the other party in the Senate says it's a terrible thing because it's too much of an imposition on the people who are running the programs. I disagree. Big choice: Who is right about the future? Are we right, or are they right? Whether we can pass it or not depends on the Members of Congress. And it will affect the lives of millions of people.

Once we get these 5 million kids insured, what about the other kids that don't have health insurance? What about all these people that work all their lives, and they have to take early retirement in companies, and they lose their health insurance, and they can't get into the Medicare program because they're not old enough? What's going to happen to them? There are lots of other challenges out there. You have to decide; who do you trust to meet these challenges?

Look at our schools. What's the next big challenge here? We've got to guarantee that all of our kids get a world-class education. The Democratic Party is firmly on record in favor of high standards, more investment, a national testing program—voluntary—to see if the kids are meeting these standards, and then opening the doors of college to every kid in this country. If you want young people not to be trapped in dead-end jobs, they have to be able to get education for a lifetime. Who do you trust to give education for a lifetime?

Now, the things that our friends in the Republican Party used to say about us—they used to say we couldn't manage the economy. Now we've got almost 14 billion new jobs and the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years. They used to say we couldn't be trusted on crime; we were soft on crime. We have the lowest crime rate in 24 years. And if our Democratic juvenile justice approach passes, it will be lower still.

They used to say we couldn't be trusted on welfare. Look at the welfare reform bill. A lot of Democrats voted against it; a lot of them voted for it. But you know what's in that bill? We did not give in to their determination to take away health care and nutrition from kids. We've got $4 billion more in there for child care and $3 billion to give to poor neighborhoods, where there aren't enough private jobs for able-bodied people to go to work. Which

party do you think made those contributions to that welfare reform bill?

These are important issues. They can't say that anymore. They used to say, well, we couldn't manage foreign policy, the national defense. This country is stronger and has made more contributions to peace and freedom and facing the security challenges of tomorrow than it was 5 years ago.

So I say to you, we have a party we are proud of. And we are not ashamed that it is more progressive, that we believe we are one Nation, that we believe we have to come together across all the lines that divide us, that we believe in things like AmeriCorps and citizen service and people getting together and what I saw in the Bronx today. And if you want more of that, if you like what's happened in the last 5 years and you want more of it, you give me a few more of these folks, and you'll have it.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:20 p.m. in the Empire Room at the Waldorf Astoria. In his remarks, he referred to singer James Taylor and former Representative Robert Garcia of New York.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Hispanic Dinner in New York City

December 10, 1997

Thank you. I was—please, sit down—I was sitting over there when Hillary was talking, thinking how grateful I am that she wrote that wonderful book, "It Takes A Village," and how many copies it sold and how it embodies what we believe in. And then I was thinking that after we leave the White House, she could write another book and sell even more copies if the subject of the book was "all the things I wish I could have said all the times I introduced my husband." [*Laughter*] Thank you once more for refraining. [*Laughter*] Let me say to all of you—some nights she kind of—she says, "Here's Bill," or who knows. [*Laughter*]

I am profoundly honored to be here tonight. This is a very special night. Hillary and I both wanted to be here. I thank the members of the Cabinet and the administration who are here that have been introduced for the work they have done, as well as for their presence here. I thank the Members of Congress who are here. I thank the Lieutenant Governor and the public advocate and the other officials from New York City and from the boroughs who are here. I thank Miguel and Marife and Dennis and the other leaders of this dinner.

This is truly an historic event, because the Latino business and labor communities have come together as never before to support the Democratic Party. And for that we are grateful. This is a fitting way for me to end the day because I started my day today in New York in the Bronx and in that borough with the highest percentage of Latinos. And I was standing on the very spot where, over 20 years ago, President Carter bemoaned the condition of the Bronx and said he would try to help; and then when President Reagan, nearly 20 years ago, said it reminded him of London during the Blitz in World War II.

Today it reminds you of any other thriving, successful, middle-class neighborhood, with beautiful homes and well-kept sidewalks and streets, and a beautiful school in the background, and enthusiastic, exuberant children, because of what people have done over the last several years together. I want to thank, in particular, Secretary Cuomo for the work that he has done in the last several years that he has been at HUD to try to help make this happen.

But if you think about what we have been about, trying to prepare this country for the 21st century, and you ask yourself, "Why am I a Democrat; why am I doing this?" I think you have to answer, first of all, because I don't buy the argument that was made by the other side for the 12 years before we came in that Government is the problem, it is inherently bad, and if we just got rid of it and it sat on the sidelines, everything would be hunky-dory—that's not true. Neither is it true that we can go back to the time when Government handed

down edicts from Washington. Government should be a partner with people in their local communities working together. That's our philosophy.

Our philosophy is, the role of the National Government in our domestic life is to create the conditions and give people the tools to make their own lives, to build successful careers and families and communities, and make those streets safe and give people a chance to do the things that I saw done in the Bronx today. And it was exhilarating. I was walking down that street, and I thought, this is why I ran for public office the first time, and this is why I ran for public office the last time. This is public service at its best, grassroots people working with national policy together, public and private sectors. And it was a truly thrilling moment.

And I think of all the communities in America, the Latino community knows best that people should never ask Government to do something for them that they can do for themselves; nor can Government ever pretend to replace the strength and joys of family life or the integrity of work life. But neither can people who are struggling to make the most of their own lives be denied a hand up when it's important to give it to them. That's what we stand for.

The other thing that I think we stand for that is unique now is that we really like the fact that we're so different from each other. We like the fact that America has so much diversity. We think in a global economy, in a global society where we have to cooperate with all different kinds of people and do business with all different kinds of people, it is a great thing. And we think that if you're a good, upstanding citizen who obeys the law and pays your taxes and if you're grown you go to work and if you're a kid you go to school and if you're—through no fault of your own—in trouble, you get help—we think that we're all part of the *familia.* That's the difference. And I'm proud to be on that side of the divide in America. I want every American to have a chance to be a part of our future. I feel good about that, and I want you to feel good about that.

There are other differences as well. We had a different view about economic policy. We tried trickle-down economics for 12 years, and we had a $290 billion deficit, enormous interest rates, a high unemployment rate. Then we set about balancing the budget, and before the last balanced budget bill was passed in a bipartisan way, the Democrats-only budget passed in 1993 had succeeded in reducing the deficit by 92 percent, driving interest rates down. We have now almost 14 million new jobs and the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years. I think invest-and-grow is better than trickle-down. I think we are right with our economic policy.

We changed the crime policy. The crime policy of the National Government, as near as I could tell, was either to do nothing but talk tough, or to talk tough and say we need to lock them up and throw away the key. We said, "How about stopping crime in the first place? Let's put more police on the street. Let's take assault weapons off the street. Let's not let people who have got criminal records have handguns. Let's give some money so that communities can give kids something to say yes to in the first place." We've got the lowest crime rate in 24 years. I think our crime policy is better. It works. People support it at the grassroots level.

We have different views about the environment. We believe we can grow the economy while we improve the environment. We've cleaned up more toxic waste dumps in 4 years than they did in 12; we need to do some more. We've got a lot of serious environmental challenges. We're trying very hard. We've been working like crazy—and I want to thank the Vice President especially—we have been working so hard for the last several weeks, and especially in the last few days, to reach agreement at the international conference in Kyoto on climate change, to try to find a way to drive down our emission of greenhouse gases here, drive down the world's emissions of greenhouse gases, and still grow the economy. We Democrats, we believe we can do that. We believe we can do that.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle, if there is the slightest question, they say, "I'm sorry, it would be nice to have a good environment, but we've got to go for the economy. We can't afford to burden it." If you look at the high-technology world in which we're living, we're going to create more new jobs if we commit ourselves to cleaning the environment in the proper way. We will explore new technologies. We will create new businesses. And more important, we will fulfill our moral obligation to leave our children and our grandchildren a planet upon which they can live in peace with one another, because of the resources that

are left. I think the Democrats are right about that, and I am proud to be a part of that.

I believe that we were right to stand up for family and medical leave. I believe we were right to give a tax cut to the lowest income families with children. I believe we were right to raise the minimum wage. I believe we should do more of that. We should help to do more to help people reconcile the demands of work and family. I believe we were right to try to provide access to health care to all Americans, and I'm proud of the fact that we're going to cover 5 million children. I'm proud of the fact that it's now against the law to take somebody's health insurance away from them just because they change jobs or somebody in their family gets sick. And I want to pass the consumers' bill of rights in health care, because I think as more and more people are insured by health maintenance organizations, they at least have a right to know that they'll know what's going on, that they can have access to the best professional opinions, and that they can get quality as well as access to health care. And I think the Democrats are more likely to provide that. I'm proud to be on that side of the divide, and I hope all of you are as well.

And let me just mention one other thing. I want more than I can convey to you to see every neighborhood in every distressed area of America look like the neighborhood I walked through in the Bronx today. I want every child to be able to have access to world-class education. I want every adult who loses his or her job or can never get a raise because they're not so competitive in the global economy to be able to go back and get further training.

And I'm proud of the fact that in the last year we put more money into education than had been put in since 1965 at the national level, that we did more to help people go to college than we've done in 50 years. I think you can really say we've opened the doors of college to all Americans, with a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college and tax credits for the other years and help for people who have to go back after they've been working a while, and more Pell grants and more work-study positions and more national service positions. I'm proud of all that.

But we've got a lot more work to do. You know as well as I do that you cannot stand here and look at me in the eye and tell me that every child in every community represented in this room is getting a world-class education. You know that it's going to provide new challenges to us—you know, we have this sort of bilingual debate going on around the country now. Do I want every child in America to be able to speak English and read English and learn in English? You bet I do. Do I think they should have to quit learning anything while they do? No, I don't. That's why I support bilingual education, because I think that we ought to have both.

But the Latino community now has got to go out and tell America, this is not a Latino-Anglo issue anymore. You know how many languages are spoken by the kids in the school district nearest me across the river—across the Potomac River in Virginia? One hundred languages. Now, our party has got to lead the way toward high standards and access and opportunity. We've got to lead the way. We've got to give every single one of those children a way to find their way into a 21st century America where they can be winners. And that's just one of the many challenges we're going to face.

So I say to you, our record in the last 5 years is good; I'm proud of that. Our record in the years ahead can be better if we continue to build on the strengths of the last few years.

I want to thank the Lieutenant Governor for joining the Democratic Party, and congratulate Judith Hope—and I want to congratulate Judith Hope, the chair of the New York party, and all the other Democrats here. They picked up over 200 local seats in the elections of 1997 in the State of New York. Fine. Because I think people do believe Government ought to give people the tools to make the most of their own lives and not sit on the sidelines. And they know that we're not yesterday's Government; we represent something different. Why? Because I think people do want us all to be one family. I think they think everybody that obeys the law and does their job deserves to be treated with dignity and equality in this country. And that's the last thing I want to say.

I have done my best—maybe because I grew up in the segregated South and I saw all the dark side of people not getting along and working together, but when I say that I want us to be one America, in the end that's the most important thing of all. My work here will be over in 3 years. And I'm doing the best I can to deal—like we've got a Medicare commission

now. We want to deal with the long-term problems of Medicare so we can secure Medicare without overburdening our children and grandchildren. I will do everything I can to solve every big problem that I can that I think will load up America for the next 25 or 30 years. But I will not be able to completely foresee the future. No one can.

One thing I know, this country is still around here after 220 years because every time we faced a real challenge, we pulled together and somehow we found the strength, the courage, the wisdom, the determination to do the right thing.

Now we're going to become more diverse than ever before. That's what this race initiative is all about. California, our biggest State, will soon have no majority race. People of European heritage will not be in a majority. Sometime in the next century, probably in the first half of it, that will become true of America. We have many other differences as well. And I'd just like to emphasize that this race initiative of mine is basically about three things.

First of all, we've taken a few licks about talking, but it's about talking. Why? Because people are both fascinated by and afraid of people who are different from them when they haven't had contact and they don't understand each other, and we've got to have a community process in every neighborhood in this country for people to talk together across the lines that divide them.

Secondly, it's about enforcing the laws against discrimination. A lot of you have stood up with me to support the idea that Bill Lann Lee ought to be head of the Civil Rights Division. I thank you, those of you who have done that. I must tell you, when I appointed him and I saw what an even-tempered man he was and what a fine record he had and how he was a Chinese immigrant's son from Harlem who then lived in Los Angeles and spent his whole life trying to keep people from being discriminated against, I thought, now, there is no way in the wide world anybody could vote against this guy. [*Laughter*] He has one totally disqualifying characteristic: He agrees with his President about affirmative action. I find that very curious that I'm being told that I can appoint anybody I want into the Civil Rights Division unless they agree with me. [*Laughter*] I thought we had an election about that.

Now, if my position was not to enforce the law, not to recognize the restrictions on affirmative action the Supreme Court has imposed upon it, that would be one thing. That is not my position. I will vigorously honor the law—the letter and spirit of the law. But that's—the thing that bothers me is that we have not obliterated all discrimination in housing. Secretary Cuomo is working day and night to try to deal with legitimate and severe claims of discrimination in housing. We haven't eliminated all discrimination in the work force. We haven't eliminated all discrimination in education. And virtually 100 percent of the American people, without regard to party, agree that what is illegal should be illegal and that the law should be enforced.

So I wanted somebody who had lived a lifetime in this, who also was committed to getting people together and changing the environment so we don't have to have so many of those kinds of problems lead that division. And I still think he deserves the job. And I thank all of you who stood with him.

The last thing that this "One America" race initiative is about is finding ways that we can work together across racial lines that will, by definition, obliterate a lot of the problems we have today. And I can tell you that there are three that dwarf all others: the more we learn together, the more we work together, and the more we serve our communities together across lines that divide us, the more likely we are to build that kind of one America.

That's why I'm so grateful we've got 800 colleges with their students working in our schools to teach children to read independently by the third grade. That's why we're working very hard on an initiative to reduce the Hispanic dropout rate, and a lot of you in business can help us with this. We now have almost no difference in America in the high school graduation rate between Anglos and African-Americans—it's a stunning statistic—almost none. There is still a big gap between both of them and Latinos. And I am convinced it is because so many Latin Americans come here as first generation immigrants, and they want to get out there and go to work and support their parents and support their children and do the responsible thing. And historically that's worked, but we're now living in a world where people who don't have a high school education are going to suffer dropping

earnings in the workforce; they won't even be able to hold their own.

So we have got to find ways to make it possible for our first generation Latin American children, no matter how difficult their circumstances at home, to stay in school and to go on to college and to get the message that that is now the responsible thing to do for their families because we don't want them stuck in a place where they can't have a future. And you've got to help us with that.

So I say again, let's work on this and be proud that you're here. And know this, too, I want you to be involved in the life of this country and the life of this administration and the life of this party in a positive way, with your ideas and your experience. We're grateful for your contributions, but your contributions should also include not just a check but your knowledge and your experience and what you can do to prepare this country to go forward as one America with opportunity for everybody, with responsibility from everybody; coming together, not drifting apart; leading the world for peace and freedom. That's what I'm working for, and tonight you have helped to make that more possible.

And let me just say, finally—this is the last thing I want to say—all my life I wanted to dance with Rita Moreno—[*laughter*]—all my life. And it only lasted 30 seconds, but it was worth the trip.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:05 p.m. at the Rainbow Room. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gov. Betsy McCaughey Ross of New York; Mark Green, New York City Public Advocate; Miguel Lausel, Marife Hernandez, and Dennis Rivera, event chairs; Judith Hope, State Democratic chair; and actress Rita Moreno.

Remarks on the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change and an Exchange With Reporters in New York City

December 10, 1997

The President. I'm sorry about the rain. I'll make this brief, but I want to take a moment before I leave to comment on the outcome of the climate change negotiations that have just been completed in Japan.

I am very pleased that the United States has reached a truly historic agreement with other nations of the world to take unprecedented steps to address the global problem of climate change. The agreement is environmentally strong and economically sound. It reflects a commitment by our generation to act in the interests of future generations.

The United States delegation, at the direction of the Vice President and with the very, very skilled leadership of Under Secretary of State Stu Eizenstat, showed the way. The momentum generated by the Vice President's visit helped to move the negotiations, and I thank him very much.

I'm particularly pleased that the agreement strongly reflects the commitment of the United States to use the tools of the free market to tackle this problem.

There are still hard challenges ahead, especially in the area of involvement by the developing nations. It's essential that they participate in a meaningful way if we are to truly tackle this problem. But the joint implementation provisions of the agreement open the way to that result. The industrialized nations have come together and taken a strong step, and that is real progress.

Finally, I cannot say enough about the extraordinary leadership of Prime Minister Hashimoto. The people of Japan should be very proud of the spirit and the work that their country's leaders did to make this historic day possible.

Thank you very much.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. No. No. And the agreement we made is actually, because of the way the details are worked out and what counts against the total, even though we have committed to a 7 percent reduction, it's actually closer to our original position than that indicates. We will make some reduction. I think we can.

We got what we wanted, which is joint implementation, emissions trading, a market-oriented approach. I wish it were a little stronger on developing nations' participation. But we opened the way, the only way we can get there, through joint implementation of projects in those countries.

This is a very good agreement. It is going to be possible for us to do this and grow our economy. It is environmentally sound. It's a huge first step. And I did not dream when we started that we could get this far. We should be very, very proud of this.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 p.m. at John F. Kennedy International Airport prior to his departure for Miami, FL. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan. The Kyoto Protocol to the Framework Convention on Climate Change was agreed upon at the Third Session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, held in Kyoto, Japan, December 1–10.

Statement on the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change
December 10, 1997

I am very pleased that the United States has reached an historic agreement with other nations of the world to take unprecedented action to address global warming. This agreement is environmentally strong and economically sound. It reflects a commitment by our generation to act in the interests of future generations.

No nation is more committed to this effort than the United States. In Kyoto, our mission was to persuade other nations to find common ground so we could make realistic and achievable commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. That mission was accomplished. The United States delegation, at the direction of Vice President Gore and with the skilled leadership of Under Secretary Stuart Eizenstat, showed the way. The momentum generated by Vice President Gore's visit helped move the negotiation to a successful conclusion, and I thank him.

I am particularly pleased the agreement strongly reflects the commitment of the United States to use the tools of the free market to tackle this difficult problem.

There are still hard challenges ahead, particularly in the area of involvement by developing nations. It is essential that these nations participate in a meaningful way if we are to truly tackle this global environmental challenge. But the industrialized nations have come together, taken a strong step, and that is real progress.

Finally, let me thank Prime Minister Hashimoto and the people of Japan for their spirit and dedication to the task.

Presidential Citizens Medal Citation for Elinor Guggenheimer
December 10, 1997

For the past 50 years, Elinor Guggenheimer has been a tenacious and effective champion on behalf of America's children. She began her crusade by persuading New York City to assume funding of Federal day care centers following World War II. Later, as founding President of the Child Care Action Campaign, she helped to elevate day care to a national concern. Throughout a lifetime of service, she has expanded the focus of her advocacy and generously lent her talents to issues that confront seniors, women, and consumers. Elly Guggenheimer's indomitable spirit and extraordinary efforts to improve the lives of her fellow citizens have helped to illuminate our common path to a better America.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: The First Lady presented the Presidential Citizens Medal to Elinor Guggenheimer in New York City on behalf of the President. An original was not available for verification of this citation.

Remarks to the Coast Guard in Miami, Florida
December 11, 1997

Thank you very much, Lieutenant Britton, for your service and for that very thorough account of your activities. I hope that none of the Coast Guard will ever have to engage in ice-breaking in this area. [*Laughter*]

Admiral Kramek, Admiral Saunders, Admiral Rufe, the men and women of the Coast Guard; Secretary Slater, thank you for your remarks and your work. General McCaffrey, thank you for the extraordinary job you have done in such a short time in focusing our Nation's attention on the drug problem and, even more importantly, coming up with a strategy with which to approach it, a strategy that is beginning to show significant results.

Acting Customs Commissioner Banks, SOUTHCOM Commander General Wilhelm—I noticed that a lot of people laughed, General, when General McCaffrey said that you had a higher intellect than your two predecessors. One of them was General McCaffrey—I can understand him putting himself down—[*laughter*]—I don't know what General Clark thinks about it. [*Laughter*]

Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Congressman Lincoln Diaz-Balart, and my good friend Lieutenant Governor MacKay, thank you all for being here and for the support that you give to the United States in the work we have to do here to deal with the drug problem. Thank all of you for coming. I see a lot of my friends out in the audience, including State Senator Daryl Jones—I'm glad to see you. And of all the men and women of the Coast Guard here, I can't help noticing that my immediate past Coast Guard military aide is now a deputy group commander in St. Petersburg, Lieutenant Commander June Ryan, and I'm glad to see her over there with General Wilhelm, earning an honest living for a change after escaping the political life of Washington. [*Laughter*]

Before I get into my remarks about what you're doing here, Lieutenant Britton mentioned the fact that the Coast Guard is not involved in ice-breaking, but with El Niño, who knows. [*Laughter*] Now, we all laughed about that, but the truth is, as many of you know better than most of our fellow country men and women, there is an enormous body of evidence that the climate of the Earth is warming at a more rapid rate than at any time in the last 10,000 years. Many, many scientists believe in the next 100 years the climate will go—the average temperature will go up someplace between 2 and 6 degrees. To give you some idea of what the consequences of that kind of change were in the last Ice Age, 10,000 years ago, the average climate—average—climate temperature was only about 9 degrees lower than it is now.

If it were to happen that we had a significant increase in temperature within a brief period, huge lowland areas in the United States, including big portions of south Florida, and island nations in the Pacific could be completely flooded. That is why the nations of the world have been meeting in Japan to try to find a way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, to reduce global warming in a way that permits us to continue to grow our economies and work together in a responsible way.

Yesterday, at the eleventh hour, the nations reached an agreement. I think it's of great relevance, especially to south Florida. It is environmentally strong, and it's economically sound. There's still a lot of challenges ahead. I believe we have to get the developing countries more involved because this is a global problem, not an American problem or a rich country problem. But this is a huge first step.

And I would urge all of you—I see already the papers are full of people saying, "The sky is falling; the sky is falling. It's a terrible thing." Every time we've tried to improve the American environment in the last 25 or 30 years, somebody has predicted that it would wreck the economy. And the air is cleaner, the water is cleaner, the food supply is safer, there are fewer toxic waste dumps, and the last time I checked,

we had the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years. So don't believe the skeptics. Give us a chance to make the case. And I just don't want the Coast Guard to be out there riding on any higher seas than we have already. And I think it's the right thing to do.

Let me also say that I want to express sincere thanks to all the people in the Coast Guard who do this work. I thank the crew of the Cutter *Chandeleur* for the tour I just got. I had the chance to see some of the new technologies that are making a tough job just a little easier and making smugglers' lives quite a bit harder.

For the last 5 years, we have been moving this country toward the 21st century, with a vision to provide opportunity for everyone responsible enough to work for it, to maintain our leadership in the world, and to pull our increasingly diverse people closer together. That has required us to have an aggressive view of what the National Government's role is, but a very different one, not that we could sit on the sidelines or that we could solve all the problems but that we had a sharpened responsibility to create the conditions and give people the tools to solve their own problems and make the most of their own lives.

Our economy is the healthiest in a generation. Our world leadership is strong. We're making headway across a whole range of social problems. Crime is at its lowest rate in 24 years. We've had a record drop in people on the welfare rolls, moving into the workplace. But surely we cannot meet all the challenges facing the American people unless we can break the deadly grip of crime related to drugs, and drug dependence itself, on our people especially and on our communities across the country.

I've come to Causeway Island today because I want America to know that off the coast of Florida you are waging a battle for America's future and America's children. The ammo is live, the dangers are real, and I want America to know you are making a big difference.

Almost 2 years ago, General McCaffrey and I came with the Attorney General to Miami to launch a comprehensive antidrug strategy for the Nation, a commonsense plan to address an uncommonly complex problem: prevention to keep children from turning to drugs, treatment to help break the cycle of addiction and crime, interdiction to reduce the flow of drugs, law enforcement to break up the sources of supply, and the largest counterdrug budget in history to back it up.

Thanks in no small measure to heroic efforts on the high seas, in the air, and along our borders, the strategy is starting to show promising results. In the areas of interdiction, the Coast Guard and its partners have just completed a banner year, increasing arrests of traffickers by 1,000 percent and seizures of cocaine by 300 percent. You've been true to your motto, *Semper Paratus,* and I know you're too modest to do it, but I think all the rest of us—and you can join in if you like—should give the United States Coast Guard a big hand for a remarkable year. [*Applause*]

I also want to congratulate the Customs Service on its success, particularly the drug seizure off the coast of Miami earlier this week. It's a feat worthy of one of these television movies—one officer, Senior Special Agent Joe Goulet, who is here with us today—stand up. Where are you? [*Applause*] Now, listen to this. You did not see this in a technologically altered movie. This happened. He singlehandedly pulled alongside a drug-running vessel cutting through the waves at 20 miles an hour, disabled the vessel, and dove back into his own vessel before it raced away. I can't tie my shoes that fast. [*Laughter*] With the help of Coast Guard personnel and air support, he and his fellow Customs officers seized more than 2,000 pounds of cocaine, the 10th major seizure in south Florida in the last 6 weeks alone.

This is an impressive record. But we know we must do more because the drug cartels will do more; after all, there's a lot of money in this. So we're already deploying new technologies, increasing the Customs budget, doubling the number of Border Patrol agents along the Southwest border. And today I'm committing another $73 million to the Defense Department's $800 million counternarcotics budget to help support the interdiction efforts in Latin America and the Caribbean. I want to especially thank the Secretary of Defense, Bill Cohen, for his leadership on these initiatives and to thank our Armed Forces leaders for their continuing dedication to this part of America's security mission.

As General McCaffrey said, in all this we'll have to continue to work even more closely with our neighbors and our allies across the hemisphere. Mexico will soon launch with us our first joint counterdrug strategy. This spring we'll

be with all the democracies in Latin America and the Caribbean at the Summit of the Americas in Chile, where we will do our best to build a true hemispheric alliance against drugs.

We'll also continue to work as we work to protect our borders, with law enforcement on the streets of America, targeting gang violence associated with drugs, helping people to adopt the kinds of strategies that where adopted have led to dramatic drops in drug trafficking and violence. I can just tell you, to cite one example, it has now been more than 2 years since a single child has been killed by a gun on the streets of the city of Boston, Massachusetts—more than 2 years in one of our largest American cities. If we can do that in one city, we ought to be able to do that in every city, and we owe our children and their future no less.

The one thing General McCaffrey recognized not long after he took office is that we can spend all the money in the world on interdiction, we can spend all the money in the world on law enforcement, we can spend all the money in the world even on preventive strategies, but somehow, some way, our children have to decide that we will stop becoming the world's largest consumer of drugs. If we have 4 percent of the world's population and we consume nearly half the drugs, we're going to have trouble. There will be big money in it, and we'll have to put big money and enormous resources and the lives of our finest young people in uniform against the effort. We have got to change the culture in America which has so many of our young people becoming willing drug users. The numbers are encouraging. They're going down, but they're still far too large.

A lot of this has to be done by people who deal with our young people one on one, starting with their parents. But Government can help. I want to applaud General McCaffrey for having the guts to go to Congress and ask them to give us $195 million for a media campaign next month. Every other serious endeavor in the United States is accompanied by a media campaign. But when we decided to ask for this, a lot of people thought we had slipped a gasket, because it made General McCaffrey and the whole effort so subject to cheap political attack. But in fairness to the Members of Congress, there was very little of it. And everyone understood that this was not a Democratic or a Republican issue, this was an American issue. And we had to reach our children however we could, whenever we could, in the best way that we could. So I thank you, General, for one more time risking a bullet for America's future.

I want to say, when these things start, I hope they will remind the parents, the teachers, the coaches, the religious leaders that they have to take the lead in making our children strong enough to take the right stands and turn away from drugs. This is not—this war on drugs, as it's often called, is somehow misleading, I think, in the sense that it's not an offensive against a single enemy conducted by a single army. Instead, it's more like one of Lieutenant Britton's hobbies. She just ran in a marathon race where there are lots of people running at different paces in different ways. Everyone that finishes ought to get a medal. And it requires strength and determination and conditioning and unbelievable patience. It requires also a certain courage never, never to stop in the face of the relentless obstacles ahead. That's what this is. We're making progress in this marathon. The Coast Guard is leading the way. But all of us have a role to play, and we better determine to play it if we expect the 21st century to be America's best years. That's what I expect, and I think you do, too.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:20 a.m. at the U.S. Coast Guard Station. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Megan Britton, USCG, Duty Officer, Seventh District Command Center; Adm. Robert E. Kramek, USCG, Coast Guard Commandant; Rear Adm. Norm Saunders, USCG, Commander, 7th Coast Guard District; Vice Adm. Roger T. Rufe, USCG, Commander, Atlantic Area; Gen. Charles E. Wilhelm, USMC, Commander in Chief, U.S. Southern Command; Gen. Wesley K. Clark, USA, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; and Lt. Gov. Buddy MacKay of Florida.

Remarks at a Luncheon for Gubernatorial Candidate Buddy MacKay in Miami

December 11, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. You all calm down now; we don't want to be too rowdy. [*Laughter*] You've got to save some of this for the spring and the summer and the fall, so that on election day you have maximum enthusiasm and energy for Buddy MacKay for Governor. I want you to do that.

Let me say, I am very honored to be here today. I want to thank so many people, but let me first say that Representative Kendrick Meek made such a good speech I thought the rest of us were going to be superfluous. Repetition is important, and he did it in a beautiful and eloquent way. And I thank him for his—for representing Florida's future so well.

I thank Attorney General Bob Butterworth for being my friend and for being with me for a long time and for his strong support of Lieutenant Governor MacKay. I thank Lawton Chiles for his great leadership of the State of Florida. He has done a wonderful, wonderful job. And he has helped me to be a better President, as well as to do a better job for the people of Florida. I will never forget it. And he showed us all 4 years ago how to win a tough election, and I haven't forgotten, Buddy MacKay hasn't forgotten, and all of you haven't forgotten. Let's bring our lessons to the table and push this thing forward next November. We can do it.

Thank you, Jim Pugh, and all the others who worked so hard to make this a success. And thank all of you for giving your contributions to Buddy MacKay. It is not easy to run a campaign, and they are not inexpensive. And normally our side is running against people who have more money than we do. But the important thing is not whether they have more, it's just whether we have enough. If our side has enough to get our message out, we'll be all right. And you've taken a major step in that direction today, and we are profoundly grateful to you.

Let me just take a couple of minutes of your time to tell you what I think this election is about and why I am here almost a year before. First of all, Florida is important to America. It's not only one of the biggest States in America, it represents every good thing that is going on as we hurtle into the 21st century and presents almost all the challenges our country faces as we move into the 21st century. Just think about it. You have a booming economy, and you have a gorgeous environment, and you have the conflict between the two. How are you going to preserve your natural resources? Can we restore the Everglades? Will there be enough water here 5, 10, 15, 20, 50 years from now?

Then you have a wonderfully diverse culture with people coming from every country in our hemisphere and increasingly from all over the world, and you have some of the conflicts that that occasions. We have people living together and working together; we also have the challenges of crime and welfare.

We have a place that people come to because they feel better and they feel healthier. And I can tell you, even though I didn't get here until after 2 o'clock last night, it still felt good when I got off the airplane after having stood in the snow in New York yesterday. So people come here because they feel good and they feel healthy, but you've got a whole lot of kids that don't have health insurance.

So you have the challenges and the joys and the opportunities of 21st century America writ large. It matters to America what happens in Florida. It matters to America whether Florida can meet its challenges and move forward together. That's the first thing.

The second thing I want to say is that what the previous speakers said about the leadership Florida has enjoyed under the Chiles-MacKay team was not just political luncheon rhetoric. This State is in better shape than it was 8 years ago. It has been very, very well led. And you should be very proud of that, and it matters who has these jobs.

It's also true that Lawton, as he said, and Buddy have had a remarkable partnership. And I did study up on the details a little when Al Gore and I took office, and the thing I liked the best was what Lawton said about—he got

to do the good stuff and the Lieutenant Governor got to do the bad stuff. I've tried to implement that at every turn in Washington—[*laughter*]—with mixed levels of success, I might add. But I've done my very best.

I do think, you know, that it's clear that the Vice President has had more influence and a wider range of activity by far than any Vice President in history, in no small measure because I believe that's the way we ought to work. We ought to make maximum use of the talents of all of the people who can serve. And I saw when I looked at Lawton Chiles and Buddy MacKay that it could work, and so I am indebted in that way as well.

Finally, let me say, just on a personal note, I'm here because in 1991, when I started to run for President and only my mother thought I had a chance to win—[*laughter*]—Buddy MacKay stood up and stood by me in the straw poll in Florida and stayed with me in the darkest hours of my campaign. And when all the experts said that Bill Clinton is dead, he will be a minor footnote in history, we have to get somebody—in every election—he's the one we got out this time—Buddy MacKay said, "I don't think so. I think I'll stay right there." And so I'm staying right here. I feel very good being here with my friend.

There's something to be said for that. You ask, what do you want in a Governor? You want charisma, you want eloquence, you want somebody that's worked a lifetime and produced something for you. One thing you want is somebody who will stick right there, just pure old-fashioned personal strength of conviction. And all I know is I have no doubt that if any one of you or your beloved State were in trouble, he'd be the last guy to abandon ship. And that's important. I know it because I have seen it, and it matters in a leader of a State or a nation. Now, anybody can rock along with you when the times are good or when the circumstances are comfortable or when there's just another nice little media event to do. It's quite another thing to stand there when the times are tough but the stakes are high. And you should be very proud of that.

Now, let me ask you this: What do you want in a Governor? What do you want? What do you want for your State? If I were to make the argument, I would say first of all, what we do works. And at some point, no matter how good our friends in the Republican Party are with their rhetoric, with their attacks, with their characterization, sometimes, sooner or later, results should be rewarded.

You know, when I ran for President, remember what this country was going—we had high unemployment, stagnation, drift, division. And they had been telling us for 12 years that the Government was the problem and they were going to get it out of our lives. Meanwhile, they had quadrupled the national debt, and the deficit was $290 billion a year. Crime was up; they didn't like it. Welfare was up; they didn't like it. They just didn't do anything about it.

And we said, consistent with, as the previous speakers have said, what we've tried to do with the Democratic Leadership Council, look, we don't think Government is the solution, but we don't think it's the problem either. We think it should be a partner. We don't believe Government can do everything, but neither do we want Government to go AWOL and sit on the sidelines. We believe the job of Government is to create the condition and give people the tools to solve their own problems, fulfill their own dreams, and make their communities in this country what it ought to be. That's what we stood for. And we said, look, we're going to have to do some things differently. If we want to restore the economy, rebuild the middle class, reclaim the future for our children, we have to do some things differently. We have to have different policies, policies that favor the future over the past, policies that help not just a few, and policies that unite us instead of policies that divide us for short-term political gain.

And so we have worked at that. And we have worked in partnership with your leaders here. And you heard Bob Butterworth say what the results were. We had a $290 billion deficit the day I took office; it was $22 billion this year. Ninety-two percent of the work was done by a Democratic economic plan before the last balanced budget passed. The lowest unemployment and the lowest crime rates in 24 years, and all we did on crime—does the Federal Government have anything to do with the crime rate? It depends on whether it's a good partner.

I'd heard all this talk all these years, but I was living out there in America like you. So I said, we're going to pass a crime bill that is, in effect, written by local prosecutors and police officers and community workers trying to save our kids. And that's why we said, let's put 100,000 police on the street; let's take the

assault weapons off the street; let's stop selling handguns to people with criminal records; and let's give our kids something to say yes to when they get out of school in the afternoon. And it's worked. It's worked.

In this last balanced budget bill, we got the biggest increase in investment for child health since 1965; it will help to insure 5 million people. But it will be done at the State level. Which Governor do you trust more to insure the largest number of people over the next 5, 6 years?

In this balanced budget bill, we've got the largest new investment in education since 1965 and a commitment to set higher standards and a commitment to accountability. And we opened the doors of college wider than we had in 50 years, since the GI bill passed. But the work of implementing these things has to be done at the State level. Who do you trust to stand up for opportunity and excellence and accountability in education and giving Florida the kind of schools you need for the 21st century? Buddy.

There are high stakes here. We have a good record; we have gotten results; we have done it by working together. Our theory of Government was right, and theirs was wrong. And you can see it in the evidence. But the most important thing is, look at Florida's future. You have to reconcile education opportunity as well as excellence in standards. You have to figure out how to continue to grow this economy, but you have got to stick up for the integrity of the Florida environment. Why have all these people moved here in the first place? Who do you trust to protect the environment of Florida for the 21st century?

Audience members. Buddy!

The President. So there are three issues: the environment, the economy, education and health care for children. And I can give you lots more. It is the nature of what we are trying to do in Washington to have a lot of this work actually done at the State and local level. If there is a partnership—and I'm trying to do what you want me to do, to set the direction for the country but not to try to direct the country, to set the direction, and then let people in their local communities solve their own problems—then the Governors of this country become more important than ever before.

So Florida is in better shape than it was. The ideas that we've espoused have been proved right. And he is the person you can best trust to deal with the challenges of the future. That sounds like a pretty good case to me, and if you go out there and make it for a year, I don't care what other arguments are made, I don't care how much money is brought into play against him, I don't care what other national political currents are supposed to be bearing down on Florida and who is trying to get this electoral bloc or that one—just ask the people of Florida to vote for their children and their future and forget about the politics, and Buddy MacKay will be the next Governor of Florida.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:27 p.m. at the Radisson Mart Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to State Representative Kendrick Meek; Gov. Lawton Chiles of Florida; and Jim Pugh, general chairman, MacKay Campaign for Governor.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Miami

December 11, 1997

Thank you very much. Well, thank you very much. Mr. Mayor, Mrs. Penelas, Lieutenant Governor MacKay, and to Chris and Gene and Mitch Berger—I thank all three of them for all the work they did to make this night a sterling success. I thank Governor Romer and Dan Dutko and Alan Solomont for the work that the DNC has done. And about the only thing harder than being President on a regular basis is trying to do a standup comedy routine at a fundraiser. And I thought they were both great, so let's give them another hand. I thought they were great. [*Applause*]

You know, I have a lot of friends in this crowd tonight. Many of you have been with me for a long time. And today I had two immensely satisfying experiences. First, I went out on a Coast Guard cutter and met with a number

of people in the Coast Guard who are working to protect the borders of our country here off the coast of southern Florida. In the last year they have had a 1,000 percent increase in the number of arrests and a 300 percent increase in the volume of drug confiscations because of their efforts. And I just went to encourage them and to thank them. And then we had, earlier today, a marvelous kick-off fundraiser for Lieutenant Governor Buddy MacKay's campaign for Governor. And many of you said something to me about that.

I want to thank you for being here for the Democratic Party. I want to thank you for being here for the people of south Florida, for the people of Miami-Dade County. This State has been extraordinarily good to me. My first real victory, when I started running for President, was in the Florida Democratic Convention straw poll in December of 1991. I will never forget that.

And we came very close to carrying Florida in 1992. And I strongly felt that we could and would carry it in 1996 because of the opportunity that so many of you gave me to work with you—for sensible immigration policies, for sensible policies toward our neighbors in this hemisphere, for sensible policies on crime and drugs and housing and economic growth, for sensible partnerships for the State of Florida, and one of the most important things we've done since I've been President, for an aggressive effort to save the Florida Everglades. Thank you all for the opportunities you have given me.

If you look at Florida, which in so many ways represents where America is going, with all of its opportunities and its challenges, a State full of people who are older—well, we're all getting older, and life expectancies are going up. And I don't know about you, but with every passing day I like that more and more. I think that's a fine idea. [*Laughter*] Florida, a State where people from all over the world are living here—we're all getting more diverse all over America; a State with high-tech employment and with people who are dying to work who don't have much education; a State with a lot of innovative partnerships to solve problems like crime and drugs, and on occasion, too much crime and drugs; a State with enormous economic growth and a passionate commitment to the environment, with a profound challenge about how to save this often fragile environment and maintain the adequacy of a clean water supply and the strength of your commitment to clean air and the strength of your commitment to basically preserving the ecostructure that makes everybody else get in a car or get in an airplane and come to Florida.

So you ought to be on the forefront of the Democratic Party of the 21st century. You know, we started my campaign for President in '96, and they said, "Well, what does the map look like?" And I said, "I'll tell you one thing; it looks like Florida will be in our camp this time. And that's my priority." And let me say, I was the only guy in the meeting who thought that. [*Laughter*] But I spent a lot of time here; I knew what kind of people were leading Florida into the 21st century. I knew what the challenges were; I knew what the opportunities were; I knew what the passionate commitment to going forward together was.

And I never will forget this—we had our first campaign meeting—I said, "Look, don't tell me we can't win Florida." They said "Nobody has won it in 20 years, and President Carter came from a State that bordered Florida." I said, "Everybody in this room raise your hands who has been there the most times." I won that. I'd been to Florida more than any of the people who were advising me. And I said, "We're going to target Florida; we're going to win Florida. And what's going to happen is, early on election night they're going to have one of those funny little maps that are on television and Florida is going to blink on and off, on and off, on and off, and the whole country will go nuts and say the election is over." And that's exactly what happened, and I thank you for that. It was a great day.

Now, what is it that we're trying to do? First, why are you here? What is the purpose of politics? What is politics? Does it deserve a good name or a bad name? The people who give it a bad name ought to think a long time. The reason this country is around here, after 220 years plus, as the oldest consistent democracy in human history, is because of politics. Politics is how free people work together to work their will and make their decisions and reach their principled compromise. And the framework within which it works is the system that has taken us from the Constitutional Convention to this moment. And I say to you, I think the purpose of it still is to preserve the liberty and the integrity of the American people and to give the American people a framework in which

they can work together to meet the challenges of each new age so that we increase opportunity and so that we have a responsible citizenry and so that we continue to come together as a community.

If you look at the whole history of America, every period of crisis has required us to redefine our commitment to our national unity and has required us to ask ourselves, what does it mean, our Constitution, in this context? What does it mean to say all of us are created equal by God? What does it mean to say we have an indissoluble Union? What has that got to do with the immigration decisions we have to make? What has that got to do with the education decisions we have to make? What has that got to do with the economic decisions we have to make or the environmental or health care or you-name-it decisions? That's what this is about.

And when I ran for President and came to Florida and asked the people here to help me, I said that we had to change the political debate in this country. The Democratic Party needed to take its oldest values and adopt some new ideas, and we needed to be unselfconsciously, unapologetically for policies that favored the future over the past, that favored everyone over a few, and that favored unity over division. And I was sick and tired of the politics of personal destruction and division which people seem almost pathologically trapped in in Washington, DC. And I'm still tired of it, and that's why this country is doing better.

I had what many people thought was a terminal disability when I ran for President: I hadn't been in Washington for 20 years. But I had been in a place where people got up every day and went to work and tried to make the best of their own lives and tried to make sense of what was going on in this country. And so, together, you and I, my friends, we began to change America. We began to change the direction. We began to change the old debate over the role of Government.

I mean, to read in the papers for years what was going on in Washington was like—the Democrats said Government can do everything, and the Republicans said Government can do nothing. The truth is, I never heard a Democrat say that, but they said we said it—[*laughter*]—and they often get away with labeling us.

And I said we've tried for 12 years their way. For 12 years we've tried just railing about problems and talking tough and doing nothing about crime or welfare. For 12 years we've tried campaigning against the Government and talking about how it's the problem, and I've seen the debt quadruple in this country. How about if we say the role of Government is to give people the tools and establish the conditions for people to make the most of their own lives, to build strong careers and strong families and strong communities and a strong Nation; and that Government should be seen as a partner, not sitting on the sidelines, not trying to dictate from Washington but giving people the tools to do what has to be done? I've always believed the American people could do anything given a fair chance, given the tools, given a hand up.

And you know, I heard a lot of railing over the years about how we were the party of handouts. I always wanted the Democrats to be the party of the hand up. And I think that's what we are today, and I think the results show that we have been right in that.

I say that because if your friends and neighbors come up to you in this Governor's race next year and they ask you, well, why are you for the Democrat—or in the Congress races or in the Senate race—you ought to say, "Listen, I'm for Democrats because we believe that everybody ought to have an opportunity, everybody ought to be a responsible citizen and serve, and everybody ought to be part of a unified American community. We are not for demonizing, denigrating, or segregating any group of Americans who otherwise are law-abiding, go to work, go to school, pay their taxes, and do what they're supposed to do. I am a Democrat because our policies were right, and theirs were wrong."

When we said we're going to reduce the deficit and grow the economy, in Washington all the Republicans voted against us. They said we were going to bring down the economy. Five years later, 14 million jobs later, the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years later, we now know our position was right, theirs was wrong. You need to tell the people of Florida they all need to come home to the Democratic Party to build a better future.

Now, when—I worried about Governor Chiles having to run for reelection 4 years ago because they said, "All the Democrats are trying to take our guns away. Nobody in rural Florida is going to be able to go hunting anymore. Bill Clinton betrayed his Arkansas roots, passing that

neosocialist Brady bill, with the radical proposition that we ought not to be selling handguns to people who were felons, fugitives, and stalkers, and the radical idea that there's no point in letting people who are in gangs on streets in tough neighborhoods and cities have assault weapons that were designed to kill people, not hunt birds, and the radical proposition that after 30 years in which we tripled crime, violent crime in America, but only increased our police forces by 10 percent, it might be a good thing if we put 100,000 police on the street and put them back in the neighborhoods where they can talk to people, work with people, and stop crime from happening in the first place." That was our idea.

Now, the other side made a lot of hay 3 or 4 years ago, told all these country people I was going to take their guns away—beat some of our Congressmen, gave our Governor here a little scare. But now we know. We also have the lowest crime rate in 24 years. No law-abiding Florida hunter has lost his gun. Over a quarter of a million felons, fugitives, and stalkers couldn't buy handguns. Thousands and thousands and thousands of people have not been able to get assault weapons to further gang warfare. The police are on the street. The preventive programs are out there. We've got the lowest crime rate in 24 years. It is not subject to debate. You ought to tell the people of Florida to join the new Democratic Party and be for a safer future for all of our children. That's what this is about.

In the last balanced budget—thank goodness, we finally had a bipartisan balanced budget. But don't forget, at the time on the day, the very day, October 1st, that the new balanced budget law took effect, we had by then, under the old budget law passed in 1993—only by Members of our party—reduced the deficit by 92 percent from where it was the day I became your President—92 percent.

So then we got a bipartisan balanced budget. What was our party's contribution? The biggest increase in child health since 1964; biggest increase in aid to education since the same time; biggest increase in helping people go to college through tax credits, Pell grants, work-study programs, IRA's you can save for and withdraw from tax-free for education, the biggest increase since the GI bill in 1945.

We represent a commitment to excellence and opportunity in education. And that is the key to giving every American, no matter what his or her racial, ethnic, or economic background, a chance to succeed in the global economy of the 21st century. And that's another reason the people of Florida ought to support our approach, not only at the national level but in this Governor's race, because if we don't have excellence in education, we will never be able to bring the rainbow of people who live in Florida together into one America. And you need to be out there leading the charge for us in 1998 for educational excellence.

There are lots of other things. I'm trying to pass a patients' bill of rights for people in HMO's, not because I'm against HMO's but because I think you ought to have access to quality and information, as well as affordable health care.

I am determined to finish the job of helping the Everglades restoration and also to deal with this problem of global climate change. You think of what will happen in south Florida if the climate of the globe goes up somewhere between 2 and 5 or 6 degrees in the next 100 years. I'll tell you what will happen. Sometime in the next 100 years, half of it will be under water. This is not a bunch of games we're playing here. We are trying to get people together to grow our economy and preserve the environment of our country and this globe long term.

So the new fear is going to say, "Oh, there goes the President; he's going to wreck the economy with this cockamamie idea about global warming." I'll tell you what will wreck the economy, is if we continue to have more and more and more extreme weather and we have disruption along all of our coasts and people don't feel that they are secure anymore because our generation refused to take responsible actions to reduce the pollution of the atmosphere.

For 30 years, every time we've done something to clean up the air, the water, the food supply, clean up toxic waste dumps, people who weren't for it said we were going to wreck the economy. I have heard it for 5 years. Five years later, compared to the day I became President, there are fewer toxic waste dumps; the food is safer; the air is cleaner; the water is purer; and we've got 14 million new jobs and the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years. We can clean up the environment, and that's another reason you ought to be a Democrat. And I'm asking you for these things.

Finally, let me just make this last point. Mayor Penelas thanked me for the race initiative. To me, politics will always have a human face. Sometimes I read things people say, and they act like that's a weakness on my part, that I'm actually interested in people as individuals instead of as a great sea of unknown faces. But I am persuaded that even Presidents, when they get ready to breathe their last breath and they're laying down, they don't think about their greatest political triumph; they think about the people they loved, the people they like, what it was like in the springtime, what it was like when their children walked for the first time.

All politics is about is about giving everybody a chance to live their dreams. We represent the party of tomorrow's dreams. And that's what you're here supporting tonight. I want you to redouble your efforts so we can do it more and more and more in 1998.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:15 p.m. at the Biltmore Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Executive Mayor Alex Penelas of Miami-Dade County and his wife, Lilliam; Chris Korge, Gene Prescott, and Mitchell W. Berger, event chairs; Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado, national chair, and Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee; Dan Dutko, chair, Victory Fund; and comedians Judy Gold and Carolyn Rhea.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Miami
December 11, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Buddy, for giving me the chance to come here today to get your campaign kicked off and to replay in some small way the great obligation of friendship I feel for you for—as I said today at Buddy's fundraiser—for being for me in early—or late 1991, before the Florida straw poll, before anything happened, and when only my mother felt I could be elected President. Buddy was there. And I'm glad to be here for him tonight.

Mayor, thank you so much for what you said and for the vigor and youth and energy of your leadership and the enormous promise of your future. I've loved being with you today, and I wish you well. And I cannot thank Chris and Irene enough. I was looking at this—you know, I knew farmers back in Arkansas that didn't have ponds this big—[*laughter*]—to feed hundreds of head of cattle. I am so—I love this place, and you've made us all feel so much at home. And at the end of a very long day, it's wonderful to be here. I'd like to thank Governor Romer and Alan Solomont and Dan Dutko for coming down for the Democratic Party. I would like to thank not only Chris but also Gene Prescott and Mitch Berger for helping us tonight.

Some of you were at the other place, and I'll try not to give the same speech twice—although I am reminded of—maybe that's what I should do. One night I was at a concert by Tina Turner, one of my favorite political philosophers. [*Laughter*] And Tina Turner—it was about 10 years ago; she was just making her big comeback, you know, after she told the story about how Ike did her wrong and everything. She had all these new songs, and she had that great saxophone player who was a bodybuilder and has chains all over his body—if you're a Tina Turner fan, you've probably seen him. So anyway, so we had the concert, and she sings all these new songs, and they're all real good. And then at the end of the concert, the band starts playing the introductory bars to "Proud Mary," which was her first hit. So she moves up to the microphone, and the crowd goes nuts. And they start screaming and cheering, and she backs off. And then she taunts them again and moves up, and the crowd screams again. And she goes up to the microphone and says, "You know something, I've been singing this song for 25 years, but it gets better every time I do it." [*Laughter*] So maybe I should just give the same talk. [*Laughter*]

Let me say, in 1991, when I decided to leave a job I loved and a State I loved and embark on the Presidency, I did it because I was afraid our country was moving into a new century and a new era without a strategy that would make

everybody be a part of America and that in the end would not have America be as strong as it ought to be. I felt that the political debate in Washington was stale and often irrelevant and too infused with an impulse to personal destruction. There's still a lot of that there, by the way—[*laughter*]—one reason I kind of hate to go back tonight.

But the main thing I thought was that we were just thinking in yesterday's framework. And I still believe that's what was wrong. And so I went to the Democrats in the primary process, and I said, "Look, I want to do something different. I don't want us to abandon our values, but I want us to take a new direction based on the time we're living in and in the time toward which we're going—a global economy, a global society, an information and technology revolution. All the patterns of how we live and work and relate to each other and the rest of the world is subject to change. I want us to focus on the future, not the past; on doing things that help everybody, not just a few people; and on promoting unity, not division. There's enough division in this country. And I want the Government to be neither the savior nor sit on the sidelines but instead to focus on a clear mission which is to create the conditions and give people the tools to make the most of their own lives." And that's what we've been doing for 5 or 6 years now—5 years really, since I've been President, and the results have been pretty satisfactory.

And I think when the issue is whether you should support the Democratic Party or whether you should support Buddy MacKay or whether you should keep helping me and our crowd do what we're trying to do, you just need to know that everything that I do and everything I try to see that our party stands for, I try to make sure that we're thinking of everyone, not just a few; that we're promoting unity, not just division; and we're committed to the future, not the past.

There's still a lot out there to do. I'm glad we've got the lowest unemployment rate and the lowest crime rates in 24 years and the biggest drop in welfare in history and a gazillion other impressive things I could say. We still have to prove that we can grow the economy and do what it takes to preserve the planet. We still have to prove that we can provide for our parents in terms of health care and retirement, save for our own retirement, and preserve Social Security and Medicare in a way that doesn't bankrupt our children.

You know, I'm the oldest of the baby boomers, and I'm increasingly mindful of that. I guess I'm what you call near-elderly. [*Laughter*] And when our crowd retires and we all get into the ranks of the retired, those of us who get there will have a life expectancy up in the eighties somewhere. And there will be only a little more than two people working for every one of us that's retired. We have a moral obligation now, while I'm still in office, to try to figure out how to preserve Social Security, how to preserve Medicare, indeed, how to make sure other people who don't have access to retirement that's sufficient to support their lifestyle can save more for their own retirement and afford to keep getting health care in a way that doesn't bankrupt our kids. Now, can we do that? Of course we can. But we have to do it. We still can't say with a straight face that every American child, without regard to their race, their income, or their station in life, has access to world-class education. And until we can, we can't secure the future of this country.

Those are just three big issues. If you look around the world, there's a lot of fear in America apparently about expanding trade. I think it's a mistake; a third of growth comes from selling more things to other people. If we've got 4 percent of the world's people and 20 percent of the world's wealth, we can't keep our income unless we sell something to the other 96 percent. On the other hand, you have to be sympathetic to American workers who figure that more and more and more what they say, feel, or think doesn't matter, that their whole pattern of existence can be wiped away in an instant by people who aren't accountable to anybody and not loyal to any country. That's the sort of negative view of the emerging global economy.

So what do we have to do? We have to find a way to get the benefits of trade and preserve the social compact. We can't protect people from economic change, because economic change is bringing a lot of benefit to a lot of people. But when people lose and they're still good people and they're willing to show up for work in the morning, we need to move more quickly to help them get the training they need, the skills they need, the future they need.

So there's plenty left to do. And that's why you're here, and that's why I believe the Democrats are the right party to do it, as I said at the earlier event. The two seminal decisions that were taken in 1993 and 1994 that have had a big impact on this country every day since was, first, the economic plan, which got no Republican votes, which had reduced the deficit by 92 percent by the time we adopted the balanced budget law; and second, the crime bill, which was bitterly opposed by the Republicans because the NRA didn't like it because we had the Brady bill, the assault weapons ban, 100,000 more police, and preventive programs for kids. But those are the strategies that are working in community after community after community throughout the country to lower the crime rate.

In the work we're doing with the Republicans when we work together, I think our party makes a unique contribution. Most of both caucuses voted for the balanced budget. It was a remarkable document. The Republicans had a slightly higher percentage of House Members voting for it than the Democrats did. The Democrats had a higher percentage of Senators voting for the balanced budget than the Republicans did. But over two-thirds of both voted for it.

What did we give to that? First of all, we gave them 92 percent of the work. It's a lot easier to balance the budget and spend more money if you're almost home. But secondly, we said now is the time to provide health insurance to the children of working parents who can't afford it. And they said okay, and we did it. And we said now is the time to give parents tax credits, not only for their children at home but for the cost of college tuition for all 4 years and graduate school and for people who lose their own jobs or are underemployed and have to come back. So we make a difference. And if you look at those challenges out there, they matter.

The last point I want to make is this—I said this before at the other thing, and I want to say this to you—I have taken a lot of good-natured ribbing and sometimes outright criticism by commentators for being a notoriously personal President, for being interested in individuals that I know and telling a lot of stories and seeing politics with a very human and highly individualized face, even if I'm just working a crowd. I have vivid memories of people I have met in crowds all my life and the stories they've told.

But the truth is, a nation is nothing much more or less than the sum of its stories. There was a report on one of the television networks the other night, a wonderful report about the State of Tennessee reviving the art of storytelling. Did any of you see that? They actually are now having an annual storytelling contest in Tennessee and bringing in all of these people out from the hills and these rural areas and letting people tell their stories and letting other people listen to them.

Mayor Penelas told me the story of his parents tonight, told me how much it meant to his mother to come to the Inauguration—he said that tonight would be her birthday if she were still with us—talked to me about his father. I don't know about you, but I think he does a better job as mayor every day because he respects his parents' roots, his parents' values, loves them when they're here and when they're gone, and they're part of the story of his life.

Every one of you has got a story to tell. That's what I try to tell people that work for me in the White House: Don't forget, every person you ever come in contact with has got a story. It deserves to be respected, and you can learn something from it. This country is still around here after 220 years plus because people got a chance to live their dreams, and the stories got better generation after generation. And it will be here 220 years from now if we do our job to form a more perfect Union, to pull us closer together, and to meet the challenges of tomorrow. That is the job of every generation of Americans, but it begins by appreciating the absolute integrity of every person's life and every person's right to dream and giving everybody that chance at the brass ring. That's why I'm still a Democrat and why I expect to die one and why I hope between now and then I can convert a lot of others.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gov. Buddy MacKay of Florida; Mayor Alex Penelas of Miami-Dade County; Chris Korge, event chair, and his wife, Irene, dinner hosts; Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado, national chair, and Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee; Dan Dutko, chair, Victory Fund; Gene Prescott and Mitchell W. Berger, event chairs; and singer Tina Turner.

Statement on the Indictment of Henry G. Cisneros
December 11, 1997

Henry Cisneros has a distinguished career of truly dedicated public service. As mayor of San Antonio, as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and as a wise counselor to me, he always has the interest of ordinary people at heart. I have greatly valued his service. This is a matter before the courts, so it is not appropriate for me to comment further.

Statement on the International Financial Services Agreement
December 12, 1997

Since I took office, I have been committed to tearing down barriers to American goods and services exports. Today's agreement by over 70 countries to liberalize trade in financial services will ensure market access in sectors where we lead the world: banking, securities, and insurance. In the wake of recent financial instability, it is particularly encouraging that so many countries have chosen to move forward rather than backwards. I want to congratulate Secretary Rubin, Ambassador Barshefsky, Deputy Secretary Summers, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative Lang, and Assistant Secretary Geithner for their hard work in bringing these negotiations to a successful conclusion.

The President's Radio Address
December 13, 1997

Good morning. This morning I'd like to give you a progress report on our fight against waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare system.

Medicare is more than just a program; it reflects our values. It's one way we honor our parents and our grandparents and protect our families across the generations. This past summer we took historic action to strengthen Medicare by improving benefits, more mammograms, cancer screenings, major improvements in diabetes care, expanding choices for recipients in health plans, and extending the life of the Trust Fund to at least the year 2010. I have also named four distinguished experts to a bipartisan commission that will find ways to ensure that Medicare will be able to serve baby boomers and our children as faithfully as it has served our parents.

But to protect Medicare and the fundamental values it represents, we also must vigorously fight the waste, fraud, and abuse that is clearly in the system, activities that diminish our ability to provide high-quality, affordable care for some of our most vulnerable citizens. Medicare fraud costs billions of dollars every year, amounting to an unfair fraud tax on all Americans and undermining our ability to care for those most in need. Taxpayers deserve to expect that every cent of hard-earned money is spent on quality medical care for deserving patients.

I am proud of what we've already accomplished to crack down on abuse in Medicare. Since 1993 we have assigned more Federal prosecutors and FBI agents to fight health care fraud, and as a result, convictions have gone up 240 percent. We've saved $20 billion in health care claims. Two years ago the Department of Health and Human Services launched Operation Restore Trust. Already it has identified $23 in fines and settlements for every dollar invested in the program. Our historic balanced budget agreement last summer gives us an array of new weapons to help keep scam artists and fly-by-night health care providers out of Medicare in the first place. And earlier this fall I announced new actions to root out fraud and

abuse in the mushrooming home health industry, from a moratorium on new home health agencies entering the system to a doubling of audits to a new certification renewal process.

But we must do more. Sometimes the waste and abuses aren't even illegal; they're just embedded in the practices of the system. Last week the Department of Health and Human Services confirmed that our Medicare program has been systematically overpaying doctors and clinics for prescription drugs, overpayments that cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. Such waste is simply unacceptable.

Now, these overpayments occur because Medicare reimburses doctors according to the published average wholesale price, the so-called sticker price, for drugs. Few doctors, however, actually pay the full sticker price. In fact, some pay just one-tenth of the published price. That's why I'm sending to Congress again the same legislation I sent last year, legislation that will ensure that doctors are reimbursed no more and no less than the price they themselves pay for the medicines they give Medicare patients. While a more modest version of this bill passed last summer, the savings to taxpayers is not nearly enough. My bill will save $700 million over the next 5 years, and I urge Congress to pass it.

There must be no room for waste, fraud, and abuse in Medicare. Only by putting a permanent stop to it can we honor our parents, protect our taxpayers, and build a world-class health care system for the 21st century.

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

Remarks at the Arkansas Democratic National Committee Dinner
December 13, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Maurice, not only for chairing this dinner but for never saying no for 6 years or more now, in good times and bad. Thank you, Alan Solomont, for your leadership and those wonderful, thoughtful, and highly perceptive remarks. [*Laughter*]

I think these other folks are about to get us, don't you? I think he's finally figured it out.

I'd like to thank all the non-Arkansans who are here tonight, particularly those who have positions in our party, Tom and Jill Hendrickson from North Carolina. And I'd like to thank Jack and Phyllis Rosen for being here. Jack's been involved with our financial efforts for a long time at the DNC, and this is his very last event. He wanted to go out with a home touch. So thank you especially, Jack, for doing that.

I probably shouldn't do this, but I'm going to try to acknowledge the Arkansans in the administration who are here. If I omit you and you quit, I will never speak to you again. [*Laughter*] I am doing my best. [*Laughter*] Normally, Presidents don't have to remember this stuff. [*Laughter*] But I think it's important.

I just want you to get a feel for how many people are here: Mack and Donna McLarty, of course; Bruce Lindsey; Nancy Hernreich; Marsha Scott; Bob Nash and Janis Kearney; Stephanie Streett; Mary Streett; Catherine Grundin; Patsy Thomasson; Ann and Grady McCoy. Ben Johnson told me he was from Arkansas tonight, that he was born in Marion and his wife, Jacqueline, said she was born in Joiner—[*laughter*]—and I'd say that qualifies. [*Laughter*] Steve and Jennifer Ronnel; Darren and Vivian Peters. And in the administration, of course, Secretary Slater and Cassandra; James Lee and Lea Ellen Witt; Hershel Gober and Mary Lou Keener; Harold and Arlee Gist; Wilbur Peer; Gloria Cabe has done great work for us; and in the DNC, Carroll and Joyce Willis; Lottie Shackleford; Mary Anne Salmon.

I'm so glad they're here. There are others I wish were here tonight. I wish Maurice Smith and Betsy Wright and Bill Clark and David Matthews and Linda Dixon and a host of other people could be here. But I want to thank you, all of you, those of you in the administration, those of you who have been in the administration, and most of all, those of you without whom there never would have been an administration. I thank you very much.

I don't want to embarrass him, but about 2 hours before I came over here tonight, I was

finishing up some paper work in my office. And Nancy always collects interesting letters that come from people from home and puts them in a little folder for me, and I get them at least once a week. And at the top of the folder was a letter that Richard Mason just wrote to the Wall Street Journal. And it said, "I got about as much chance of getting this letter printed as Dan Quayle does of getting elected President." [*Laughter*]

But he went on to say he was a businessman; he had read the Journal faithfully for years. He said, "For 5 years I've watched you bad-mouth my President and my State and say things that weren't true. And if your advice on business is as bad as your understanding of politics, I'll be in deep trouble if I keep reading this newspaper." [*Laughter*] "Please cancel my subscription." [*Laughter*]

I did what I always do. You know, I was saying, "But, Richard, you know, you can't blame the editorial page. They have good articles, all that kind of stuff." I was making my good Government argument. He said, "Look, the economy is better. The world is at peace. The crime rate is down. The country is in great shape. Sooner or later some of those people that are trying to tear your guts out and lying about our State are going to have to fess up and admit it. Get over it, the country is in better shape. This is working."

Since under our new policy all these are covered by the press, they may have to run your letter now, Richard. [*Laughter*] We'll see.

Let me say to all of you, when I was getting ready to come over here tonight—and I'm sorry Hillary is not here, but she is, to put it mildly, under the weather, and she said to send you her love—but when I was getting ready to come over here, I was reliving many of the things that have happened since October 3d of 1991 when I declared for President.

I remember how people sneeringly referred to me as the Governor of a small southern State. I remember how people talked about how we had failed to do all these things. I remember when I was pronounced dead before arrival in New Hampshire. And the Arkansas Travelers, who had been traveling all around the country anyway—and then all of a sudden, 150 people just dropped everything they were doing at home and came to New Hampshire and went around knocking on people's doors, total strangers, introducing themselves, saying, "This is my Governor; you cannot do this. Don't let them stampede you into this. Don't one more time let the kind of negative, hateful, personality-destroying politics that has kept our country back—don't do it one more time." One hundred fifty people up there in colder weather, some of them, than they had ever been in their lives—[*laughter*]—knocking on doors in New Hampshire.

I remember when that great ad appeared in the Manchester Union Leader, with hundreds of Arkansans' names and their phone numbers, saying, "Instead of believing what they're saying about him, if you want to know about this guy, call me." I will never forget that.

I remember how surprised—the people that ran against me in '92 are, by and large, good friends of mine now, and I remember how surprised they were that we kept doing well in odd places. And it took them a long time to figure out that 25 percent of the voters in Chicago were from Arkansas. [*Laughter*] That there was something to be said for being poor throughout the thirties, forties, fifties, and sixties. [*Laughter*] I keep waiting any day now for all of them to be subpoenaed by Mr. Starr. [*Laughter*] You know, a 50-year-old conspiracy to take over the White House—[*laughter*]—which started with our running people out of Arkansas back in the thirties and forties in a dark and devious way.

I came upon a little town outside Flint, Michigan, one day, full of auto workers. And literally 90 percent of them had roots in Arkansas, and I thought to myself today, those people are going to be called to testify any minute now. [*Laughter*] There's a presumption there's something wrong with them; it was some dark plot.

I was in the Bronx—did you see the pictures, where I went back to the Bronx to the place where President Reagan said it looked like London during the Blitz, and now it looks like a neighborhood any American would be proud to live in—to celebrate what this community organization had done. They're called the Mid-Bronx Desperadoes, because they were so desperate to turn their community around years and years ago. Half the housing this particular group has built has been built since I have been President because of our approach, which is to basically support community groups and people that are working together and let them define their own future.

So I get out; I shake hands with Ralph Porter—he's the current president of the Mid-Bronx Desperadoes—and we are walking down the street in the Bronx. He looked at me, and he said, "You know, my wife worked with your mother at Washita Hospital for 15 years—[*laughter*]—and I graduated from Langston High School in Hot Springs." [*Laughter*] I said, "No, they'll never believe this." [*Laughter*] I hope Ralph doesn't get a subpoena. [*Laughter*]

And he went on to tell me that his mother was living in the Bronx and was ill, and he'd been living in—he grew up in Hot Springs and his wife worked in the hospital with Mother; and that he went to see about his mother, and he's decided the Bronx is in terrible shape and that God wanted him to be in the Bronx and help turn it around. And I'm telling you, it will take your breath away if you could walk down some of these streets, not just nice houses but safe streets, clean streets, going to remodeled schools that are working, where communities that were given up for dead are working.

And sometimes I think what our adversaries, that are almost pathologically obsessed with personal destruction, don't get is that that's what politics is about. That's what you taught me. That's why we're all here after 5 years, and that's why the country is in better shape. Politics is about real people and their hopes and their dreams. So, to me, all this stuff—you all always say, "Gosh, I don't know how you put up with it." How do you put up with mosquitoes in summertime in Arkansas? [*Laughter*] You just swat them and go on, it's a part of living. That's what you do. If rice farmers thought farming rice was about mosquitoes, we'd all starve. [*Laughter*] It's about planting rice and bringing it in when harvest comes. Politics is about people and their dreams and building a better future. And that's what you taught me.

All the stories—I saw a great little special on one of the television networks the other night, that the State of Tennessee is now sponsoring a story-telling contest every year. And there was a very, very large African-American woman telling stories, and all these east Tennessee hill people were sitting around the circle listening to her, and their eyes were big as dollars, and they were all—and they were taking turns telling stories, and then they'd pick a winner. And I thought to myself, it would do this town a lot of good if we had a story-telling contest every year—[*laughter*]—to remind people about what life is all about.

So they were telling their stories. You want to know why we survived up here? Because I still remember the stories. I got to telling some of the young people that work for me the other day in the White House stories about my first two or three campaigns in Arkansas; they were laughing so hard they had tears in their eyes. [*Laughter*] When David Pryor and I started, you had to know that kind of stuff. I mean, you were expected to know people, and you cared about their parents and their children and their brothers and their sisters. You knew that misfortune happened. It wasn't a denigrating thing to say you felt someone's pain; that just meant you were a real live human being with blood flowing in your veins and you had some imagination about what life was all about.

And I just want you to know that that's what we've tried to do here. If I hadn't been Governor of Arkansas in the time I was—and keep in mind, until the year I ran for President, every single month I was Governor but one, the unemployment rate in our State was higher than the national average—every single month. And I stood on those factory lines when people came off the line for the very last time before they shut down in the recession of the eighties. I knew farmers that had gone broke. I understood what things happened to people when older people couldn't buy medicine and younger people couldn't afford to send their children to the dentist.

I understood those things because you taught me them, and I knew what politics was about. And I ran for a very clear reason: I thought our country was divided and drifting, that we were not succeeding, that we were clearly the greatest country in human history, and that we were too dominated, completely paralyzed, and in the grip of the mosquitoes instead of the planting. That's what I thought then. And so we decided that we would endure the mosquitoes so that we could plant and reap. And I think it's been worth the effort.

When you go home tonight I want you to think about this: You were standing and freezing your feet off in New Hampshire in '92, or you've had to do some other kind of service above and beyond the call since then; you gave us the chance to serve, and your country has the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years. That's

the statistic. The story is, there's 14 million people out there with jobs who didn't have them before, and every one of them has got a story. There's 3.8 million people who were on welfare when I became President, who are now living in homes, with paychecks, and they've got a different story. There are over 13 million people who got to claim the benefits of the family and medical leave law when a baby was born or a parent was sick.

There are 8½ million people whose pensions were gone that were rescued in one of Senator Pryor's last legislative acts, great legislative acts, when we reformed the pension system, and we saved 40 million other people's pensions from having to worry about it—8 million people who saved their retirement. That's a story. There's 250,000 people with criminal records or mental health histories who couldn't buy handguns because we passed the Brady bill, and we don't know how many people are alive because of that, and they're out telling stories tonight of their lives because we did that.

We set aside more land—I'd forgotten this until I read Richard's letter—we set aside more land in national trusts in one form or another than any administration in the history of America, except the two Roosevelts'. And there will be millions and millions of people just before the end of this decade that will be someplace or another having an experience with nature and God and their families because of that, that they would not have had. And that will become part of their story.

The air is cleaner. The water is cleaner. The food is safer. There are fewer little children living next to toxic waste dumps. And every one of them will have a different story now.

We're about to pass another Christmas in Bosnia, where we no longer have the bloodiest conflict since the end of World War II. We've made another year in Haiti. We're on the verge of seeing a profound and permanent peace, I hope, in Ireland this coming year. We've made real steps in making the world less likely to be subject to chemical warfare last year—this year, when we ratified the Chemical Weapons Treaty.

This race initiative—a lot of people say it's just talk; I'd rather see people talking than fighting—it's not just talk; it's a lot more than that. But there's something to be said for that. The more complicated and different this country gets and the more contentious and conflict-oriented the larger means of communications get, the more important it is for people who are different to sit down and talk to one another and understand their stories and understand that we have things that bind us together that are even more important than the very interesting things about us which are different, one from another. And that's what this whole race initiative is all about.

We've got a lot of challenges in the world. The challenge in Iraq, the general challenge of weapons of mass destruction, the chemical and biological weapons. They could bother our kids a lot, and we're going to work hard to see that they don't. We've got financial upheavals in Asia now. And since Thanksgiving, Secretary Rubin and I have been talking at all kinds of odd hours because of the time difference in Asia and here. I was on the phone last night at 11 to Asia. But we're managing the best we can.

And there are lots of other things we have to deal with: the challenge of the entitlement, the challenge of educational excellence in our public schools, the challenge of extending health care further.

But you just look at this balanced budget. All the other politicians, I heard them all talk about balancing the budget up here for years; it just got worse. The deficit has been cut by 92 percent before we passed the Balanced Budget Act. Now we've got a balanced budget bill that gives a tax credit or a scholarship to virtually every person who needs to go to college in America. We can literally say we've opened the doors of college to everyone. The balanced budget has the biggest increase in aid to go to college since the GI bill passed in 1945. That will make a lot of different stories. It has the biggest increase in health care for children since Medicaid was enacted in 1965. Five million more kids in working families with modest incomes will be able to get health insurance. Who knows how many of them will live to be adults because of it. Who knows how many of them will be healthier intellectually and physically and emotionally because of it. They'll all have a slightly different story, and it will be better. That's what I want you to think about.

The reason it's important for you to be here is that part of the counterbattle, the mosquito biting, this year was a calculated, determined effort to use the hearing process and the legal

process to force all the Democrats—and especially people associated with the party—to hire a lawyer every 15 seconds in the hope that we'd never have another penny to spend on campaigns. Somebody pointed out I'd been to so many fundraisers in the last year that I'd gotten tired a time or two, and I plead guilty to that. It's okay to get tired; you just can't give in.

So when you go home and people ask you why you did this, say because they tried to end the two-party system in America by forcing the Democrats to spend all their money hiring lawyers, and you think the two-party system is a pretty good idea, especially since one party, the one you belong to, was right about the deficit, was right about the economy, was right about crime, was right about welfare, was right about so many things, and that's why this country is in better shape today, and you think that's a pretty good indication about which party ought to be able to lead us into the new century. That's why you're here, and that's why I'm very proud of you.

Let me just say, lastly, I want you to go back home and tell the people who aren't here what I said tonight. And remind them, because they're a long way away, never to get confused between the mosquitoes and the planting, because as soon as you do, you won't be able to bring in the crop. We have brought in the crop, and you made it possible, and I'm very, very proud of you.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:16 p.m. at the Decatur House. In his remarks, he referred to Maurice Mitchell, Arkansas Democratic fundraiser; Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, Democratic National Committee; C. Thomas Hendrickson, chair, Democratic Business Council, and his wife, Jill; Jack Rosen, chairman, national finance council, Democratic National Committee, and his wife, Phyllis, member, President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities; Kenneth Starr, Whitewater independent counsel; Ralph Porter, executive director, Mid-Bronx Desperadoes; and former Senator David H. Pryor of Arkansas.

Remarks at "Christmas in Washington"

December 14, 1997

Ladies and gentlemen, first let me begin by thanking Bob and Suzanne and all their whole network family for what has been a wonderful show. Thank you, Glenn Close; thank you, Aaliyah; thank you, Shirley Caesar; Deana Carter; Hanson; Thomas Hampson; the Eastern Choir; and of course, our Naval Academy Glee Club; the Army Herald Trumpets; our musicians and choir over there; and thank you to George and Michael Stevens for the wonderful job they do every year and especially this year.

Hillary and I look forward to celebrating "Christmas in Washington" every year. It gets us in the holiday spirit. If we're not in now, we don't have a chance. [*Laughter*] It also gives us another chance to thank the Children's National Medical Center for the outstanding work that all of them do on behalf of our Nation's children.

More than any other holiday, Christmas is for our children. We revel in their excitement. We rejoice in their growth. We renew our pledge to help them make the most of their God-given gifts. It all began with the miracle of a child, born in a manger, who grew to teach a lesson of peace that has guided us for 2,000 years now. It continues to light our journey toward a new century and a new millennium. Every child is a miracle, and it is for their futures that we must all dedicate ourselves to work for that universal, timeless vision of peace in every nation, in every community, and most important, in every heart.

Hillary and I and Chelsea wish you all a joyous holiday and a very happy new year. Thank you. God bless you. May the magic of Christmas be always with you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:40 p.m. at the National Building Museum. In his remarks, he referred to Robert C. Wright, president, NBC, and

his wife, Suzanne; actress Glenn Close; entertainers Aaliyah, Shirley Caesar, Deana Carter, Hanson, and Thomas Hampson; and George Stevens, Jr., executive producer, and Michael Stevens, producer, "Christmas in Washington." "Christmas in Washington" was videotaped for broadcast at 10 p.m. on December 19.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Additional Sanctions Against UNITA
December 12, 1997

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

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b), I hereby report to the Congress that I have exercised my statutory authority to take additional steps with respect to the actions and policies of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) and the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12865.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on September 26, 1993, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions and policies of UNITA pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. United Nations Security Council Resolution 864 (1993) imposed prohibitions against the sale of weapons, military materiel, and petroleum products to UNITA. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1127 of August 28, 1997, and 1130 of September 29, 1997, determined that all Member States shall impose additional sanctions against UNITA due to the serious difficulties in the Angolan peace process resulting from delays by UNITA in the implementation of its essential obligations as established by the Lusaka Peace Protocol of November 20, 1994.

Accordingly, and pursuant to the requirements of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1127, I have issued an Executive order which: (1) orders the closure of all UNITA offices in the United States, and (2) prohibits: (a) the sale or supply in any form, by United States persons or from the United States or using U.S. registered aircraft, of any aircraft or aircraft components to UNITA, or to any location within Angola other than those specified by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Secretary of State; (b) the insurance, engineering or servicing by United States persons or from the United States of any aircraft owned or controlled by UNITA; (c) the granting of permission to any aircraft to take off from, land in, or overfly the United States if it is destined to land in or has taken off from any location in Angola not specified by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Secretary of State; and (d) the provision by United States persons or from the United States of engineering and maintenance servicing, the certification of airworthiness, the payment of new claims against existing insurance contracts, or the provision or renewal of insurance to any aircraft registered in Angola not specified by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Secretary of State or to any aircraft that entered Angola through any location not specified by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Secretary of State.

In furtherance of the goals of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1127 and of the foreign policy interests of the United States, the authorization of exemptions for flights responding to medical emergencies or for essential humanitarian and peace process mediation needs is implicit in this order.

Under the terms of this order, UNITA includes: (1) the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola; (2) the Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola (FALA); and (3) any person acting or purporting to act for or on behalf of the foregoing, including the Center for Democracy in Angola (CEDA).

The United Nations Security Council acted to impose these additional sanctions in response to the actions and policies of UNITA in failing to comply with its obligations under the Lusaka Peace Protocol and thereby jeopardizing the return of peace to Angola. The United Nations Security Council resolutions demand UNITA's compliance with those obligations, including demilitarization of all its forces, transformation of its radio station into a nonpartisan broadcasting

facility, and full cooperation in the process of normalization of government authority throughout Angola.

The above measures will immediately demonstrate to UNITA the seriousness of our concern over its delays to the peace process. It is particularly important for the United States and the international community to demonstrate to UNITA the necessity of completing the peace process in Angola. The flight restrictions will further limit UNITA's capacity to import weapons and military materiel in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 864 (1993).

When UNITA fully complies with its obligations and completes its transition from armed movement to unarmed political party, the United States will support measures lifting these sanctions.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 15. The Executive order is listed in Appendix D at the end of this volume.

Exchange With Reporters Following Discussions With Prime Minister Bertie Ahern of Ireland

December 15, 1997

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, do you feel that your meetings are helping with the peace process, and do you feel that it will be staying on track for its timeframe, the way it's figured now for a May referendum?

The President. Well, I'm very impressed by what's been done and very encouraged. And I can tell you just two things: One is, I intend to stay personally involved in this in however ways I can be helpful. I will do anything I can. But the second thing is, it's time to get down to details now. There's a very ambitious timetable. It can be met. I think the people would like it to be met, the Irish people. And so the political leaders will have to get down to the details, and the devil is always in the details. There are difficult, difficult decisions that have to be made, but that's what people who occupy positions of leadership are hired to do, and the time to do it is now. And I will do everything I can to help. And the *Taoiseach* and I have had a great meeting today, and I'm encouraged by the reports that he's given.

Q. Is there anything specific, Mr. President, that the *Taoiseach* asked you to do?

The President. Just that he asked me to stay involved, and he said that anything I could do to encourage all the parties to be part of an evenhanded process—and I believe George Mitchell is doing his best to be evenhanded—was important. And then, of course, early next year we'll be getting into the details, and then I expect we'll be talking in a more regular way. By the time he comes back here for St. Patrick's Day, we'll all be up to our ears in it, I would imagine.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, going to Bosnia, are you signaling an intention to keep U.S. forces there beyond deadline?

The President. Well, you know I'm going to have several opportunities to talk to you over the next few days, and I'll have a statement about that soon. I'm proud of what our people have done there; I'm proud of what the Irish have done there, all the people who are involved. And a great deal of progress has been made. A great deal more work needs to be done.

The main thing I'm doing is going to Bosnia to thank the American military personnel for being there and for spending their Christmas there and for the sacrifices they've made to bring peace to Bosnia, and to tell them why it's important. That's the main reason I'm going.

Iran

Q. Do you see new flexibility from Iran in statements made in the past few days?

The President. Well, I was quite encouraged by Mr. Khatami's statement, and it was welcome. And I will say again, I would like nothing better than to have a dialog with Iran, as long as we can have an honest discussion of all the relevant issues. We remain concerned about the sponsorship of terrorism, about the violent attacks on the peace process, about the development—their acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. And we will continue to be concerned about those things. But I was quite encouraged by the President's statement, and I think that the American people should be.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. Taoiseach, could I ask your impressions of your meeting with the President? How did it go?

Prime Minister Ahern. Well, first of all, I'm delighted to be here, and I'm very grateful that the President has afforded part of his horrendous schedule some time for us to be here. We had an excellent discussion, where we were able to go back over what has happened over the last number of months, and I had an opportunity to brief the President on all of the moves since the peace process and the real talks started on the 24th of September, right up to what's happening in Belfast and the castle buildings today.

The most important thing for us is that the President has continued to be so involved and so committed, so personally involved. The President has at all times helped, during the summer when things were scrappy, and he afforded me a number of phone calls, which I greatly appreciated, and of course, some of his most key people are actively involved in trying to bring us all to a balanced, comprehensive settlement.

And this morning we had an opportunity of going through what are the factors of the talks, the three strands, and how we can see ourselves working into the springtime to try to get to a comprehensive settlement. And that he liked the meeting that I had with Tony Blair the other day; the President is in full agreement and is urging me that we must now get into the detail and that we have to try to put together the comprehensive settlement that the people will be allowed to vote on and that is balanced and for all sides. And that's precisely what we'll do. And as the President has said, by St. Patrick's Day, hopefully I can report back some progress in that area.

President's New Dog

Q. Mr. President, what news on the puppy? [*Laughter*]

The President. He's here, and we had a great weekend. More later. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:45 a.m. at the Northwest Portico at the White House. In their remarks, the President and the Prime Minister referred to George J. Mitchell, Special Assistant to the President for Northern Ireland; President Mohammad Khatami of Iran; and Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom.

Remarks Announcing the Appointment of Bill Lann Lee as Acting Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights and an Exchange With Reporters

December 15, 1997

The President. I want to thank the Attorney General for her support. And again, I want to join the Vice President and the Attorney General in thanking Isabelle Katz Pinzler for the great job she has done as Acting Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. I wish her well as she returns to private life, to her husband, her son, and daughter in New York City.

Today it is with a great deal of pride that I name Bill Lann Lee to the post of Acting Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights and Counselor to the Attorney General for Civil Rights Enforcement. From this day forward, he will be America's top civil rights enforcer, serving at the helm of the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division.

It is fitting that this announcement comes on the 206th anniversary of the Bill of Rights, our charter of freedom and equality. Our present civil rights laws have helped all of us move closer to those timeless values. They protect every person from discrimination, especially discrimination against women, minorities, Americans with disabilities, and victims of hate crimes. They ensure that all Americans have equal opportunities to work, to learn, to live, to raise their children in communities where they can thrive and grow.

I can think of no one whose life story and impeccable credentials make him more suited to enforcing these laws than Bill Lann Lee. Because of his long struggle in this nominating process, his life story has become rather well known to millions of Americans. They know now that he has lived the American dream and that he embodies American values.

The son of poor Chinese immigrants who, like millions of other Americans, came to this country seeking better futures, and despite feeling the sting and frustration of discrimination throughout their lives, they were people who never lost faith in America. They settled in Harlem, built a small business washing clothes, taught their two sons the value of hard work and the limitless possibilities of a good education. Bill Lee won a scholarship to Yale and went on to earn a law degree from Columbia. His brother became a Baptist minister. I leave it to you to decide which one got the better end of the deal. [*Laughter*]

Above all, the Lees instilled in their sons a deep and abiding love for country and our values. It is this love for America, the faith in the American ideal, that inspired Mr. Lee to pursue a career in civil rights law. Over a lifetime he has worked tirelessly to end the discrimination that keeps us from reaching our greatest potential as a people.

As a lawyer for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, the organization founded by the great Thurgood Marshall, Mr. Lee has sought to bring people together, to reconcile opposing views, to forge consensus, and to find the common ground we all must stand on. His commitment to fairness and the dignity of all Americans won the respect and admiration of clients and opposing lawyers alike.

We need more Americans like Bill Lee in the highest offices of Government. In the last session of Congress, he was denied the vote he deserves on his confirmation because some Senators disagree with his views on affirmative action. But his views on affirmative action are my views on affirmative action: No quotas, no discrimination, no position or benefit for any unqualified person; but mend, don't end affirmative action, so that all Americans can have a fair chance at living the American dream.

My constitutional right and responsibility as President is to put in office men and women who will further our policies consistent with our obligations under the Constitution. Some people want to wait for me to appoint someone to this position whom I disagree with. But America cannot afford to wait that long. And it would be a long wait indeed. [*Laughter*] The enforcement of our civil rights laws demands strong leadership now.

In the coming months, I will resubmit Mr. Lee's nomination to the Senate. I will be pressing very hard for a straight up or down vote, and I am confident that once the Senate and the American people are given a fair chance to judge Mr. Lee's performance, he will be confirmed.

While he will have the full authority and support to carry out the duties of the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, I still look forward to striking the word "acting" from his title. He is a remarkable American, and I am confident that he will enforce our civil rights laws with the same professionalism, honesty, and integrity he has exhibited throughout his life and career. He is truly the best person for this job.

Mr. Lee.

[*At this point, Mr. Lee made brief remarks.*]

Q. Mr. President, why did you pick acting instead of recess?

Q. [*Inaudible*]—Senator Specter has appealed to you——

Q. Why did you choose to——

The President. I have two objectives. One is to get Mr. Lee into the leadership of the Civil Rights Division as soon as possible. The other is to maximize the chances that he can be confirmed in the coming year in the Senate. I believe this path is the best way to maximize the chance of achieving both objectives.

Q. Mr. President, do you think that you minimized the problem of retaliation that the Republicans threatened by choosing this path?

The President. Well, I don't know about that. I think that retaliation is not only inappropriate and unwarranted, it would be wrong. As far as the pace of confirmation of judges, I don't think it's been adequate to date anyway. The Senate has a constitutional responsibility to consider these judges in a timely fashion, and I want them to do much better, not worse.

But you know, no President can proceed in office and do the duty that the Constitution imposes if you spend your time worrying about retaliation. I think this is an honorable decision which gives the Senate a chance to consider Mr. Lee again, something which I believe would not have happened if I had done it in another way. That's what I want to do. And I want to work with the Senate in a positive way, but I can't be worried about retaliation. I have to do what I think is right.

Q. The Senate also appealed to you on constitutional grounds as well, saying that you shouldn't do this under Articles I or II. How do you respond to that? And if Mr. Lee wants to step up, why did you want to step into such a political firestorm that was caused by your nomination?

The President. Well, first of all, I have been very judicious in the use of recess appointments. If you look at my record as compared with every President—I've gone back all the way to President Ford, and he was just here a little less than 2½ years. But I have been very disciplined in the use of these appointments. President Reagan and President Bush made far more recess appointments than I have.

I have done my best to work with the United States Senate in an entirely constitutional way. But we had to get somebody into the Civil Rights Division. And I'm not sure anybody could have been confirmed if the test is that I have to appoint someone who disagrees with me on affirmative action, which seemed to be what some of the Senators are saying. And I just couldn't imagine getting anybody more qualified than Bill Lee. So I decided we needed to go on and do what I thought was right for the country.

Q. But, sir, why should this not be seen as an act of defiance against the advise and consent process in the Senate?

The President. Well, first of all, the Senate did not decline—they did not reject his appointment. The Senate never even got a chance to vote on his appointment. And if the Senate had rejected his appointment, I would not—even though I would have bitterly disagreed with it, I certainly would not have named him to this position. I believe that the Senate, if given a chance to vote on him, will embrace his appointment. And I believe after he's been there a few months, he'll have even more votes. So that's what I hope will happen and what I believe we have a chance to have happen now.

Q. Isn't it like having one hand tied behind his back to start this job politically as an acting——

The President. No. Absolutely not. He has the full authority of the office. And you have seen here, he has the full confidence of the Attorney General and the President. That's all he needs.

Q. But, Mr. President, you still have those that are opposing him. And what if the same thing were to happen that happened this year? What's the next step?

The President. He'll be the Acting Attorney General for Civil Rights, and he'll be enforcing the civil rights laws.

Q. Why do you think politics were at play in this issue, sir? You and your top aides are saying that politics were responsible for the opposition. Why could it not—why do you not accept it as just an honest disagreement on issues?

The President. Because I was elected President, and I didn't make any secret of my position on affirmative action. I might say also, this administration has done a lot to change the affirmative action laws to eliminate some of the abuses that I thought existed. But we can never be in a position of saying that a President shouldn't have someone in office who agrees with him. Now, that doesn't mean every—if a President makes an appointment that's way outside the mainstream of established legal thought or somebody who has a lack of experience or someone who has otherwise demonstrated an unfitness for office, then the Senate may reject that person, who parenthetically may be agreeing with the President.

But none of those elements were here—none, not a single one. And that's why I thought this was the right thing to do, and I still feel that way. I feel more strongly than I did the day I nominated him.

Q. What is the name of your dog? [*Laughter*]

Q. When will you submit the nomination again?

The President. What did you say?

Q. When will you submit the nomination again?

The President. Oh, I don't know. Early next year, in a timely fashion.

Q. Your appointment to Mexico as a Mexican Ambassador was also blocked. Did you decide with this that enough is enough and that you were going to take a stand on this? Why was there a difference in the decision to put Lee in there without confirming him?

The President. Because I think under these circumstances we actually have a chance to get him confirmed. The Ambassador position to Mexico was entirely different. And normally you don't appoint a recess—you don't make a recess appointment, for example, of an Ambassador unless there is some understanding that that person will actually be confirmed when the time comes for the confirmation. The facts were different.

Q. Is there any difference between the way an Acting Assistant Attorney General does his job and a fully nominated and confirmed Assistant Attorney General can do his job? Is there any difference between the two?

The President. I do not believe there is any difference at all as long as the Acting Attorney General—the Acting Assistant Attorney General has the confidence and support of the Attorney General and the confidence and support of the President. And that is the message today. I think he's in great shape, and I can't wait for him to go to work.

President's New Dog

Q. What's the answer to the big question in this country? What's the name of your dog? [*Laughter*]

The President. First of all, let me thank—I want to thank everybody, all these kids that came in all over the country. I've never gotten so many suggestions in my life. And some of them were quite hilarious, Advise and Consent. A child yesterday said I should name the dog Top Secret, so I could run around the White House saying, "Top Secret, Top Secret." [*Laughter*]

Q. What do you call him now?

The President. Anyway, I got all these names, and we had a little family conference last night. We got down to two names, and we selected one. And I think I'll announce it tomorrow at the press conference. [*Laughter*]

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:45 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to former Gov. William F. Weld of Massachusetts, whose nomination to be Ambassador to Mexico was withdrawn on September 18.

Remarks on Presenting the National Medals of Science and Technology

December 16, 1997

The President. Thank you very much, Dr. Gibbons, Secretary Daley. I'm also delighted that Neal Lane, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and Dr. Harold Varmus, the Director of the NIH, are here with us, as well as the chairman of the House Science Committee; Congressman Sensenbrenner, thank you very much for being here.

Today we honor 14 remarkable men and women for extraordinary individual accomplishments from discovering new ways to chart the universe to exploring the internal universe of human nature. We honor them, however, also for their collective achievement. By giving these awards, we honor the American passion for discovery that has driven our Nation forward from field to factory to the far reaches of cyberspace. This spirit of discovery will lead us into a new century and a new millennium.

This is a moment of great challenge for our Nation, a time where we must rise to master the forces of change and progress as we move forward to the 21st century. Later this week I will announce or discuss the new economy, one of the most powerful forces of change. This morning I want to talk about the force of scientific and technological innovation. It is helping to fuel and shape that new economy, but its impact goes well beyond it.

For 5 years in a row, I have increased our investments in science and technology while bringing down the deficit, often in the face of opposition. These investments have surely paid off in higher paying jobs, better health care, stronger national security, and improved quality of life for all Americans. They are essential to our efforts to address global climate change, a process begun last week in Kyoto with the strong leadership of the Vice President. They are critical to America's ability to maintain our leadership in cutting-edge industries that will power the global economy of the new century.

Half our economic growth in the last half-century has come from technological innovation and the science that supports it. The information, communications, and electronics industries already employ millions of Americans in jobs that can pay up to 73 percent above the national average. Firms that use advanced technologies are more productive and profitable than those which do not.

But technological innovation also depends upon Government support in research and development. Let me give you just two examples. Five years ago, the Internet was unknown to most Americans. Today, thanks to farsighted investments, tens of millions of Americans surf the Web on a daily basis, and our investments in the next generation Internet will give our universities and national labs a powerful research and communication tool. Five years ago, the mystery of the human genetic system was only partly known. Today, Government-funded scientists have discovered genes linked to breast cancer and ovarian cancer, and our human genome project is revolutionizing how we understand, treat, and prevent some of our most devastating diseases.

These ground-breaking innovations could not have happened without dedication, downright genius, and Government investment. Today I'm pleased to announce $96 million in new research and investments to continue that progress.

First, the Defense Department will invest $14 million to help our universities, in partnership with private industry, to develop a new supercomputer on a chip, among other new projects. These chips will be no larger than my fingernail, but their computing power will be 25,000 times greater than this entire mainframe computer. Let me try to illustrate; this is the size of the chip. It equals 25,000 of those. Pretty good work. [*Laughter*] This technology, once developed, will make possible everything from faster, cheaper home computers to advanced weapons systems to cleaner, more efficient car engines and many, many others.

Second, the Commerce Department's advanced technology program will sponsor a series of private-sector competitions for $82 million in new grants to foster innovations like cleaner energy sources that reduce greenhouse gases, low-cost methods of producing lifesaving drugs, and radio-transmitting ID cards that can help to locate lost children, to name just a few. These investments will help to usher in a new era of discovery we can only dream of today.

Benjamin Franklin once said he was sorry to have been born so soon because he would not, and I quote, "have the happiness of knowing what will be known 100 years hence." It's hard to imagine what he would think if he were here, 200 years later. I'm sure he'd be filled with awe and pride that the American tradition of innovation he helped to establish is still driving our Nation forward.

And who knows what will be known in only 25 years, whom we will be honoring: the researchers who find cures for cancer, perhaps scientists who discover life on other planets, the engineers who devise new energy sources to preserve our environment and sustain our economy for generations to come. The discoveries of tomorrow will be made possible by the scientists of today and by our continued commitment to their passionate quest.

Now I am honored to present the men and women with the National Medals of Science and Technology. Please read the citations.

[*At this point, Lt. Comdr. Wesley Huey, USN, Naval Aide to the President, read the citations, and the President presented the medals and congratulated the recipients.*]

The President. Give them all a hand here. [*Applause*]

[*A group photograph was then taken.*]

The President. Thank you all very much. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building.

Exchange With Reporters on the South Lawn
December 16, 1997

President's New Dog

Q. So what's his name?

The President. Isn't he pretty?

Q. But what's his name?

The President. Press conference, press conference.

Q. His name is "Press Conference"?

The President. That's a good idea. That's probably what I should have called him. Do you want to go see them?

Q. Mr. President, where does he sleep? Where does your puppy sleep?

The President. Upstairs.

Q. Upstairs. And does he have his own little doggy bed?

The President. He has a little house in the kitchen. He's sleeping in the kitchen right now.

Q. He sleeps in a little doghouse?

The President. Yes, he sleeps in a little doghouse.

Q. Is he really trained?

The President. You may get a chance to see here in a minute. [*Laughter*] Yes, he is. He's done quite well so far.

Q. And what can he do?

The President. Sit. That's good.

Q. And what's he eating, Mr. President?

The President. Just a little dog biscuit. Now, he's pretty well-trained. And I get up in the morning and take him for a walk early, at 7 a.m., and then I give him breakfast. Then we go for another walk. [*Laughter*] And then he has lunch and goes for another walk.

Q. Who takes him at lunchtime?

The President. Well, so far, I have.

Q. He likes the press, Mr. President.

The President. Yes, he does. So do I.

Q. He doesn't bother your allergies?

The President. No, I've never been allergic to dogs. And I have a minor allergy to cats. That's why most of the time when I play with Socks, I've tried to play with him outside.

Q. Has he met Socks?

The President. Yes, twice—three times. I'm trying to work this out.

Q. What happened?

The President. It's going to take awhile. It's kind of like peace in Ireland or the Middle East. [*Laughter*]

Q. What happened when they met?

The President. Socks was a little scared of him, I think. Yesterday—you could have had a great picture yesterday. She jumped—he jumped way up on my shoulders. Socks climbed right up and got up on my shoulders so that they would have an appropriate distance. But we're giving them items that the two of them have, to try to get used to the scent. And I'll get it worked out.

Q. Where will he hang out most of the day?

Q. What's his name?

The President. He can hang out nearly anywhere. We've got a little flexible cage back in the Dining Room now in the White House. He comes over to the Oval Office with me in the morning, and he does fine.

Q. Without telling us the name, can you tell us if it came from a citizen?

The President. No, in the end it didn't—[*inaudible*]—reviewing them. And then we went—don't eat that; you just had lunch—and we got down to about seven or eight, and then we got down to three and finally made a decision.

Come on, kiddo, come on. Let's go.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 1:50 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, prior to the President's departure for the State Department. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference
December 16, 1997

The President. Good afternoon. It is only fitting that we gather today in the Dean Acheson Auditorium, for as Acheson was in his time, we truly are "Present at the Creation," the

creation of an era after the cold war that might be unrecognizable to the wise men of Acheson's time; a new era of promise and peril, being defined by men and women determined that the 21st century be known as a new American Century.

I briefly want to review the progress we've made in the last year and our mission to prepare America for that new century. Even as we reap the hard-earned profits of the strongest economy in a generation, our Nation refused to be complacent. We confronted big issues in 1997. We passed a plan to balance the budget. We made college affordable and community college virtually free to every American. We cut taxes for middle class families with children. We saved Medicare for another decade. We extended health insurance to 5 million children in lower income working families. We cut crime, reduced welfare, strengthened our schools. We made the world safer by ratifying the Chemical Weapons Convention. And at Kyoto, with the Vice President's leadership, we took an important step toward protecting the environment even as we promote global economy growth. We renewed the consensus for honest engagement with China. We stood strong against a rogue regime in Iraq. We made real progress toward lasting peace in Bosnia. Next week I will personally thank our troops there and talk to the Bosnian people about their responsibilities for the future.

Of course, even as we reflect on how far we've come in our mandate to carry out enduring American values into a new century, we realize we have far to go. Nineteen ninety-eight will be a year of vigorous action on vital issues that will shape the century to come. From education to the environment, from health care to child care, from expanding trade to improving skills, from fighting new security threats to promoting peace, we have much to do both here at home and abroad.

Earlier today, with the simple stroke of a pen, we helped to make European history. Secretary Albright and her NATO counterparts signed protocols of accession for Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, formalizing our intent to welcome these nations as NATO's newest members and a grand effort to defend our shared values and advance our common destiny. This is a milestone in the enterprise I launched 4 years ago to adapt our alliance to the challenges of a new era and to open NATO to Europe's new democracies. The entry of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into the alliance will make America safer, NATO stronger, and Europe more stable and united.

The decision to add new members to NATO must be ratified by all 16 allies. I'm gratified that Congress has already taken an active, positive role in a bipartisan manner through the Senate NATO Observer Group that joined us at the Madrid Summit and the extensive hearings and resolutions this fall. I will promptly seek the Senate's advice and consent on NATO expansion when Congress returns in January.

The United States has led the way in transforming our alliance. Now we should be among the first to vote yes for NATO's historic engagement. We are well on the way to the goal I set last year of welcoming the first new members to NATO by NATO's 50th anniversary. Today I am pleased to announce that the NATO alliance has accepted my invitation to come to Washington for that special summit in the spring of 1999. Together, we will strengthen NATO for the next 50 years, and I hope we will be welcoming its newest members.

Now, before I take your questions, in this room where President Kennedy held so many memorable press conferences, let me remind you that he once praised these exercises, with tongue only somewhat in cheek, saying, and I quote, "It is highly beneficial to have 20 million Americans regularly observe the incisive, the intelligent, and the courteous qualities displayed by their Washington correspondents." [*Laughter*] Precedent has its place.

Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Asian Economies

Q. Mr. President, 3 weeks ago in Vancouver you said that the economic chaos in Asia was just a glitch in the road, but the currency turmoil continues, and South Korea says that it needs a faster IMF bailout. What—how serious is this crisis for Americans, and will you go along with the additional funds that the IMF says it needs?

The President. Well, first of all, the American economy is strong, and the new numbers on low inflation, coupled with the very high rate of business investments, show that we have a significant capacity to continue to grow from within. Now, having said that, as I have repeatedly pointed out to our people, a significant part of our growth comes from our ability to

sell to others around the world, including in Asia. And so it is very much in our interest to do what we can to support the Asian economies as they work to weather this crisis.

I remain convinced that the best way to do that is to follow the plan that we outlined at Manila. One, we need strong economic policies on the part of these countries. When you have a problem at home you have to address it at home. That's what we did in 1993 in addressing our deficit. Two, the IMF has—and the other international institutions should play the leading role, and there is a framework within which they can do that, and we know they can do it successfully when you look at what happened with Mexico. Third, we should be there, along with Japan and other countries, in a supporting capacity when necessary. That is the policy that will work.

I am very encouraged—you mentioned South Korea—I am very encouraged by the steps that they are taking to try to implement the IMF plan to take actions at home that are important, and I think it is terribly important that President Kim met with the three candidates for President in South Korea, because they have an election coming up very soon, you know, and they all agreed to support this plan to rebuild the South Korean confidence of the markets and to work through this problem.

Now, do I think we may need to do more? I think we may need to do more within the framework that has been established, but that needs to be a judgment made on a case-by-case basis. The important thing is that the United States must be in a position to do more to fulfill its responsibilities. And that means, among other things, that it's very important when Congress comes back here that we take up again the bill to provide for paying the dues that we owe to the United Nations and for giving us the ability to participate in the so-called new authority to borrow provision of the IMF. That bill should be taken up and judged on its own merits, and I would urge Congress to do it right away.

But the most important thing is that we have a system in place. That system has to be followed; strong domestic policies by these countries, the IMF framework with the other multinational institutions, then the U.S. and Japan and others there in a back-up role when necessary.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Administration Accomplishments

Q. Mr. President, this may fall into the category of "with friends like that," but two of your former aides, advisers, have written you off already, at the start of your second term. George Stephanopoulos says you're a lame duck. Dick Morris says you've gone to sleep. What is your rebuttal, and what's the dog's name? [*Laughter*]

The President. Maybe that should be my rebuttal. [*Laughter*] You know, President Truman said if you want a friend in Washington you need to get a dog. [*Laughter*]

Let me back up, and let me just say I don't know—first of all, I'm not sure that Mr. Stephanopoulos is being properly quoted there. But if you look at what happened in 1995, I think it is very difficult to make that case. I mean, if you compare year-by-year in each year of this administration, we have had significant accomplishments. But I think the—1997, we had the balanced budget; we had the biggest increase in aid to children's health since 1965, the biggest increase in aid to higher education to help Americans go to college since the GI bill passed. We voted to expand NATO; we passed the Chemical Weapons Convention; we had a historic agreement in Kyoto; and along the way, we passed sweeping reform of America's adoption laws. We passed sweeping reforms of the Federal Food and Drug Administration to put more medical devices and lifesaving drugs out there in a hurry, and a score of other things, plus the beginning of the first serious conversations Americans have ever had about their racial differences not in a crisis. I think it was a banner year for America. We have the lowest unemployment and crime rates in 24 years. Now we know we've got the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 30 years.

We had a good year because we're all working hard. And all I can tell you is, in '98 there will—it will be a more vigorous year. And perhaps you'll have questions about that, but we intend to have a very, very active time. So I can't comment on what others say. I just say that all you have to do is look at the evidence, look at the record, look at our plans for the future, and I think that it's almost worthy of a dismissal.

President's New Dog, Buddy

Now, back to the dog. [*Laughter*] Let me begin by thanking all the children and others, including members of the press corps at the Christmas parties last night, for their voluminous suggestions of a dog's name. We got great groups of suggestions, people who suggested categories related to the coloring of the dog, people who suggested names related to my interest in music, naming all kinds of jazz musicians that I would love to have named our dog after. Then there was a whole set of Arkansas-related suggestions, Barkansas, Arkanpaws. [*Laughter*] Then there were suggestions that related to all of our family names, somehow putting them together, or saying since the Secret Service knows me as POTUS and Hillary as FLOTUS, that we should call the dog DOTUS. [*Laughter*] Then there were the parallels to our cat, Socks, saying we should call it Boots or Shoes or something else like that.

In the end, our family got together; we came down to about seven names, many of them personally inspired, and then to three. I finally decided to name the dog after my beloved uncle who died earlier this year. I'm going to call the dog Buddy, because of the importance of my uncle to my life but also because my uncle raised and trained dogs for over 50 years. And when I was a child growing up, we talked about it a lot. And because the dog was—as was in the press this morning—the dog was trained for a couple of months with another name, it is also, I can tell you, the name he responded best to of all the ones that we sort of tried out on him. [*Laughter*]

And I think while it's important that I train the dog, it's been a good two-way street. But mostly it's a personal thing. And it's ironic that Hillary had thought about it; I thought about it; and then one of my uncle's daughters called me last night. And I didn't take the call last night because it was too late when I got done, so when I called her this morning, she said, "You know, our family thinks you ought to consider naming it after Dad." And I said, "That's what we've decided to do." So I made a few of my family members happy.

But I want to thank everybody who participated in the exercise.

Larry [Larry McQuillan, Reuters].

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, to go back to NATO and your celebration of this expansion, Bosnia kind of underscores the obligations that membership brings. The foreign ministers today have said they basically reached a consensus that there will be a need to keep troops there beyond the June pullout date. Can you tell us just what conditions you've set in order to allow U.S. participation in this?

The President. Well, first of all—you know this, of course, but I think it's worth repeating—we have been involved for the last several weeks in a whole series of intense meetings about the situation in Bosnia, where we are, what progress has been made. Let me point out that after 4 years of the bloodiest war in Europe since World War II, we've had 23 months of peace. It's easy to focus on the problems, but there has been peace, there has been a restoration of significant economic activity. A lot of the facilities, the waste systems, the sewer systems, the schools have been rebuilt. Housing units have been rebuilt. We've had elections and the beginning of a resurgence of democratic processes.

So with all the continuing difficulties, there has been, in my view, a significant amount of progress in the last 23 months, of which the American people can be justly proud, and indeed all of our allies in NATO and beyond NATO and Russia and the other countries that are participating can be proud of that.

We are discussing now actively both within the administration, with our allies in NATO, and our other allies and with Congress what should be done after the June date for the expiration of SFOR. And as you know, I'm going to Bosnia on the night of the 21st to be there on the 22d with our troops and to meet with people in Bosnia. And I will have an announcement about what I expect should be done thereafter before I go. And I'll be able to shed a little more light on that for you.

Yes, go ahead.

Campaign Finance Reform

Q. After all the things we've learned in the months of hearings about campaign fundraising and campaign contributions, I wonder if you can tell us whether you still consider two people, John Huang and Charlie Trie, to be your close friends, sir?

The President. Well, I think what we've learned—first of all, what we've learned is that we need campaign finance reform. If anybody intentionally violated the law, then they should be held accountable. We've already had some examples of that—not involving my campaign, but we've had some examples of that already in the last year or so, people who apparently intentionally violated the campaign finance laws. And no one should be exempt from that. We have laws.

But what we've also learned is, as I have been saying now for 6 years, the laws we have are inadequate. And I am hopeful that the vote we have scheduled for the spring, the fact that we finally have a commitment to have a vote on some kind of campaign finance reform in the spring, will give us the kind of campaign finance reform that the American people need and deserve. And I can tell you, I believe most of the public officials would welcome it.

It is difficult because of the advantages that the Republican majority has in Congress in raising money from all sources. I understand the challenge that's on them to get them to vote for this, but we do have all the Democrats in the Senate, 100 percent of them now, lined up in favor of the McCain-Feingold bill, and I am strongly committed to it. That is ultimately the answer to this.

The fundamental problem is not those that might have deliberately violated the law; the fundamental problem is that the system no longer operates on the 1974–75 system of rules. We need to do more to deal with it. Now, I would like to see more done, whether Congress acts or not. I would like to see the FCC explore its authority and try to do something to offer free or reduced air time for candidates for Federal office, especially if they in turn agree to accept voluntary spending limits. I would very much like to see the FEC try to tighten up its rules on soft money. They opened the floodgates in the beginning; there may be some things that can be done there. But in the end, we have to have a decent campaign finance reform system if we want the kind of results that I think most Americans want.

Yes, go ahead.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—Mr. Huang and Mr.——

The President. I answered that question.

President Saddam Hussein of Iraq

Q. Mr. President, how long are you willing to tolerate Saddam Hussein's continued defiance of the United States and of the United Nations?

The President. Well, Saddam Hussein has been in defiance of the United Nations since the end of the Gulf war. That's why we have a system of sanctions on him. And I am willing to maintain the sanctions as long as he does not comply with the resolutions.

If you're asking me are there other options that I might consider taking under certain circumstances, I wouldn't rule out anything; I never have, and I won't. But I think it's important that you remember, since the end of the Gulf war, the world community has known that he was interested in not only rebuilding his conventional military authority but that he was interested in weapons of mass destruction. And a set of sanctions was imposed on him. There are those that would like to lift the sanctions. I am not among them. I am not in favor of lifting sanctions until he complies. Furthermore, if there is further obstruction from the mission—the United Nations' mission in doing its job, we have to consider other options. But keep in mind, he has not come out, as some people have suggested, ahead on this last confrontation, because now the world community is much less likely to vote to lift any sanctions on him that will enable him to rebuild his military apparatus and continue to oppress his people and threaten his neighbors and others in the world.

So that's my position on that. I feel that we have to be very firm. It is clear to me that he has still not come to terms with his obligations to the international community to open all sites to inspections. We need to wait until Mr. Butler gets back, make a full report, and see where we are and where we go. But this is something that we are following on a—I and my administration are following on a daily basis and very closely. And the United States must remain steadfast in this. But we now have more people who are more sympathetic with being firm than we did before he provoked, needlessly, the last incident.

John [John Donvan, ABC News].

President's Initiative on Race

Q. Mr. President, reports from the front lines of your race initiative suggest that the initiative is in chaos, it is confused. The Akron town

meeting was little more than Presidential "Oprah." Some people involved are beginning to——

The President. That may be your editorial comment. That's not my reports. I've received scores of letters, including letters from ordinary people who said that they loved it, and they thought it was important. So if that's your opinion, state your opinion. But——

Q. It's an opinion, sir, that I'm hearing from others who are beginning to question whether simply talking——

The President. Who are they? Name one. Just one. Give me a name. All this "others" stuff—you know, it's confusing to the American people when they hear all these anonymous sources flying around.

Q. I don't want them to get fired by you, sir, so—[*laughter*]—but they are people who are involved in the process who are beginning to question whether simply talking is enough. Some of them are saying there needs to be more policy, but just talking about an issue doesn't take it very far.

The President. First of all, there has been policy. Keep in mind, we're trying to do four things here. We're trying to identify policies that we need to implement, and do them—from as basic a thing as finally getting the Congress to adequately fund the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to the scholarship proposal I made to help to pay people's expenses to college if they'll agree to teach in underserved areas that are predominately minority areas in the country to Secretary Cuomo's recent initiatives on discrimination in public housing. And I have said there will be more. So the suggestion that there have been no policies is an inaccurate one. There have been policies, and there will be more—first.

Second, many people have told me they think perhaps the most important thing we can do is to get out the practices that are working in communities that are working. That's one of the reasons we went to Akron. And we have had many, many people access—hundreds and hundreds of people access the website that we set up for promising practices in the communities that work.

Third, we're trying to enlist new leaders. I sent a letter to 25,000 student leaders the other day asking them to take specific personal responsibility for doing something. We're getting about 100 letters a day back in response from them, saying what they're going to do.

Fourthly, I believe talking is better than fighting. And I believe when people don't talk and communicate and understand, their fears, their ignorance, and their problems are more likely to fester. I think that's one of the reasons that what you do is often just as important in our society as what decisionmakers do, because people have to have information, they have to have understanding.

Keep in mind, this is the first time—as I said in my opening statement, this is the first time ever that our country has tried to deal with its racial divergence in the absence of a crisis. We don't have a civil war. We don't have the aftermath of civil war. We don't have big fights over Jim Crow. We don't have riots in the streets. We have a country that is emerging as an ever more divergent, diverse democracy.

In the next couple of days, the racial advisory board is going out to Fairfax County, Virginia, with people of different views, including Secretary Bill Bennett, former Secretary of Education, to sit down in Fairfax County, see what they're doing in their schools, how they're dealing with this, and whether there are any lessons there that we can learn for the rest of the country.

So I believe we are on track. I believe that the kinds of criticisms that this board has received were inevitable once we decided to undertake this endeavor in the absence of a crisis or in the absence of building support for some single bill, like an open housing bill, a voting rights act, an omnibus civil rights act. But I think it is working, and I think it is taking shape, and I believe it's got clear direction, and I think you will see better results as we go forward.

So that's the only reason I ask you the specifics. I think it's very hard for me to shadowbox with people if I don't know specifically what they're saying. You can always make these sort of general statements. But I'm very upbeat about this commission. I felt great about the Akron townhall meeting.

And one of the things that I think we ought to do more of, however, following up on the Akron meeting, is to get people who have different views about real issues that are before the country and to try to see them talk together. I'm going to have a meeting with people who have been labeled and perhaps self-styled conservatives on a lot of the issues surrounding

the civil rights debates in America today in the next few days. I'm very much looking forward to that. But what we really need to do is to get people talking across the lines that divide them. And I hope we can do more of that. But I believe that there is an intrinsic value to this kind of discussion.

Susan [Susan Page, USA Today].

Taxes

Q. Mr. President, speaking of what will happen in 1998, some lawmakers are talking about giving Americans a tax cut next year. But there is a separate issue of fundamental tax reform, that is, changing the Tax Code to a flat tax or national sales tax or a greatly simplified progressive tax. Do you believe that the time has come to seriously consider fundamental tax reform?

The President. You mentioned two things, so let me try to respond to both of them. First of all, on the whole tax cut front, there has been some talk about that by some lawmakers who say that now we have a surplus, and therefore, we should spend it in part, at least, with a tax cut. And by that they mean one of two things. They mean we have a projected surplus at the end of this budget period, or they mean that the deficit is lower now than it was projected to be last August when I signed the balanced budget bill.

But it's important that the American people understand we don't have a surplus yet. We have a deficit; it's over 90 percent smaller than it was when I took office. I was at $290 billion, and now it's at $23 billion. That is not a surplus. This economy is the strongest it's been in a generation because of the discipline that we've been able to bring to the task of bringing the deficit down and getting our house in order. We should not lightly abandon that discipline. The most important thing the American people need is a strong economy with good jobs and now rising incomes for all income groups. We've worked very hard to reverse 20 years on that, and we need to stay at that task.

Now, the second question, should the Tax Code be simplified, and should the system work better for ordinary Americans? On an elemental level, of course, it should. Let me remind you that we have a bill which passed the House with overwhelming support—I think there were only three or four votes against it—that is now in the Senate, that will further unshackle, if you will, the American people from any potential abuses by the IRS and make the system more accessible and fair for them. So I would urge the Senate to pass that bill.

Now, let's go to some of the more ambitious schemes. I would not rule out a further substantial action to simplify the Tax Code. But I will evaluate any proposal, including any one that our people might be working on, by the following criteria: First of all, is it fiscally responsible? Secondly, is it fair to all Americans; that is, we don't want to shift the burden to middle class taxpayers to lower income taxes on upper income people. We did that for 12 years, and it didn't work out very well. And we have reversed that, and we don't want to start that all over again. Thirdly, will it be good for the economy? And fourthly, will it actually lead to a simpler tax system?

Now, within those parameters, any proposals that meet those criteria, I think I am duty bound to consider supporting, and I would consider supporting them.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel

Q. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Prime Minister of Israel, Binyamin Netanyahu, was in the United States, and you and he were in Los Angeles at exactly the same time; in fact, your planes were both on the tarmac at LAX as you were getting ready to leave. But you refused to meet with him. He later said in an interview that you, in effect, were not only snubbing him, but you were humiliating or embarrassing the State of Israel, the people of Israel. I wonder if you'd care to respond to that, and why didn't you meet with Prime Minister Netanyahu? This is the first time in my memory that an Israeli Prime Minister was in the United States and did not get a meeting with the President of the United States.

The President. Well, first of all, let's put the record straight here. Mr. Netanyahu has been in office only a year and a half, and we have had five meetings. I don't believe I have ever met with any other world leader five times within an 18-month period. So there can be no serious suggestion that the United States is not interested in the peace process or respectful of the people and Government of Israel. We have had five meetings.

Secondly, I expect that we will have a meeting early next year, a sixth meeting, to discuss where

we are and where we're going. Secretary Albright was slated to meet with and did meet with Mr. Netanyahu to talk about what the next steps were. I think it is important when the President meets on the peace process that it be a real meeting and that there be some understanding of where we are and where we're going and what we're doing together. And I have always taken that position.

So there was no—you never heard, I don't believe, me say anything about some sort of calculated decision to snub the people of Israel or the Government of Israel. I simply wouldn't do that.

Yes.

Women in the Armed Forces

Q. Mr. President, would you support the resegregation of the sexes in the military? And wouldn't that send a message to women that they cannot benefit from equal opportunity in the Armed Forces?

The President. Well, I think you must be referring to the report issued by Senator Kassebaum and her—Senator Kassebaum Baker and her committee today. I have not had a chance to review the report. I did read the press reports on it this morning. I'm not sure exactly what their recommendations are. I can say this. It's a group of eminent Americans; I think they looked at a difficult question. I'm not sure they recommended a total resegregation of the military.

What I would be very reluctant to do is to embrace anything that denied women the opportunity to serve in positions for which they are qualified and to progress up the ladder of promotion in the way that so many have worked so hard to permit them to do in the last few years.

Now, within those parameters, if there is something that they feel strongly ought to be done in the training regime or in the housing regime because of the problems that we have seen in the military in the last couple of years, I think we ought to entertain it. And I think within those limits that this ought to be largely a decision left to our military commanders upon serious review of the report. But I don't think—I doubt that the committee wants to do anything to deny women the opportunity to serve or to gain appropriate promotions, and so I'm not accusing them of that. I'm just saying that we would be in my framework within which to evaluate this.

Mara [Mara Liasson, National Public Radio], and then Peter [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio]. Go ahead.

Iran

Q. Mr. President, a question about Iran. You said this week you were looking forward to an honest dialog with Iran. Can you tell us how and when that dialog might begin? And also, given that the United States has not been able to enlist a single other country to help us in our effort to isolate Iran economically, to join in the embargo, do you still think that policy is effective, or are you willing to rethink it?

The President. Let me answer the questions in order, but in reverse order. On our embargo, I think it is the right thing to do. And it will have varying degrees of effectiveness depending upon how much other people are willing to work with us, but I think that the voters in Iran, when they made the selection of the current President, seemed to be sending a signal that they wanted a more open society. And I was quite encouraged by his remarks. So that I'm not sure you can say that our policy has been in error. I certainly think it is right, whether it is supported or not.

Now, going to your first question. We are, all of us, discussing about how to proceed now. No decision has been made. But I have always said from the beginning that I thought it was tragic that the United States was separated from the people of Iran. It's a country with a great history that at various times has been quite close to the United States. We have had the privilege of educating a number of people from Iran over several decades; indeed, some people in the present government were able to get some of their education in the United States. And Americans have been greatly enriched by Iranian, by Persian culture, from the beginning of our country.

We have three issues that we think have to be discussed in the context of any comprehensive discussion. The first relates to Iranian support of terrorist activities, with which we strongly disagree. The second relates to Iranian opposition to the peace process in the Middle East, with which we disagree. And the third relates to policies involving the development of weapons of mass destruction. I think we have to be able to discuss those things in order to have

an honest dialog, just like we have an honest dialog with China now. We don't have to agree on everything, but people have to be able to have an honest discussion, even when they disagree.

And in terms of terrorism, I think the United States must maintain an uncompromising stand there. We would not expect any Islamic State, in effect, to say it had no opinions on issues involving what it would take to have a just and lasting peace settlement in the Middle East. We would never ask any country to give up its opinions on that. But we would ask every country to give up the support, the training, the arming, the financing of terrorism.

If you look at the world that we're living in and the one toward which we are going, if you look at the torments that many Americans underwent in the 1980's because of terrorist activities, our uncompromising position on that I think is clearly the right one, and we shouldn't abandon that, and we must not, and we won't. But do I hope that there will be some conditions under which this dialog can resume? I certainly do.

Peter.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, I'd like to go back to the earlier question on Bosnia. You're obviously laying the groundwork for an extended stay for U.S. troops there. What kind of a mandate do you envision for that mission? And what type of military and financial responsibility do you hope that the European allies will agree to in this follow-on effort?

The President. Well, of course, that is all part of our discussions now both with our allies and with the Members of Congress, and I don't want to truncate the discussions. What I want to do is to see that the peace process continues. I think one of the things that all of our military people agree on is that we must do more to beef up the civilian police there; and that there must be a distinction between what we expect our military leaders to do and what we expect the civilian police to do; and that the mission must be—if there is to be a mission after the SFOR mission expires, it also must have clear, objective components with some way of knowing whether the mission has been achieved or not.

In other words, I still don't believe that there should be anybody interested in some kind of a permanent stationing of global military presence all over Bosnia. But I do think that these are all elements that have to be discussed. And as I said, I hope to be able to tell you more about this before I leave on my trip in a few days.

April [April Ryan, American Urban Radio Networks].

Affirmative Action

Q. Mr. President, as the national dialog on race gains momentum, the one-year anniversary seems too near, and how are you going to pull apart the issue of race reconciliation and affirmative action that seems to be cross-tied? And will you extend the race initiative beyond this year, to the end of your term?

The President. Well, in some sense, this whole initiative has been a part of my administration from the beginning, because it permeates so much else of what we try to do and what we're trying to do.

With regard to affirmative action, I think that's an ongoing process. My reading of the Supreme Court's decision not to hear the Court of Appeals ruling that the California vote abolishing affirmative action was, in fact, not unconstitutional, that it was permissible for the voters to vote in the way that they did under the Constitution—my reading of the Supreme Court's decision there is that they were saying that we're going to allow this matter to be resolved in the political process, that is, that affirmative acts of discrimination are illegal; what should be done to root out the vestiges of discrimination or to create a society in which people have more or less the same chance to succeed without regard to their racial background must be resolved in the political arena. As you know, there was a different decision made by the voters of Houston recently in a vote on affirmative action.

So what I would like to see done is to move beyond the I'm-for-it and you're-against-it stage to a more sophisticated and, ultimately, more meaningful debate to the American people, which is, if you don't like the way California used to admit people to its colleges and universities, what would you do to make sure that you didn't exclude whole groups who happened to be predominantly of racial minorities, but also happen to be predominantly poor, predominantly from difficult neighborhoods, predominantly born into families without the kinds of advantages as many other children have? What

are we going to do? And that debate is, I would suggest to you, in its infancy. But there are a lot of people who are trying to contribute to that debate.

I noticed there was an interesting set of op-ed pieces in one of our papers recently, one by Chris Edley, who used to work for us, essentially defending affirmative action, but pointing out some of the problems within it; and another one by Glenn Loury, who's normally viewed as a conservative intellectual, who said that he thought in some cases there was still some room for it, but there were a lot of other things which ought to be done which might make an even bigger difference.

Let me give you a problem; this is one that I think about all the time. Most people believe that our affirmative action program in the United States Army has worked quite well. It's clearly not a quota, and clearly no one is given a position for which they are not qualified. But there is an intensive effort to qualify people so that in each promotion pool, the pool of applicants for the next rank roughly reflects the racial composition of the people in the next lowest rank.

Now, if you try to draw a parallel from that to where we are in our colleges and universities, what is the breakdown? The breakdown, it would almost be as if—people are in kindergarten through 12th grade over here in this system, and then they go to college or graduate school over in this system, over here. It's almost as if the Army were divided so that one group of people was responsible for training everybody from private through captain and everybody else, and a whole different group were responsible for training and picking everybody from major through four-star general.

Is there something we can learn from the way the military does that? Should the universities be more involved, for example, in a more systematic way in identifying candidates who may not have the academic background that will give them a high score on a SAT test, but whose probability of success in college is very, very high indeed early on, and doing more for them so that they can get there? Is this the sort of affirmative action that would be widely supported by the American people?

I really believe that these debates really turn more on how the—in these initiatives—turn more on how the initiative is described as opposed to what the problem is and whether we can reach agreement on how to solve it. So we may not get this done by next June. And if that's not done, that's something that has to continue. We have to continue to work on that until we reach a reasoned resolution of it.

Yes, go ahead, and then Sarah [Sarah McClendon, McClendon News Service] next. Go ahead.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, you said earlier, getting back to the Middle East peace process, you said that if you met with the Prime Minister, it should be with an understanding of the direction that the peace process is going—forgive me if those aren't your exact words, but did you mean to suggest that there is no understanding of the direction that the peace process is taking?

The President. No, I didn't mean that at all. But what I mean is I think the next time we meet, we are likely to have a productive meeting, because we'll have a lot to talk about because a lot of work has been done. Secretary Albright has been out there to the region; she's been meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu in Europe. The Netanyahu Cabinet has taken a decision on redeployment, which they're attempting to flesh out and define at this moment. And, as you know, there's a lot of controversy within the Government in Israel about what next steps ought to be taken in the peace process.

The only point I made is I think the next time we meet we'll have quite a meaty agenda; we'll have something to talk about and something to do. I'm not suggesting that there is some standard that the Government or the Prime Minister has to meet in order to have a meeting, but I think that it will be a useful meeting and it's an appropriate thing to do.

Sarah, go ahead.

Vice President Al Gore

Q. This is about Vice President Albert Gore. He apparently is your heir apparent, and he's been very loyal to you. But he seems to be the target of a nationally well-organized campaign on the part of Democrats and Republicans to knock him out and fix it so that he will be so scandalized that he can't even run for President after you're gone. Now, what do you think about the way these people are acting, especially the Democrats? [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, I think anybody that wants to run for President has a perfect right to do so. And if anybody wants to run and believes they have a unique contribution to make and has the passion and the pain threshold to do it, I'd be the last one to tell them not to.

What I would say among all the Democrats is that there's plenty of time for Presidential politics—I would say that to the Republicans as well—and that the most important thing now is that we show the people we can make progress on the problems of the country and on the promise of the country.

As for the Vice President himself, he needs no defense from me. I have simply said, and I will say again, what everyone knows: He's had the most full partnership with the President of any Vice President in history, and he has performed superbly. Whether it was on the environment, or on energy initiatives, or on helping us downsize the Government by 300,000 and increase the Government's output, or on the foreign policy issues like Russia and South Africa, he has done a superb job. And I'm proud of that, and I appreciate it. And I think that we've accomplished more for the American people because of it.

Yes, Elizabeth [Elizabeth Shogren, Los Angeles Times], go ahead.

Campaign Fundraising

Q. Mr. President, many analysts suggest that the Attorney General finding legitimizes making telephone calls for soft money from the White House. Given that, and given the troubles that the Democratic Party faces, the financial troubles, do you have any plans to make more such telephone calls, and if not, why not?

The President. I believe that I spoke to this earlier, but let me try to restate it. I think the most effective thing for me to do when raising money is to meet with people in small groups and tell them what I think should be done, and I prefer that to just making phone calls. I also think it gives people who contribute to the Democratic Party the sense that they are part of an administration and part of a process that stands for some ideas; so you're not just calling people for money, you're also listening to what they think should be done. And I think that's more fruitful and more productive.

But I do expect to continue to try to help our party, our candidates for Senate, our candidates for the House, and our candidates for Governor to raise funds in the 1998 elections. I hope before I leave office, however, that my successor of whatever party, and all others, will be living under a different campaign finance reform system which will be better for the American people and much better for the people in public life.

Go ahead.

FBI Director Louis J. Freeh

Q. Mr. President, the Attorney General has rendered her judgment, and the FBI Director has dissented from that judgment as to the appointment of a special counsel. On several occasions, your spokesman has declined to express full confidence in the FBI Director. Have you lost confidence in Director Freeh? Is it because of his dissent, and is that fair, sir?

The President. First of all, his decision to dissent in that case has no effect on whatever opinion I have of him. I think he should be—I think that—the Attorney General runs the Justice Department the way I try to run the White House, which is, I want to hear what people's opinions are.

But on this confidence business, I think there has been too much back-and-forth on that, and I don't want to get into it. What I have confidence in is that, if we all work on trying to make the American people safer and continue to try to drive the crime rate down and solve crime problems, the American people will feel that they're getting out of all of us what they paid for and what they expect from us. And that's what I think we should be doing. I don't think we should—I don't think it's a very fruitful thing to try to keep spinning that around.

Yes, George [George Condon, Copley News Service].

Democratic Party

Q. Mr. President, just to follow up a little bit on what you said about the Democratic Party—since you became President, the Democrats have lost both Houses of Congress, more than a dozen Governorships, and has gone broke. Now you have Congressman Gephardt saying he wants to steer the party into a more liberal direction. First off, do you feel at all personally responsible for the state of the party today? And secondly, is there anything you plan to do to take the challenge of Congressman

Gephardt to keep the party on a more centrist course after you leave office?

The President. Well, I don't know what I'm going to do when I leave office, and I don't think I should spend much time thinking about it. I think I should spend my time thinking about what I can do in the next 3 years and 2 months to leave America in the best possible shape for a new century, so I'm not going to think about it very much.

Secondly, I think the Democratic Party's financial problems are due almost entirely to the legal bills it incurred with a lot of very vigorous help from the Republican congressional committee. So it is obviously part of the strategy, and it's worked to some extent. And I've worked very hard this year to try to keep it from bankrupting the party.

Now, we did well in the elections of '92, the congressional elections, and we did pretty well in the elections of '96. The Governorships I think tend not to be so identified with national party trends as the Senate and House. I feel badly about what happened in '94. I think only partly it was due to the fact—several things—there were three big factors, I think.

One is, the Republicans successfully argued that we had a tax increase in the '93 budget for ordinary Americans, and that simply wasn't so. The income tax went up on 1½ percent of the people. Secondly, they scared a lot of people in districts that—where you had a lot of rural gun owners into believing we were taking their guns away, when we weren't, with the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. And thirdly, they were able to, with the help of a massive campaign by private industry, to convince people we wanted the Government to take over the health care system, which we didn't.

I would just remind you to look at history there. The last time that happened was when Harry Truman went from 80 percent approval on the day after he dropped the bomb ending World War II, in effect, down to about 38 percent approval because he tried to provide health insurance coverage to all Americans, with the same consequence in the midterm election. So I feel—I'm sorry that happened, and I hope that we'll have more skills and more ability coming up in this midterm elections. If we have a clear position, I think we'll be fine.

Now, in terms of the debate with Congressman Gephardt, let me just say, I think that it's easy to overstate that—which is not to say that I trivialize it, but let's look at the issue here. First of all, we were together when we passed that economic plan in 1993 without a single vote from anybody in the other party, and it reduced the deficit by 90 percent before the balanced budget bill passed. So we were together, and I think we were both right. We were together on the crime bill, and we were together on trying to do something about the health care needs of all Americans.

And I think the left-right issue is a little bit misstated. We have a difference of opinion on trade, but I think it's important to articulate what the difference is. I believe strongly that selling more products around the world is a precondition to maintaining our standard of living and growing jobs, for the simple reason, as I have said repeatedly, we have 4 percent of the world's population and 20 percent of the world's wealth; and the developing countries will grow 3 times as rapidly as the developed countries in the next 10 years. Therefore, if you want to keep your income, you've got to sell more to the other 96 percent, especially those that are growing fast.

However, I agree with him, and it was our administration and our campaign in '92 that explicitly made a national priority of trying to do, in addition to expanding trade, in the process of expanding trade, at least not to diminish environmental standards, to raise them where possible, and to try to lift the labor standards of people around the world.

Our difference about fast track was a difference about how much that could be mandated in the process of giving the President the authority to negotiate trade. And I would argue that that is no different than a lot of the differences that exist within the Republican Party today over issues that are potentially far more explosive.

The second thing I'd like to say is, I consider the real obligation here, over and above that, in the trade area, is to do what is necessary to make more winners, which is to trade more but to develop a public response from our Government where we can do more and do it more quickly to help the people that are displaced from the global economy or from technology or from anything else.

We have doubled funds invested for displaced workers since I've been President, while we were reducing the deficit. We have doubled funds. But we need to do more, and I am now

in the process of working with the Secretary of Labor and others to set up a model which will enable us to help communities that are hurt by trade dislocation or plant closings for other reasons to basically operate the way we did with communities that lost military bases because they had a big hit.

So I don't believe any advanced country can say with a straight face and a clear conscience that it has done everything possible to help those that are losing in the modern economy, that are rendered more insecure in the modern economy because of the industries they work in or because they have low levels of skills. And until we have a comprehensive lifetime system of education and training and an investment strategy that works in those communities, we have to keep working on it.

So to that extent, if that's the debate we're having in the Democratic Party about how to get that done, that is a good thing to do, because our party cares about the people who lose, as well as trying to make more winners. That's always been our burden, our obligation, our responsibility. It's a part of our conscience about who we are. And I think that's a healthy debate. But it's not a debate that's going to split this party in 1998, because basically both factions, if you will, of our party, agree that we should do both; we should trade more, and we should do more to help people around the world with environmental and labor problems, and to help people here at home that are being left behind. All I want to do is keep it in a policy-oriented, positive context, and I'm going to do what I can to get that done.

Yes, in the back. Go ahead.

District of Columbia

Q. Mr. President, about a year ago you first voiced your vision and your thoughts about the District of Columbia and where we ought to be going. And since then, frankly, you've been very active. You worked with the Congress to get a legislative plan passed that calls for financial recovery and restructuring. And yet the city leaders are criticizing you. They say you haven't done enough. They apparently expected something at your church service, even though ahead of time you said, in effect, not to expect that much. My question to you is, how do you respond to this kind of criticism, and what kind of thoughts might you have on the future, from taxes, commuter taxes—anything like that that you might be thinking about in response?

The President. Well, first, if you go back to Mr. Donvan's question or any others, it's almost a citizen responsibility to criticize the President. Why be an American if you can't criticize the President? [*Laughter*]

Secondly, the District of Columbia, I think, has a lot of accumulated frustration. The people who live here, who have put their roots down here love this city deeply. They see folks like me come and go, have our roots elsewhere. But there really is, with all the problems in the District of Columbia, there is a passionate love for it among the people who have lived here. And I want to see that love redeemed, and I want this city to be something—a place that every single American can be truly proud of. But I can't do everything that everybody in the city wants me to do as soon as they want me to do it.

Furthermore, there are some things that will have to be done by people here themselves. Folks here want more home rule. There were people in our meeting, our leaders' meeting, who want more home rule. They would like to see an elected official represented on the control board, for example. But with more freedom comes more responsibility. And actions must be taken to restore the confidence of the people of the District of Columbia in the school systems—not just in some schools, not just in teachers, in the school system. Action must be taken to restore the confidence of the people of the District of Columbia in law enforcement generally, not just in some precincts or some police officers but in law enforcement generally.

We know now from schools I could show you in the District of Columbia that urban schools with poor children in difficult neighborhoods can perform at high levels. Every school has to be able to perform that way. We know now that in urban environments with very difficult circumstances, children can be made safe and crime can be made low, and that ought to be done here in the District of Columbia.

I will do everything I can to help. There is more that the Federal Government can do. But we have to do it in partnership. So I would say to the people who are frustrated with me, keep on pushing. Push me, push the Congress, push the Federal Government. There is more to do. But in the end, a city is formed and made by the people who live in it and shape

its life day-in and day-out. I want to be a good partner. I don't mind the fact that some people with greater ambitions are still disappointed even though we've done very sweeping things, but there still has to be a lot more done here as well.

Go ahead.

Iran

Q. Mr. President, if I could follow up on the question about Iran. You mentioned, in your answer to Mara, concerns about terrorism, and one of the specific concerns with respect to Iran and terrorism is that they might be involved with Khobar Towers. Is your hope for improved dialog—is there any prospect for that if it's shown that Iran was involved with that bombing? And also, could you give us your understanding of the status of that investigation? Many family members, understandably, are frustrated by the progress or the seeming lack of public progress so far.

The President. I think it better to answer the second question without answering the first because I don't think it's worth having a hypothetical question—if I give an answer to that hypothetical question, it will imply that I think I know what the answer is, and I don't.

I share the frustration of the families. Here is a case where I believe that Mr. Freeh and the FBI have worked hard to try to get an answer. We have tried to work in cooperation with the Saudis, as we had to since the crime occurred—the murder occurred in their country. And we are not in a position at this time—all I can tell you is the investigation is ongoing, and we are not in a position at this time to answer definitively your question, which is who was behind this, who did it all, who contemplated it, who funded it, who trained, who facilitated it. I wish I could answer that question. When we know the answer to that question, then there will be a range of things that are appropriate to do when we know the answer. And for the family members, it grieves me that we don't. But we don't know the answer yet.

Yes, sir, in the back.

India, Pakistan, and China

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*]—1997—[*inaudible*]—a year—[*inaudible*]—you're doing a great job. And also you have done a great service to America by appointing Mr. Lee to the Civil Rights Division post. The last time at the White House press conference you renewed your call that you are going to India and Pakistan. But since other things—things have changed in those two countries: The Pakistan President was forced to resign, and the Prime Minister of India was also forced to resign. Now, despite all these political changes in India and Pakistan, are you still renewing your call, going to the region?

The President. Absolutely. First of all, let me say the United States has an enormous national interest in having greater positive involvement with all of South Asia, with India, with Pakistan, with Bangladesh, the other countries in the region. India already has the world's biggest middle class. Pakistan has had historic alliances with the United States. There are difficulties in each country which make it difficult for us to resolve everything and to have every kind of relationship we'd like to have.

But I still intend to go there next year. I have not set a time for when I will go, and I think I have to be sensitive, among other things, to the Indian election schedule. But both countries are now celebrating their 50th anniversary of independence, and I think that it's quite appropriate for the President of the United States to be there.

Q. To follow up—I'm sorry—also India is the world's largest democracy and U.S. is the world's richest democracy, and also China is the world's largest Communist country. And this triangle, you are also visiting India and also to China. So where do you fit all these largest democracies and Communist countries?

The President. Well, you know, in the cold war, our relationship with India was sometimes complicated because the tensions between India and China led to relations between India and the Soviet Union, which made difficult relations between India and the United States. The last thing I want to do is to replay that in a different context with regard to China and India. What I'm trying to do is to develop constructive relationships with both of them and hope that they will have constructive relationships with each other, so the world will move together toward more peace, more prosperity, and ultimately in countries which don't have it, more personal freedom.

Bill [Bill Neikirk, Chicago Tribune].

Press Secretary Mike McCurry. Penultimate question. [*Laughter*]

The President. We're having a good time.

Press Secretary McCurry. All right. [*Laughter*]

Affirmative Action

Q. Mr. President, the polls show that people support affirmative action, but not when it's known as racial preference. How do you get around this clash of language? And what do you think about the term "racial preference"? Is it a proper one?

The President. I think people support affirmative action when you describe it, and then if you call it "racial preference," they don't support it because the words itself seem to inevitably mean that someone will get something because of his or her race for which he or she is not really qualified.

Now, the problem, if you back off from that, is that we Americans believe in three things: We believe that the best qualified people ought to get what they're best qualified for; we believe everybody ought to have a chance; and we believe people that have had a hard time ought to have a hand up. If you took a survey, I believe over 80 percent of the people would say that. We believe that merit should prevail over pull, if you will, or privilege. We believe that everyone should have a chance. And we believe that people who have had a hard time ought to have a hand up. The problem is, when you try to translate those three principles, if you have a label that can be affixed to your efforts that is consistent with those principles, people say, yes, do it. If the label seems to be contradictory to those, they say, no, don't do it. And what really matters is, what are you doing, and is it working?

There are a lot of problems. For example, in college admissions—let's just take college admissions. It's something I think I know quite a bit about. I wasn't thinking about Chelsea at the time. [*Laughter*] I mean, I used to teach in a college; I used to deal with admissions policies. I've thought about this a lot. The whole premise on which affirmative action is being attacked is that there really is a totally objective, realistic way you can predict success in college and right to go to college and capacity to learn in college based on your high school grades and your SAT scores.

And yet, we know—if you forget about race altogether, that grading systems in some high schools are very different from those in others, and that the work done in the courses in some schools at the same period of time are different from those in others. Furthermore, we know that performance on the SAT scores is not a perfect predictor of capacity to learn and capacity to perform in college, because there are some people who just won't do as well because of the experiences they've had, but they're capable, given the chance, of making a huge leap in college. And you can see that in the sterling careers and performance that has been established by many people who got admitted to either college or professional schools through affirmative action programs.

That is why I say I honestly believe that it's going to be difficult to finally resolve all this at the ballot box if voters are coming in and it's a question of which label wins. I thought it was interesting in Houston that the proaffirmative action position won, I think in no small measure because it was a city where people knew each other; they probably had a greater familiarity with how the programs worked; and they understood what their elected leaders were saying perhaps better than—the bigger the electorate is and the further away more voters are from the actual decisions that are being made, the more vulnerable they may be to the way—the general characterizations.

And that's what—one of the things I think that we should be charged with in this racial dialog is maybe something that will blend talk and action which is, how can we overcome this, how can we get beyond the labeling to how the real world works? See, I honestly believe—let's—I honestly believe that if every kid in this country had the right kind of preparation and a hand up where needed, enough in advance, and the right sort of supports, and you had a realistic set of criteria for letting people into college, that there would not be much racial disparity in who got into which institutions.

I honestly believe, furthermore, in the economic area it's even more complex. You know, when people get into business and when they get bank loans and when they get training to do certain things, it has so much to do with the whole fabric of contacts people have and what they know and what experiences they've had—which is why I've supported a lot of these economic affirmative action programs.

My whole idea is that we have to reach a point in this country where there is a critical mass of people in all neighborhoods from all backgrounds that have had enough business contacts, business experience, and have enough

credibility with financial institutions, for example, to be able to do business and compete on equal terms. And I don't think we're there yet.

So I'm hoping—I haven't given you a clear answer because it's not a clear problem. If we get down to slogans, you have no better than a 50–50 chance of seeing any kind of affirmative effort prevail. If you get down to brass tacks, I think people in both parties, of good faith, what they want is a society where everybody who needs it gets a hand up, everybody has got a fair chance, but where unfair criteria don't deprive the deserving at the expense—to the benefit of the undeserving. We can get there if we'll move beyond the slogans to keep refining these programs and maybe even extending our efforts to help more people in their earlier years and to help more people in these disadvantaged communities. That's what our whole empowerment concept is all about.

Yes.

Anthrax Vaccinations

Q. As you know, the Pentagon is going to vaccinate every member of the armed services against anthrax. A two-part question on that. One, as Commander in Chief, will you be vaccinated? [*Laughter*] And second, Secretary Cohen made a quite vivid demonstration not long ago on TV that a primary threat of anthrax would be a terrorist attack against a civilian population. Should civilians be vaccinated against anthrax?

The President. I do not think that's called for at this time. I couldn't recommend that. But I will say this. I gave a directive to the Pentagon on force protection because I felt that it was more likely that over the next 20 to 30 years we might be in settings with our forces in other countries where they might be exposed to chemical or biological weapons. This instruction grows out of that directive I gave to the Pentagon. I think it is appropriate, and I will support it. Also, keep in mind, the anthrax vaccine is fairly well-known and widely administered to people who deal with animals which might have been infected with anthrax. So we don't believe this presents any significant risk to our men and women in uniform.

Now, having said that, at this time I know of no expert opinion that would say that those of us that are essentially in the civilian population in the United States should be vaccinated. I don't think the evidence is there that would support that kind of recommendation.

Taxes

Q. Mr. President, you mentioned, somewhat skeptically, that Republicans in Congress are talking again about new tax cuts on top of those that you and they agreed to this year. But you get the first word on next year's agenda in your State of the Union and in the budget. What tax cuts might you call for? And, in particular, what do you think of the Republicans' idea of doing away with the marriage penalty?

The President. Well, I do get the first word in the State of the Union, and I hope you will all watch it, because there will be a lot in there—a lot of things in there. I can't say at this time that I will have anything to say about tax cuts in the State of the Union. Keep in mind, we have worked so hard to make this country work again, and we need to be looking to the future and our long-term challenges now. And we cannot break the connection of progress between making the country work again and looking to the future by basically losing our discipline and our concentration and giving in to the easy answers. So we don't have a surplus yet, and I don't know that anyone's talking about paying for tax cuts with some other sort of program cut or some other sort of tax increase. So I have reached no decision about that, and I'm not entirely sure that I will.

Now, on principle, I don't like the marriage penalty—on principle. I don't think any American could. I think that—you know, whether it's the Family and Medical Leave Act or the $500 children's tax credit or the adoption tax credit, I have been firmly committed to supporting policies which would both strengthen families and strengthen work and help people reconcile the balance between the two. And the so-called marriage penalty is, I think, not defensible under those circumstances.

On the other hand, it's like every other tax cut. There are a lot of tax cuts that might be desirable, but how would you pay for them? How would you not increase the deficit? How would you keep the budget moving toward balance? Even married couples paying an otherwise unfair rate of tax because they're married are better off, first and foremost, with a strong economy. And most of those married couples will now be able to take advantage of the children's tax credit, the education tax cuts, and

the other changes which have been made in America to have a better life. So that's the first and sort of bottom line for me.

Susan [Susan Feeney, Dallas Morning News].

Affirmative Action

Q. You touched on college admissions. And very early this year you said you were quite concerned that some American universities, public universities in Texas and California in particular, were going to become resegregated, and you vowed to come up with some sort of plan to counter that. Have you come up with a plan, and could you share it with us?

The President. Well, what I said was that I wanted to look at what the alternatives were. Texas has now adopted an alternative which I think will work apparently quite well for them for undergraduate schools, which is simply to say that the top 10 percent of every high school graduating class in Texas is eligible for admission to any public institution of higher education in Texas. But I think if you look at it, while I think it is an acceptable alternative, the critics will argue it's simply affirmative action in another form. But it's a way of saying, look, high schools are different, but the ability of children is not unevenly distributed, so we're going to give them a chance. That may be one answer.

The other thing we're looking at is trying to support more college efforts in actually identifying young people in schools with the promise of going to college, who have a difficult situation, and trying to work with them over a period of a few years to make sure that when they come to take the college exams, that they are fully prepared to do so and much more likely to succeed. You know, the military academy has a kind of a prep school like this, that enables people to apply for positions in our service academies with a greater prospect of success. So these are some of the things that I think we might do.

Let me say, are there any foreign journalists here? Since we're here, let me take a few questions from the international press corps, since we're in the State Department.

U.S. Ambassador to Mexico

Q. Thank you, Mr. President, Maria Equsquiza, Eco Televisa. On several occasions, sir, you mentioned that Mexico is the second most important partner and commercial partner to the United States. But it's been more than 5 months, and there's not a U.S. Ambassador in Mexico. Are you considering any particular names right now, and by when you're going to announce with your nominee?

The President. I expect to have a name quite soon, but I don't want to say the people I'm considering. I'll have a nominee, and then I'll name it, and I think it will be quite soon.

Yes.

President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Q. Mr. President, this is the first time for the last 6 years, I guess, that we don't know when you're going to go to Russia for the next meeting with President Yeltsin. Otherwise, we could say it was pretty easy before that. Is that the START II impasse in Duma, or something else?

The President. Well, we have agreed, President Yeltsin and I, that we are going to meet again and that we will meet again in Russia. We think it would be better for me to go to Russia after the Duma ratifies START II, because then we can work on START III. I think that's very important. And that's the sort of timetable we agreed to embrace.

I'm glad to see that the President, apparently, is getting over his little illness, and I expect to see him back to work soon. And I hope and believe the Duma will ratify START II, and when they do, I'd like to go there and talk about START III, because for Russia it's very important in order that they not be in an unfair either security or economic position, that there not be much gap between the time START II is ratified and we agree on the broad terms of START III. And that's my personal commitment to the President, so I expect to be there shortly after START II is ratified.

Yes.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, on Bosnia, you mentioned that being there you're going to talk about responsibility. Sir, would you care to share with us how will you characterize responsibilities of Belgrade, Zagreb, and Sarajevo in Bosnia among Bosnians and Serbs and Croats, and responsibilities of your own and international community?

The President. Well, I think that all of us should support the Dayton accords, the Dayton process. We should do nothing to undermine it and do whatever we can to support it. Now, when the Croats, for example, supported the

turning over of some Bosnian Croats who were indicted for war crimes recently, I though that was a very positive thing.

Now, they'll all have difficult moments when it comes to relocation of people and to areas where they'll be the minority, and there are a lot of difficulties ahead. But Belgrade, Sarajevo, and of course, Zagreb, all of them have the responsibility to support Dayton. They said they'd support it; they signed off on it; and that's what they ought to do. It's a good framework, and it will work if we all support it.

Yes, sir.

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. I'll take them both, go ahead.

Presidential Election in Guyana

Q. Mr. President, a feisty 77-year-old Chicagoan, American woman is said to be the first elected President in South America. From one American to another, do you have any words of wisdom to offer her? And just in case you're wondering where it is, it's in Georgetown, Guyana.

The President. Excuse me, I'm sorry, what——

Q. Georgetown, Guyana.

The President. Oh, yes, I know. I couldn't hear what you said before. I think anybody with enough energy to get elected President at that age probably knows what to do. [*Laughter*] And I'm very impressed. But I'll try to be a good ally, and I hope we can work together.

China and Taiwan

Q. Sir, General Xiong Guangkai, the very high-level—China's military officer who warned that U.S. better care about the safety of Los Angeles other than the safety of Taiwan, was in town last week and conducted so-called first defense consultative talks with U.S.—I think the Under Secretary of Defense. By conducting such a meeting, does your Government care more about Los Angeles now, or do you care both? I mean, regarding the security of Taiwan, I guess, in your press conference with President Jiang Zemin, you urged that both sides of Taiwan Strait to resume their talk as soon as possible. Now it's been about 5 weeks already, and during the interlude you also met with President Jiang Zemin once. Do you think they're moving toward that direction under your advice, or not? If not, do you have any other suggestion?

The President. Well, I know you didn't mean it that way, but the American President, of course, has to be concerned about the security of Los Angeles. They've endured earthquakes and fires and now El Niño—[*laughter*]—and they just keep going on. They're remarkable. So we're worried about them, and we'll be there for them.

But I think the important thing that you understand is that nothing, nothing has changed in our position on the security of Taiwan. The whole framework of America's relations with China, embodied in three communiques, is that while we recognize one China, China makes a commitment to a peaceful resolution of the issues between itself and Taiwan. And we have always said that we would view a departure from that with the gravest possible concern. So you shouldn't be worried about that.

In terms of whether too much time has elapsed before the resumption of talks, I can't comment on that, because I don't believe I know enough to make a judgment. But I would urge them to get together to keep working on it as soon as possible. Both places, they're just doing too well now, economically and otherwise, to risk their prosperity and their progress on a fight that need not occur and should not happen.

Yes, Andrea. [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News]

Press Secretary McCurry. Mr. President, let's go home. [*Laughter*]

The President. My answers are too short today.

President Saddam Hussein of Iraq

Q. Mr. President, as you pointed out, it seems like maybe about a half-hour or 45 minutes ago—[*laughter*]—every time Saddam Hussein seems to be close to winning, perhaps getting the U.N. sanctions eased, he does something that might be considered less than rational. As the Commander in Chief who has to weigh options that will inevitably affect the lives of young Americans, how do you assess your opponent? How do you assess Saddam Hussein? Is he less than rational and, not to put too fine a point on it, are you persuaded that he's not simply crazy?

The President. Well, if he is, he's clever-crazy on occasion, and then sometimes he does something that seems maddeningly stupid. Though, in this case, I think he made a calculated decision that was wrong. That is, I don't think this

was—I think there was a calculated decision here that other countries wanted to do business with him, that he owed money to other countries from before the Gulf war that he couldn't pay and never would be able to pay unless he could do more business, that the war is fading into memory—you know, it's not imminent now—and that the burden of maintaining the sanctions had wearied many of those with responsibility for doing so, and that there might be a way to split the alliance here. I also think he knew that the suffering of the Iraqi people is something which has touched the hearts of the whole world, and he thought it was a card he could play. So for all those reasons I think that he thought this decision—finally, I think that he felt, probably, that the United States would never vote to lift the sanctions on him no matter what he did. There are some people who believe that. Now, I think he was dead wrong on virtually every point, but I don't know that it was a decision of a crazy person. I just think he badly miscalculated.

I will say again, we supported—the United States initiated the oil for food and medicine resolution. I am glad—I would support broadening it. I still don't think the caloric intake of the average Iraqi is sufficient. I'm worried about those kids. I'm worried about the people who are hurt over there. But the biggest problem they've got is him. He delayed the implementation of the oil for food embargo for a year and a half to try to play on global sympathy for the suffering of his own people. So that's not an issue for me.

Furthermore, I have done everything I could not to have the American people overly personalize our relationship with him. To me it is a question of his actions. But I do believe that he has shown, whether you think it's madness or not, that he was willing to rain SCUD missiles on Israel and use chemical warfare on the Iranians and on the Kurds. So whatever his motives are, I think it best serves the United States—our interests, our values, and our role in the world—to judge him by his actions and to insist that we proceed, in return for substantive progress, on concrete actions. I think that is the practically right thing to do and the morally right thing to do.

Yes, sir, in the back.

Greece and Turkey

Q. You take pride, understandably, in the expansion of NATO. But one member of NATO, Greece, is constantly being threatened by another member, Turkey. Is that an example for the other three countries coming in?

The President. You mean the problems between Greece and Turkey?

Q. Yes. And what's your role as the leader of the superpower in the world to help two members solve their problems? The European leaders this weekend called upon Turkey to accept the countenance of the International Court of Justice. You're meeting Turkish Prime Minister Yilmaz on Friday. Are you going to talk about that?

The President. Yes, we are going to talk about that. The problems between Greece and Turkey, and the decisions taken by the EU with regard to Turkey, it seems to me to point to two objectives that the American people should care very much about as we move toward a new century.

First of all, I think it is very important that we do everything reasonable to anchor Turkey to the West. They are a secular Islamic government that has been a dependable ally in NATO. They have also supported a lot of our operations in and around Iraq since the Gulf war, and they have been a good ally of ours. I think that is terribly important. If you look at the size of the country, if you look at its geostrategic significance, where it is, what it can block, and what it could open the doors to, it is terribly important.

Secondly, I think it is terribly important for us to do everything we can to resolve the differences between Turkey and Greece. They are deeply held, historic, and I'm convinced, at bottom, ultimately irrational. I mean, that to allow the potential that Greece and Turkey both have for future economic growth and cooperation, for political cooperation, for security cooperation, to be broken on the rocks of their differences over Cyprus and other territorial differences in the Aegean is, in my view, a grave error.

And so I will be talking to Prime Minister Yilmaz about this. I want a resolution of the Cyprus issue very badly. You have evidence of that in asking—when I asked Mr. Holbrooke to head our efforts to try to resolve it. And our long friendship, our long alliance with Greece, the role that many Greek-Americans have in our national life would, if nothing else,

impose on us a heavy responsibility for trying to work out the problems on Cyprus.

But the truth is, this is a case where not only does the United States need to be on good terms with Greece and Turkey,[1] they need to be on good terms with each other. If they could sort of take off their blinders about each other and look at what they're really up against for the next 30 or 40 years in their neighborhood in terms of opportunities and threats, this world would be in considerably better shape moving into a new century.

Q. Mr. President——

Agenda for the Future

The President. Look, it's 3:30. I've gone on for an hour and a half. Let me say, first, some of you had trouble getting in last night. I'm really sorry about that. It shows I haven't solved all the administrative problems of the Government.

Secondly, I wish you a happy holiday. We've got a lot to be happy about, a lot to be thankful for.

Thirdly, if in a sentence—I'll leave you with one sentence. A lot of people are curious about the next 3 years. When I came here I was trying to just prove America could work again. I just wanted the country to work again. I wanted to get the economy going; I wanted to deal with social problems like crime and welfare; and I wanted to pull the country together. I want to see us spend the next 3 years fleshing out that agenda.

But now is the time that we should be looking at the long-term problems of the country, the long-term challenges. That's why this environmental issue of climate change is so important. Every environmental challenge we have met in the last 30 years—we proved we could grow the economy and preserve the environment; we've got to deal with it here. That's why the education issues and setting up excellence and lifetime learning are so important, because we will not be able to protect all Americans from the global changes that are taking place unless we do that. That's why it's important to deal with the entitlements challenge, because we have to honor the good that has been done by Social Security and Medicare for retirees, and let more people do more for their own retirement as well, and do it in a way that doesn't bankrupt their children when we baby boomers retire.

And those are just three of the issues that we have to face that are long-term challenges. So I think you'll see in this next 3 years we'll still be trying to make America work; we'll still be trying to deal with these issues. But we'll spend a lot more time on those long-term challenges and on the long-term challenges of having a security framework in the world that enables us to both pursue our interests and our values. On this occasion, at the end of this year, I think our country is in better shape than it was 5 years ago, and I believe 3 years from now, if we continue to work on that agenda, we'll be in better shape still.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 154th news conference began at 2 p.m. in the Dean Acheson Auditorium at the State Department. In his remarks, he referred to President Kim Yong-sam and Presidential candidates Kim Dae Jung, Lee Hoi Chang, and Rhee In Je of South Korea; the President's late great-uncle, Henry Oren (Buddy) Grisham; Richard Butler, Executive Chairman, United Nations Special Commission; former Secretary of Education William J. Bennett, codirector, Empower America; former Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker, Chair, Federal Advisory Committee on Gender-Integrated Training and Related Issues; President Mohammad Khatami of Iran; Christopher Edley, adviser to the President's Advisory Board on Race; Glenn C. Loury, professor, Boston University; Prime Minister and First Vice President Janet Jagan of Guyana, candidate for her nation's Presidency; Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz of Turkey; and Special Presidential Emissary for Cyprus Richard Holbrooke. The President also referred to the NATO-led Stabilization Force in Bosnia (SFOR).

[1] White House correction.

Remarks on Presenting the Congressional Space Medal of Honor Posthumously to Roger B. Chaffee and Edward H. White II

December 17, 1997

Dr. Gibbons, Mr. Goldin, Congressman Sensenbrenner, to Edward White and the White family, and Martha Chaffee and the Chaffee family, and Mrs. Grissom, other representatives of astronauts' families that are here.

A generation ago, President Kennedy challenged our Nation and asked God's blessing to undertake the most hazardous and dangerous and greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked. His challenge in 1961 to send a man to the moon and bring him safely back to Earth by the end of the decade captured the imagination of millions of people around the world. A group of pioneering Americans recognized the limitless possibilities of this seemingly impossible challenge, and they would risk their lives to make it happen.

Two great Americans we honor today, Lieutenant Commander Roger Chaffee and Lieutenant Colonel Edward White, were among them. More than 30 years ago, these two men, along with their commander, Virgil "Gus" Grissom, were selected for the very first Apollo mission. Tragedy struck before they could achieve their goal. On January 27, 1967, fire swept through the Apollo capsule during a training session, killing all three of them. In 1978 President Carter presented Commander Grissom with one of the first Congressional Space Medals of Honor.

Today I have the privilege of presenting the same medal to his crewmates, Roger Chaffee and Edward White, courageous men who gave their lives in our Nation's effort to conquer the frontiers of space. Even before they joined the Apollo program, Chaffee and White had already served our Nation with great distinction.

Born in Texas and a member of the United States Air Force, Colonel White was the first American to walk in space. At a White House ceremony soon afterward, President Johnson called him "one of the Christopher Columbuses of our century."

Commander Chaffee was a Michigan native and a decorated Navy pilot. Though he was the rookie of the crew, he didn't lack self-confidence. He once said, "Hell, I'd feel secure taking it up all by myself."

Today we bestow upon Roger Chaffee and Edward White the highest honor in America's space program, but they were honored in our hearts long ago. Their deaths will remind us always that exploring space is dangerous, life-threatening work, work that demands and deserves the bravest and best among us. Though they never got there, astronauts Chaffee, White, and Grissom's footprints are on the Moon. Their presence is felt on every mission of our space shuttle program. Their spirits live on in every successful launch and every safe return. And I'm certain they will be there when the international space station goes into orbit.

America has become the world's leading spacefaring nation because of the selfless pioneering spirits of the men we honor today. I am proud to present these medals to the families of Roger Chaffee and Edward White. On behalf of a grateful Nation, I thank them for their sacrifice.

Now I'd like to ask the military aide to read the citations.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:37 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Edward H. White, III, son of Lt. Col. White; Martha Chaffee, widow of Lt. Comdr. Chaffee; and Betty Grissom, widow of Lt. Col. Virgil I. (Gus) Grissom.

Remarks on the Peace Process in Bosnia and an Exchange With Reporters
December 18, 1997

The President. Good morning. I want to speak with you today about the progress we have made toward a lasting peace in Bosnia and the challenges that still must be faced in order to finish the job.

For nearly 4 years, Bosnia was the battleground for the bloodiest war in Europe since World War II. The conflict killed or wounded one out of every 10 Bosnians. It drove half the country's people from their homes, left 9 out of 10 of them unemployed. We will never be able to forget the mass graves, the women and young girls victimized by systematic campaigns of rape, skeletal prisoners locked behind barbed-wire fences, endless lines of refugees marching toward a future of despair.

The war in Bosnia was abhorrent to our values. It also threatened our national interests. We've learned the hard way in this century that Europe's stability and America's security are joined. The war threatened to explode into a broader conflict in the Balkans, endangering the vital interests of allies like Greece and Turkey and undermining our efforts to build a peaceful, undivided, and democratic Europe.

Then, 2 years ago in Dayton, Ohio, American leadership helped to end the war in Bosnia. With our allies in NATO and others, we launched an extraordinary military and political effort to implement the peace agreement. Twenty-four months later, by almost any measure, the lives of Bosnia's people are better, and their hopes for the future are brighter.

Consider what we have achieved together. We ended the fighting and the bloodshed, separating rival armies, demobilizing more than 350,000 troops, destroying almost 6,600 heavy weapons. We helped Bosnians to put in place national democratic institutions, including a Presidency, a Parliament, a Supreme Court, and hold peaceful and free elections for all levels of government, with turnouts exceeding 70 percent. We've begun to restore normal life, repairing roads and schools, electricity and water, heat and sewage, doubling economic output, quadrupling wages. Unemployment in the Bosnian-Croat Federation has been cut from 90 percent to 50 percent.

We're helping the Bosnians to provide for their own security, training ethnically integrated police forces in the Federation, taking the first steps toward a professional democratic police force in the Serb Republic. We've helped to turn the media from an instrument of war into a force for peace, stifling the inflammatory radio and television broadcasts that helped to fuel the conflict. And we've provided a secure environment for 350,000 displaced persons to return to their homes, while bringing 22 war criminals to justice. Just a few hours ago, SFOR captured and transported to The Hague two more war crimes suspects.

The progress is unmistakable, but it is not yet irreversible. Bosnia has been at peace only half as long as it was at war. It remains poised on a tightrope, moving toward a better future but not at the point yet of a self-sustaining peace. To get there, the people of Bosnia still need a safety net and a helping hand that only the international community, including the United States, can provide.

Our assistance must be twofold. First we must intensify our civilian and economic engagement. As a result of the progress we've achieved in recent months, we know where to focus our efforts. Civilian and voluntary agencies working with Bosnian authorities must help to do the following things: first, deepen and spread economic opportunity while rooting out corruption; second, reform, retrain, and re-equip the police; third, restructure the state-run media to meet international standards of objectivity and access and establish alternative independent media; fourth, help more refugees return home; and fifth, make indicted war criminals answer for their crimes, both as a matter of justice and because they are stumbling blocks to lasting stability.

The second thing we must do is to continue to provide an international military presence that will enable these efforts to proceed in an atmosphere of confidence. Our progress in Bosnia to date would not have been possible without the secure environment created first by IFOR, now by SFOR. They've allowed dozens of civilian agencies and literally hundreds of voluntary

agencies to do their job in security, laying the foundation for a self-sustaining peace.

In authorizing American troops to take part in the SFOR mission, I said the mission would end in 18 months, in June of 1998. It was my expectation that by that time we would have rebuilt enough of Bosnia's economic and political life to continue the work without continuing outside military support. But following intensive consultations with my national security and military advisers, with our NATO allies, and with leaders from both parties in Congress, it has become clear that the progress we've seen in Bosnia, in order for it to continue, a follow-on military force led by NATO will be necessary after SFOR ends. America is a leader of NATO, and America should participate in that force.

Therefore, I have instructed our representatives in NATO to inform our allies that, in principle, the United States will take part in a security presence in Bosnia when SFOR withdraws this summer. The agreement in principle will become a commitment only when I have approved the action plan NATO's military authorities will develop and present early next year after careful study of all the options. The details of that plan, including the mission's specific objectives, its size, and its duration, must be agreed to by all NATO allies.

Without prejudging the details, let me make clear the key criteria the plan must meet for me to approve United States participation:

First, the mission must be achievable and tied to concrete benchmarks, not a deadline. We should have clear objectives that when set—when met will create a self-sustaining, secure environment and allow us to remove our troops.

Second, the force must be able to protect itself. Over 2 years we have steadily decreased the number of our troops in Bosnia from about 27,000 Americans in IFOR in 1996 to 8,500 in SFOR today. I hope the follow-on force will be smaller, but I will insist it be sufficient in number and in equipment to achieve its mission and to protect itself in safety.

Third, the United States must retain command. Time and again, events have proven that American leadership is crucial to decisive collective action.

Fourth, our European allies must assume their share of responsibility. Now, Europe and our other partners are already doing a great deal, providing 3 times as many troops as we are, 5 times as much economic assistance, 9 times as many international police, 10 times as many refugees have been received by them. And while Bosnia is a challenge to American interests and values, the longer term and fundamental challenge is to make Bosnia a genuine part of Europe, and we hope the Europeans will do more.

Fifth, the cost must be manageable.

And sixth and finally, the plan must have substantial support from Congress and the American people. I have been pleased by the spirit and the substance of our consultations with leading members of both parties. As we develop the details of the new NATO mission, these consultations must and will continue. I am pleased that Members of both parties in both Houses of Congress have accepted my invitation to go to Bosnia with me when I leave in a couple of days. All of us have a duty to explain the stakes in Bosnia to the American people, and I will do my very best to shoulder my responsibility for that.

Now, some say a lasting peace in Bosnia is impossible and, therefore, we should end our efforts now, in June, and/or allow the country to be partitioned along ethnic lines. I believe they're profoundly wrong. A full and fair reading of Bosnia's history and an honest assessment of the progress of the last 23 months simply refutes the proposition that the Dayton peace agreement cannot work. But if we pull out before the job is done, Bosnia almost certainly will fall back into violence, chaos, and ultimately, a war every bit as bloody as the one that was stopped.

And partition is not a good alternative. It would sanction the horrors of ethnic cleansing and send the wrong signal to extremists everywhere. At best, partition would require a peacekeeping force to patrol a volatile border for years to come. More likely it would set the stage also for renewed conflict.

A lasting peace is possible, along the lines of the Dayton peace agreement. For decades, Muslims, Croats, and Serbs lived together, worked together, raised their families together. Thanks to the investments of America and others in Bosnia over the past 2 years, they have begun again to lead more normal lives.

Ultimately, Bosnia's future is in the hands of its own people. But we can help them make it a future of peace. We should finish the job we began for the sake of that future and in the service of our own interests and values.

Go ahead. We'll take—yeah.

Benchmarks for Troop Withdrawal

Q. Mr. President, a number of Americans are understandably going to be concerned about an open-ended U.S. military commitment to Bosnia. Can you at least assure the American people that by the time you leave office, a little more than 3 years from now, those American troops will be out of Bosnia?

The President. In order to answer that, let's go back and see what our experience has been. First of all, the big military mission, IFOR, really was completed within a year. In fact, it was completed in less than a year; that is the robust, large military presence we needed there—I think we had over 60,000 total allied troops there—to end the war, separate the forces, establish the separation zone between the parties. It was achieved quickly and with remarkable peace and remarkably low loss of life for all of our allied forces who were there.

But then we went to the smaller force to try to support the civilian implementation of the Dayton agreement. Now, what has happened? An enormous amount of progress has been made; we don't believe the peace is self-sustaining. I think the responsible thing for me to do, since I do not believe we can meet the 18-month deadline, and no one I know now believes that, is to say to the American people what the benchmarks are.

What are the benchmarks? Let's talk about that. Can they be achieved in the near-term? I believe they can. Do I think we should have a permanent presence in Bosnia? No. I don't believe this is like Germany after World War II or in the cold war or Korea after the Korean war. This is not what I'm suggesting here. But what are the benchmarks? First, let me say the final set of benchmarks must be developed by our NATO allies working with us. But let me give you just some of the things that I think we ought to be asking ourselves. Number one, are the joint institutions strong enough to be self-sustaining after the military operation? Number two, have the political parties really given up the so-called state-run media that have been instruments of hate and venom? Number three, is the civilian police large enough, well-trained enough, well-managed enough to do the job it has to do? Number four, do we have confidence that the military is under democratic rule?

Those are just some of the benchmarks. I think, when we go through this, I want a full public discussion of it. But I will say again, I understand your job is try to get a deadline nailed down, but we tried it in this SFOR period, and it turned out we were wrong. I am not suggesting a permanent presence in Bosnia. I am suggesting that it's a more honest thing to do to say what our objectives are and that these objectives should be pursued, and they can be pursued at an affordable cost with fair burden-sharing with the Europeans. If that can be done, we should pursue them.

Go ahead.

Prosecution of War Crimes

Q. Mr. President, the lead prosecutor in the War Crimes Tribunal says that Mladic and Karadzic can rest easy because the French won't try to capture them. What is the United States willing to do to bring these men to justice?

The President. Well, I don't want to comment on what the prosecutor has said about the French. I can tell you this, that we were involved this morning with the Dutch, and it was in their sector, and they took the lead. They asked us for support just like we were involved with the British not very long ago when they made their arrests. And we believe that provision of the Dayton agreement is important, as I said again today, and we think that all of us who are there should be prepared to do what is appropriate to implement it. And I think that, having said that, the less I say from then on in, the better.

We believe the war crimes process is an important part of Dayton. The United States, indeed, is supporting an international permanent war crimes tribunal even as we speak. We've got countries working on trying to establish that.

Yes.

Benchmarks for Troop Withdrawal

Q. Mr. President, sir, one of the benchmarks you listed was the willingness of the political parties there really to work toward progress. Does that not make us hostages of those political figures there, particularly those who don't want progress? They can simply undermine the attempt to reach that benchmark and keep U.S. troops there forever.

The President. Well, let me—I don't think I was clear about that. What I mean is the willingness of the political parties or, whether

they're willing or not, our capacity to stop them from, in effect, perverting the state-run media and using them as an instrument of violence and suppression. I don't think it's necessary for us to stay until everybody wants to go have tea together at 4 o'clock in the afternoon in a civil environment. I think it's—I do think that there are—and again let me say, we will make public a final set of benchmarks before we go forward with this, and our allies have to work on this. I'm just telling you what my thoughts are.

But if you look at where we've really had problems—or let's flip the question; why do we think we still need some military presence there after June? I think because we believe there is more venom still in the political system than there otherwise would have been if there had been no perversion of the so-called state-run media by the political parties that control them. We believe that if the joint institutions were working a little more effectively they would—the people would see the benefits of the joint institutions more than they will by June.

We're grateful that there are 2,000 civilian police working there. And I might say, while the United States has put up 90 percent of the money, as I said, the Europeans have put up 90 percent of the personnel for the training and the preparation of the civilian police. But there should be more.

So I think that's what we have to do. I do not want to hold us hostage to the feelings of the people of Bosnia, although I believe the feelings will change as the facts of life change. But I do think we should stay there until we believe we've got the job done.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Prosecution of War Crimes

Q. Mr. President, how did you get Secretary Cohen on board on this? And you know, the whole public perception—unless you go after the highest profile alleged war criminals, it doesn't have much of an impact. Why the restraint?

The President. Well, first of all, there are—the circumstances under which the SFOR troops will apprehend war criminals have been fairly well defined. We did not send SFOR there to mount major military campaigns.

Secondly, I don't want to discuss the circumstances in detail under which we might or might not go after anyone. But let me go to the point underlying your question—I think it is—which is, can this peace be made to work unless Mr. Karadzic is arrested? I mean, let's just sort of get to the bottom line here.

I think the answer to that is, under the right circumstances—that is, if he flees the country, if he is deep enough underground, if he can't have any impact on it—we might make the peace work anyway. After all, a great deal of progress has been made. I would point out that more progress has been made in the Bosnian-Croat—the Muslim-Croat Federation part of Bosnia economically than in the Serbian part, in part because reactionary elements there have resisted doing the right thing across the board in many areas.

Q. Are you considering aid for Serbia in that respect?

The President. I'm considering—what I'm going to do is to work with the allies to implement the Dayton accords. And our position is going to be we're going to support the people that are trying to implement the Dayton framework; we're going to oppose those who are opposing it, in all specifics. If you use that benchwork, I think it will get you there.

One last question. Go ahead, Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

Timelines and the Peace Process

Q. Just to wrap up this by asking you the question that a lot of Republican critics of yours are suggesting that your credibility was undermined on Bosnia by imposing these two deadlines which you failed to meet, and knowing that some of your own advisers at the time were saying, "Don't give these deadlines because they're unrealistic; the job can't be done within a year or within 18 months." So how do you answer your critics now, like Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison or Arlen Specter or Newt Gingrich, who say that you have to prove your credibility because you failed to honor these two earlier imposed deadlines?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say, I have a fundamentally different view of the first deadline. I mean, we did—the mission I defined for IFOR was achieved, and it was achieved before a year was out. And I was—it's not worth going through and rewriting history there about who said what at the time.

I did think that in 18 months—I honestly believed in 18 months we could get this done

at the time I said it. And it wasn't—I wasn't right, which is why I don't want to make that error again. Now, having acknowledged the error I made, let's look at what we were right about. Let's flip this around before we get too much into who was right about what happened after 18 months.

What has happened? With the leadership of the United States, NATO and its allies, including Russia, working side by side, ended, almost overnight and with virtually no bloodshed, the worst war in Europe since World War II. We have seen democratic elections with 70 percent participation take place; hundreds of thousands of people have been able to go home under circumstances that were difficult, to say the least; economic growth has resumed; infrastructure has been rebuilt; the conditions of normal life have come back for tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of people.

So if I take the hit for being wrong about the timetable, I would like some acknowledgement that in the larger issue here, the United States and its allies were right to undertake this mission and that the results of the mission have been very, very good. They have justified the effort. And the cost of the mission in lives and treasure to the United States and to its allies has been much lower than even the most ardent supporters of the mission thought that it would be.

So I think—I don't mind taking a hit for being wrong about the timetable. But after the hit is dished out, I would like the larger truth looked at. That is, did we do the right thing? Was it in our interests? Did it further our values? Are the American people less likely to be drawn into some other conflict in Europe 10, 20, 30 years from now where the costs could be far greater if we make this work? I think they are.

And I'd like to close basically with a conversation I had from my opponent in the last election, Senator Dole. I want to give him—he said something that I thought was very good and pithier than anything I've said about this. We had a talk about it the other day on the phone, and he said, "Look," he said, "you know, I didn't necessarily agree with all the details about how you got to where you were. But," he said, "what's happened in Bosnia? It's like we're in a football game. We're in the fourth quarter, and we're winning, and some people suggest we should walk off the field and forfeit the game. I don't think we should. I think we ought to stay here, finish the game, and collect the win."

And that's a pretty good analogy. And with due credit to the Senator, I appreciate it. I wish I'd have thought of it myself.

Thank you very much.

Merry Christmas.

President's New Dog, Buddy

Q. How is Buddy?

The President. Good.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:15 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Judge Richard Goldstone, Chief Prosecutor, United Nations International War Crimes Tribunal; Bosnian-Croat war crimes suspects Vlatko Kupreskic and Anto Furundzija; and Bosnian-Serb war crimes suspect Radovan Karadzic, former President of the Bosnian-Serb Republic. The President also referred to the NATO-led Stabilization Force in Bosnia (SFOR) and the NATO-led Implementation Force in Bosnia (IFOR). A reporter referred to Bosnian-Serb war crimes suspect Ratko Mladic.

Message on the Observance of Hanukkah, 1997

December 18, 1997

Warm greetings to everyone celebrating Hanukkah.

The Festival of Lights is a powerful reminder each year that the age-old struggle for religious freedom is not yet over. From the days of the ancient Maccabees down to our present time, tyrants have sought to deny people the free expression of their faith and the right to live according to their own conscience and convictions. Hanukkah symbolizes the heroic struggle of all

who seek to defeat such oppression and the miracles that come to those full of faith and courage. This holiday holds special meaning for us in America, where freedom of religion is one of the cornerstones of our democracy.

The coming year will mark the 50th anniversary of the State of Israel, where the story of the first Hanukkah took place so many centuries ago. As families come together in prayer for the eight nights of Hanukkah, to reaffirm their hope in God and their gratitude for His faithfulness to His people, may the candles of the menorah light our way to a true and lasting peace for the people of the Middle East.

Hillary and I extend our warmest wishes to all those celebrating Hanukkah, all those who work for religious freedom, and all those who devote themselves to the cause of peace throughout the world.

BILL CLINTON

Remarks on Presenting the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards

December 19, 1997

Thank you very much, Mrs. Baldrige, Robert and Nancy Baldridge, Harry Hertz, the examiners and judges and all those associated with the Baldrige Award Foundation, especially to the winners. We congratulate you all. We're delighted that the Chair of the District of Columbia Control Board, Andrew Brimmer, and Councilwoman Charlene Drew Jarvis are here.

And I want to thank Secretary Daley in spite of the fact that he was making fun of my penchant for animal stories of all kinds. [*Laughter*] I mean, I don't come from Chicago—[*laughter*]—I come from the country. But my wife comes from Chicago.

I want to thank Earnie Deavenport, too. Several years ago the Eastman Company loaned me an executive when I was Governor of Arkansas, and we established the first statewide total quality management program in the country. It was what gave me the idea to start what eventually became the reinventing Government project headed by the Vice President, which among other things has now given us the smallest Federal Government since John Kennedy was here. And I'll give $5 to anyone in the audience who can honestly say you have missed it. [*Laughter*] I say that because the Federal employees have done a very good job of increasing their output and the quality of their service while downsizing their numbers so that we can take advantage of technology, get the deficit down, get the economy going again. So we have learned from you.

And I've talked with Earnie many times about the importance of trying to apply these lessons to other areas of human endeavor. You mentioned the two most important, I think, are health care and education. I also think there are applications—if you look at the success in many law enforcement departments around the country, there are law enforcement applications here because the thing that a belief in continuous progress through not only doing the right things but doing the right things right gives you is the conviction that you can repeat whatever you're doing right in one place somewhere else. And that is by far the biggest problem Government faces.

So I really am delighted to see you here. But I think, for me, because I have seen this work over and over and over again in the private as well as the public sector, that is what cries out for application to our public institutions, whether it's in education or health care or in law enforcement.

If the city of Boston could go virtually 2½ years without a single child being killed by a handgun, until—unfortunately, they had an incident last week, but they went 2½ years. No city in the United States that big has been able to do that. They did. It must therefore follow that if other people did the same thing in the same way and then you started the kind of contest you have here in the market system so everybody tried to keep continuously improving their process, that we would become a safer country.

In health care, we have all these—you know, managed care, on balance, has been a good thing for America, because we've managed some inefficiency out of the system. But now people are genuinely worried about who's making the

decisions about their health care and whether quality will continue to be the most important value in the health care system. I think all of us want it to be; even those of you who may have responsibility in your organization for holding down health care costs, the last thing in the world you want is for your employees not to have access to the health care that they need.

And goodness knows, in education—I've said this so many times, the poor people in the press who have to cover me get tired of hearing it, but the most frustrating thing about American education today is that every problem in education has been solved by somebody somewhere, and nobody's figured out how to have everybody else follow suit so that you launch the kind of competitive process that you come here to celebrate today.

So, for all these reasons, I love coming here. And I always feel that by the time I get up to speak, there's no point in my saying anything. [*Laughter*] I told Mrs. Baldrige I kind of hated to walk out here. You all were so enthusiastic, you should have been outside listening to all this energy being emanated from this room. It's wonderful to be in a place where people don't think it's too corny or too embarrassing to be exuberant about what they do. Can you imagine what would happen in this country if everybody wanted to wave a flag for the place they work every day? [*Laughter*] Can you imagine that? I'm sure somewhere in this room there is some cynic saying, "This is too hokey. I can't believe they're doing this." [*Laughter*]

Where do you spend more time than at work? Why shouldn't you want to wave a flag? Why shouldn't we want to cheer about where we work? We want to cheer about our families, cheer about the places we work, cheer about the clubs we associate with. This country would work a lot better if everybody felt like they could cheer about the place they work. That's why I always try to make these awards, and why I think it was a stroke of genius to establish them, although I bet even when they were established, the founders could never have imagined what the far-reaching impact would be, that most States would follow suit, that countries would follow suit.

There is this idea now embodied in our four winners today, in 3M Dental Products, in Merrill Lynch Credit, in Solectron, and XBS, that you can always get better and that you can organize not only to do the right things but to do the right things right in a way that elevates the people who work for the enterprise, serves the general public better, and obviously supports the bottom line.

It's nice to think that. Otherwise, you would get bored if you didn't go broke. [*Laughter*] So it's sort of better, bored, or broke. [*Laughter*] If you get a multiple-choice question like that, it's not too easy to make an A. [*Laughter*] And yet we don't. None of us do all the time. But we come here to celebrate what we can do at our best.

I'd also like to thank the Department of Commerce, Secretary Daley, the National Institute of Standards and Technology for the support that they give to this endeavor. It has been a great partnership. But most of all, I just want to say, just think about where this idea was 10 years ago and where it is today. Think about how many of the groundbreaking reforms that have been recognized in Baldrige Award winners in the past that are now just standard industry practice.

Think about what it would be like if everybody would so shamelessly try to learn what their competitors are doing and do it at least that well and then figure out how to do it better, if in every area of human endeavor you did that. I think that this is something that is really worth focusing on. What do we celebrate? The stake the employees have in the company, the flexibility, the innovation, the creativity, the spirit of enterprise. It has brought America back.

When I became President, and even when I was running for President, I saw that the 1980's, while they had been very tough on American business, had also produced a remarkable understanding that was widely shared throughout the country about what had to be done to be internationally competitive. And I always saw a big part of my duty here as just to have Government policies that would reinforce what is right and get out of the way of what is right, so that we could create the conditions and give people the tools so that everybody could do what you're doing. And we've tried to do that.

I appreciate what Secretary Daley said about the turtle on the fencepost; that's one of the things I always say in the Cabinet meeting. It took us 3 months, and we didn't have to translate all my aphorisms to people who never had the privilege of living in rural areas. [*Laughter*]

We've tried to do three simple things to help you. One, get the deficit down and balance the budget so that we could keep interest rates down, improve interest rates not only for businesses but for individuals and on home mortgages, and two consequences of that are that we have an all-time high rate of homeownership—it's above two-thirds for the first time in the history of America—and we have record levels of business investment, which is becoming very important now because we're able to sustain a little higher rate of internal growth as you see a little turmoil around the world. I want to say a little more about that in a minute. But it's very important.

When the Congress adopted the balanced budget amendment—I mean act—in 1997, back in August, and I signed it, the deficit had already dropped by 92 percent below its high in 1992. It went from $292 billion a year down to $23 billion a year. And I want to make a point about that, because I'm sure you found this in your company. When you get this award, you can come here and celebrate, and you don't even have to think about how hard and often controversial some of the changes you had to make were to get to this point. Right? Well, when we decided we were going to bring the deficit down, it was like pulling fingernails out around this place. And the bill in 1993 passed by one vote in both Houses. Now all of us think we're geniuses. If it had gone wrong, half the people that live in town could have said, "I told you they were fools." [*Laughter*] But it worked. And now we're going to balance this budget, and we're going to have a healthier economy. And that's very important because it frees you to do what you do best.

The second thing we've tried to do is to change the conditions in which you operate by opening more of the global economy to American companies. We've had over 200 trade agreements in the last 5 years, by far the largest number ever. And the Uruguay round, finished back in 1993, amounts to the largest tax cut on American goods in history. And now we're the number one exporter in the world again. I think it is very important that we continue to press ahead in that.

I believe very strongly that it was a mistake when we were unable to get enough votes in the House of Representatives to renew the President's fast-track trade authority to negotiate comprehensive bills. Why? Not because nobody ever loses in trade in America. There are some—in competition, there are by definition some losers and some winners. But most of the job loss in America comes from technological change and old-fashioned business failure. Some of it does come from change in the trading rules.

What is the answer to that? Well, there are only two answers: You can either say, "Well, we're just not going to change any more rules and try to pretend that we won't be subject to these global forces," or you could say, "We're going to change the rules, create more jobs, raise more incomes, and do a heck of a lot better job than we've been doing in the past with the people who are dislocated through no fault of their own." The second is the right answer, not the first.

We have 4 percent of the world's people and 20 percent of the world's income. And the developing economies are growing at roughly 3 times the rate of the advanced economies like the United States, Japan, and Europe. Now again, you don't have to be a mathematical genius to figure out if you have 4 percent of the people and you've got 20 percent of the income and you would like to stay roughly as well off as you are and maybe, if you're very clever, get a little better off, you have to sell something to the other 96 percent of the people in the world, especially if their growth rates are faster than yours.

Now, that does not mean that we should forget about the people who are dislocated from trade or from technology or even from old-fashioned business failures—people who have to start again.

That brings me to the third thing that I want to say, which is that in addition to balancing the budget and having sensible economic policies, having an aggressive trade policy, we must have a policy that invests in our people and recognizes that in every company here rewarded, you were rewarded in part because you recognized that by far the most important resources you had were the people who were working for the company. Right? There is no question about that.

With all respect, nobody was up here waving a flag for the Xerox machine back home—[*laughter*]—you know, or the whatever. Whatever the widget is, nobody was doing that. It's a great thing, whatever those machines are. You're waving the flags for yourselves and your

colleagues that are here because you know that basically creativity and continuous improvement requires people who can think and then who are free to act along the lines that they think and work out things together.

The very intellectual processes that you are trying to make permanent and embed in the daily work of your companies require a level of thinking and reasoning skills that mean that we have to be committed in America to universal excellence in education.

Now, not everybody needs a college degree in physics. But everybody needs more than a high school diploma today, and everybody needs the ability to keep on learning for a lifetime. That's why we have tried to say—implement the national education goals and to oversimplify it by saying every 8-year-old should be able to read, every 12-year-old should be able to log on to the Internet, every 18-year-old should be able to go to college, every adult should be able to keep on learning for a lifetime. And we're trying to set up a system where that will be true for every American, because it will help more companies to do what you have done. And I think that's very important.

In this last balanced budget, I think 30 years from now when people look back on it, they'll say, "Aside from the fact that we balanced the budget for the first time in a generation, the most important thing about that bill was it opened the doors of college to every American who would work for a college education, with a tax credit called the HOPE scholarship that virtually makes the first 2 years of college virtually tax-free to every American and other tax incentives and more Pell grants." That's very important that we are setting the stage for promoting a comprehensive reform of America's schools, kindergarten through 12th grade, based on national standards and accountability for them and real production so that all schools will be organized for performance for all the children.

And I want to compliment Secretary Daley's brother on the remarkable work that has been done in Chicago to try to totally change the culture of education there to make it more like a continuous quality operation, systematically in the way that all of you have achieved. So we're trying to do that. And as I said, we also have to do that for people who lose their jobs or who are drastically underemployed.

What else do we have to do? We want to set up—we've doubled funds for dislocated workers in the last 5 years to invest in their training. The systems don't work very well or at least not nearly as well as they can. I'd like to see us consolidate all these Government programs and give the workers a skills grant. Most people who are out of work have got enough sense to figure out what they could learn to get a better job or to get a new job. And I'd like to see anybody that qualifies just get a skills grant that they can take to the nearest educational institution of their own choosing and get the education they need to become a productive member of society and have a great chance to get a good job in an organization like the ones we honor today.

I'd like to see us, when a community is hard hit by a big plant closing, go in there like we did when the military bases closed. What's the difference? People are out of work, and you have great capacity. They deserve a chance to have everybody work together to get them started again.

So we need to do more on that. But that's the right answer, not to run away from the global economy, not to say we're not going to trade. The right answer is to do more, more quickly for the people that are dislocated.

I guess what I'm saying is, we're still trying to get it right here. We're still trying to make our operation one that is continuously improving. But at least we know what the objective is. The objective is to give every American the chance to live up to their God-given capacity and live out their dreams. The objective is to give people the power they need to not only have successful careers but to build strong families and strong communities. The objective is to help people balance the demands of work and family, a problem that I hear in every place I go. The objective is to help our country balance our obligation to grow the economy and preserve the environment, something we have proved, repeatedly, we can do over the last 30 years. The objective is to reach out to the rest of the world and get the benefits of the global economy while meeting its challenges instead of pretending they don't exist. We are, whether we like it or not, all interconnected, one with another, in this country and, increasingly, beyond our borders.

I've spent an enormous amount of time in the last month—enormous—trying to help come

to grips with the financial difficulties you're reading about every day in the Asian markets. Why? Because a huge percentage of our exports go to Asia. They are our neighbors now for all practical purposes. And it is in our interest that those countries be able to be stable, growing, increasingly healthy countries from which we not only buy but to which we sell, countries that together we can build a stable future. Instead of have a part of the world in the 20th century that called Americans there to fight and die in three wars, better to be a part of the world that participates in—[*inaudible*]—three new stages of the global economic revolution in the 21st century. We still have a lot of challenges out there.

Technology is not an unmixed blessing. It bothers me some of the things little kids can see on the Internet at night. It bothers me that people who know how to do it can figure out how to build bombs and have access to dangerous weapons just by having the technological availability of it. There are a lot of things that bother us about it. There are troubling questions of our competitive laws and how they should apply to new technologies that have to be worked out. That's why we all have to be committed to the idea that we can continuously improve. Or in the language that was quoted from David Kearns, that our endeavor is a journey without an end. That's frustrating to some people; they always want to get there. But, you know, the older I get, the more I like the journey. [*Laughter*]

So I thank you. I thank you for making America a better place. I thank you for your enthusiasm and for being a model for other American workplaces. And I ask you when you go home to share with your friends and neighbors, who may not work with you, the idea that this country is like where you work. America is still around after 220 years because we have a Constitution which said, if you want the country to always get better, you have to make it possible for people to always get better. And you have to give them the freedom to fail and mess up. I mean, that's what the Bill of Rights is all about. That's what the Constitution is all about, limiting the powers of Government and mandating, in effect, partnerships. That's what the flexibility of the Constitution is all about, so we could change over time to adapt to new circumstances without giving up our values. That's the kind of country you live in.

And if it's going to be everything it ought to be in the 21st century, it has to do, as a nation, what you're trying to do every day at work. And you have to ask yourself, do you think America is on a journey without an end; do you think we can always get better? I think the answer, because of your example and that of millions of others, is an unequivocal yes.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:54 a.m. at the Sheraton Washington Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to former Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige's sister, Letitia Baldrige, brother, Robert Baldridge, and sister-in-law, Nancy; Harry Hertz, national quality program director, National Institute of Standards and Technology; Earnest Deavenport, president, Malcolm Baldrige Award Foundation; Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago, IL; and David T. Kearns, retired chairman and chief executive officer, Xerox Corp.

Remarks in a Race Initiative Outreach Meeting With Conservatives
December 19, 1997

The President. First, let me thank you for coming in what must be a busy time for all of you. What I think may be the most productive thing to do, although Governor Kean, since—[*inaudible*]—may interject something here. I think what I'd like to do to begin, is just to hear from you. I'd like to—on the question of "Do you believe that race still matters in America and is still a problem in some ways?" And if so, instead of our getting into a big fight about affirmative action—although if you want to discuss it, we can—what bothers me is that even I, who think it works in some ways, believe it works only when people who—it works predominantly for people who are at least in a position for it to work. A lot of the people

that I care most about are totally unaffected by it one way or the other.

So what I'd like to talk about today is that I thought that we could at least begin by just getting a feel for where you are and do you think it's still a problem, and if so, what do you think we ought to do about it? And if you want to talk about affirmative action—[*inaudible*]—but I'm happy to do that.

[*Ward Connerly, chairman, American Civil Rights Institute, stated that the country has a serious and complex problem which does not lend itself to a Government solution. He indicated that the Nation could not move forward on the race issue without resolving the issue of racial preferences.*]

The President. What do you think we should do? Since there are—since various racial minorities are represented in groups of people that are at least not doing very well in this society, in numbers disproportionate to their numbers in the country as a whole, how should we respond to that?

[*Mr. Connerly stated that school choice, an overhaul of the K–12 system, smaller class size, and other educational initiatives were appropriate responses and parental involvement was a necessity. Former Bush administration adviser Thaddeus Garrett, Jr., associate pastor, Wesley Temple A.M.E. Zion Church, Akron, OH, stated that he hoped that the day's discussion would not get bogged down on affirmative action but rather address race and race relations. He indicated that mechanical programs would not change attitudes and that Americans did not relate well across racial lines. He commended the President for the Akron meeting on race and said that community leaders, beginning with the President, had to provide leadership to address the divide and that affirmative action only served to divide the Nation further.*]

The President. Maybe you can—[*inaudible*]—maybe for discussion's sake, let's assume we abolished them all tomorrow, and we just had to start all over. What would you do?

[*Former U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Staff Director Linda Chavez, director, Center for the New American Community, stated that affirmative action put the Government in the role of picking winners and losers on the basis of race and that under those circumstances the Nation would never get beyond racism. She stressed reaching the disadvantaged in society, citing a University of Maryland program not aimed at race but at students who are the first in their family to attend college. Mr. Connerly stated that in addressing the problem, labels should be abandoned and focus placed on people with something to contribute.*]

The President. Okay. Let me just say this, first of all. I think, if you imagine—forget about—think about what the world would look like 30 years from now if things go well, that is, if all the threats to our collective security—[*inaudible*]—restrained and trade develops as we hope it should, and we develop a decent education system that embraces virtually everybody that will work for it. The fact that the United States is becoming—[*inaudible*]—multiethnic country that at some point in the next generation, in the next 50 years will, for the first time in its history, not have a majority of people of European origin, I think will make it an even more fascinating, even more interesting, and even more prosperous and successful place if we're not consumed or limited or handicapped in some ways because of our racial differences.

So, to me, this is—I'm looking at this through the perspective of the future that I want to see our country make for itself. And I don't think anyone has all the answers about how we should make that future.

If you look at—there is no question that—if you just take African-Americans, for example, the middle class is growing and a lot of good things have happened. But there is also no question that there are still pockets where crime is greater, incarceration rates are horrendous, that education systems are not working. And even the people who do have some level of it, who are highly industrious, and are dying to get into business very often don't have access to credit and don't have access to the networks. Affirmative action originally, I think, on the economic side was a kind of networking thing, and on the education side it was designed to do what you —the Maryland program you just described. I think if there was ever a shortcoming in college education—we ought to be focusing on people who are educationally disadvantaged without—[*inaudible*]—they didn't get the preparation and continuing support that they needed. The schools that have done that are much better.

[*Stephan A. Thernstrom, Harvard University Winthrop professor of history and coauthor of "America in Black and White: One Nation Indivisible" with his wife, Abigail, a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, took issue with two points made by Mr. Connerly. First, he stated that people now know each other better across racial lines than they did a generation ago and offered some examples. Second, he said he found the Akron meeting troubling and one-sided and gave examples of the lack of dialog. He commented that while most of the discussion was addressed to white racism, recent studies showed that among African-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Hispanic-Americans, each group had stronger negative stereotypes about the other two groups than whites did and that as these populations grew, the problems would become worse, concluding that the issue was not simply one of white racism.*]

The President. But if what you say is true—you say the crime problem is disproportionately African-American; that's like saying the college population is disproportionately white or the business population is disproportionately white. That doesn't justify an affirmative action program to—[*inaudible*]—like section 8 of the SBA program.

The other day we had a group of African-American journalists in here. Every man in the crowd, to a person—there were, like, 20 of them here—every man in that office, every single, solitary one, had been stopped by the police when he was doing nothing, for no reason other than the fact that he was black. And you say that's because there's a rational fear because of the fact of what occurs in some neighborhoods. Nonetheless, that is a race-based public policy. I'm just saying, it's not as simple as——

Ms. Thernstrom. No, we agree with that. We agree with that. It's unacceptable to me.

Mr. Thernstrom. But doesn't it happen in Detroit, in Atlanta, in other States where——

The President. All I'm saying is it's very difficult to get these things out of our society. And you just made one reason why. Let me give you another example. Because of the—a lot of work that's been done by a lot of people, there's been a dramatic increase in the capacity of the United States to limit the inflow of drugs into the country from the south by land and sea. But the consequence is that Mexico, which is a big, open country, has had enormous amounts of money invested there to try to undermine what little infrastructure there was to deter the influx of drugs. Five hundred million dollars was spent last year alone trying to bribe Mexican police. Now, as a result, over half of the cocaine in this country comes across the Mexican border. So, all right, fast forward. What do you do if you're a local police officer with a drug problem? That's what this whole profiling is about—[*inaudible*]—to stop people who are Hispanic if they're driving through town. That's an affirmative action program. That's a race-based affirmative action program. So how do you——

Ms. Chavez. But Mr. President, some of us are opposed to that. I mean, Randall Kennedy has written, I think, very eloquently on exactly that issue. And those of us who oppose race preferences when they benefit groups are also opposed to them when they harm groups.

The President. If you were running a police force and you were trying to figure out how to deal with the drug problem and you had a lot of people who were coming through your town on an interstate and you had a limited amount of resources and you couldn't stop every car, which cars would you stop?

[*Ms. Chavez stated that they should stop every third car and that police should be held to the same standard as business. Representative Charles T. Canady of Florida stated that it was pernicious for the Government to classify people by race because doing so sends a message that people should be judged on that basis, which reinforces prejudice despite the Government's good intentions.*]

The Vice President. Could I ask a question, Mr. President? If you lived in a community that was 50 percent white, 50 percent black and for a variety of historic reasons the level of income, educational attainment, and so forth was lower among the blacks in that community and the police force was 100 percent white, and the problems of the kind that we all deplore took place, and other problems took place and the community decided that the police force would be better able to do its job if blacks were much more represented on the police force because then the police force would have a much greater ability to relate to the community effectively and to do its job—under those circumstances, do you think that the community would be justified in making affirmative action efforts to open

up a lot more positions on the police force for blacks?

[*Mr. Canady stated that he favors community policing which requires people to live in the neighborhood they police but which doesn't require race-based selection. Vice President Gore emphasized that his example demonstrated a benefit to the whole community. Mr. Canady then noted that the Drug Enforcement Agency had a policy of using African-Americans as undercover agents on the theory that they would be more effective, but was sued for discrimination by African-American agents, concluding that efforts which start out making sense may end up doing harm.*]

The President. Let me ask you this. You don't quarrel with the fact—because I think this is very important. This is something that we really have to deal with all the time. You don't quarrel with the fact that, other things being equal, in cities that are highly racially diverse, it would be a good thing, if it could be done without race preferences, to have a diverse police department.

Mr. Canady. Absolutely. I think we ought to have a police department that can work with——

The President. But you just said that you like this whole idea of—that's what we're doing now at HUD. We're actually encouraging police officers to go back and live in the neighborhoods where they patrol and letting them buy HUD-foreclosed houses—where HUD's got the property, letting them buy houses for half price if they'll serve in the police in the neighborhoods where they live.

I've thought of that, and every time I go to New York or any other big city, I always look at the police and see—so let me just say, I'm Irish—Irish immigrants got ahead and many of them in urban police departments. And many of their children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren are still in urban police departments. And I think—what I think we have to do is figure out—I think part of this problem will go away if we ask ourselves, are the criteria by which we are making this decision, whatever this decision is, really relevant? Are we really—whether it's college admission or—are we keeping score in the right way here?

But it seems to me that we have a vested interest in the objective. If we agree that we need an integrated police department, and that it would be better——

Ms. Thernstrom. We'd like to have an integrated police department.

The President. ——that we would like to have one and that our society would function better if we had one, then we should ask ourselves, "Okay, how are we going to get there?"

[*Ms. Chavez took exception to the Vice President's example, stating that statistics show significant numbers of African- and Hispanic-American police officers.*]

The Vice President. Partly because of affirmative action.

[*Ms. Chavez stated that, while minority representation was not proportional, it was close and that the issue should be whether or not there was discrimination in a police department, which no one favors. She said that the way to root out discrimination was training and recruitment. Mr. Thernstrom pointed out some of the complexities, stating that white communities are often well served by African-American police officers, who should not be forced to go back to predominantly black communities, and that while Asians do a good job of producing physicists and physicians, they are not very interested in law enforcement careers. He questioned the wisdom of making the police department look like the population. Former New Jersey Gov. Thomas H. Kean, president, Drew University, stated that the rising rate of immigration requires us to get to know one another. He noted that in his State, the largest college scholarship program was based on poverty, not on race, but still tended to help minorities. He observed that racial groups tended not to mix but that, when there were activities that crossed racial lines, such as athletics, race was less an issue and friendship flourished. Rev. Garrett stressed the need for different racial groups to get to know each other and gave examples. He also indicated that the media were part of the problem, pointing out the contrast in media coverage between the African-American Virginia couple who had six babies and the white Iowa couple who had seven. Ms. Thernstrom stated that all recognized that there was a long way to go on the road to racial equality but posed the question if the Nation was were going in the right direction. She added that the discussion had to focus more on facts and less on emotion,*

stressing the racial gap in academic performance. She concluded that she thinks the failure of even one child is a national scandal.]

The President. I do, too. I think what Chicago has done—tells everybody that you've got to go to summer school if you don't measure up, and if you don't measure up a second time, you can't go ahead; your self-esteem will be hurt more when you're 50 and you can't read than it will be when you're 16 and you have to stay back another year—I think that's great.

But let me just say, first of all, I think what you generally just said is absolutely right. The reason I wanted you to come here today is that I hope there will be another series of meetings where we'll get an even more diverse group—I mean, diverse by opinion. Because what I'm trying to get to is—here's my theory about this: I think if we could ever get to the point where we would ask ourselves, can we agree on the objective, and then talk about what means will work, and then look at the things we don't like and say, well, did it do any good and what harm did it do?

For example, what I think about affirmative action, a lot of these economic—let's just take the economic affirmative action. What I honestly believe is that it did a profound amount of good for the people who got into the programs who might never have had a chance to be successful business men or women. But I believe the problems with it are twofold. Number one is, once you get in and you start doing it, it's hard to graduate out. This whole theory about graduating out and moving through, going out into the private sector—that theory never really worked very well. And we ought to fess up; those of us who were for it ought to say that's one of the problems that didn't work. The other problem is it doesn't reach the vast majority of the people who have a problem because it doesn't reach down into basically the isolated urban areas with people in the economic underclass.

So if we say, okay—you know, we can all say, "Okay, here are the facts. It was a pretty good thing, but it didn't do everything it was supposed to do." So should we argue about getting rid of it; should we argue about doing something else; should we argue about what's going to happen to these people? I mean, I think there's a lot to be said for that.

Let me go back to what Steve said about the composition of the police force when you got into the tete-a-tete with the Vice President. Let me just mention three things because Governor Kean mentioned this. The seven white septuplets were delivered by two African-American women doctors. Two days later, two black kids were rescued in a Chicago fire by a white fireman. Nobody feels anything but good about that. Why is that? Or why do all these rich white Republicans pay to go down and watch some black guys play basketball at the MCI Center? I would argue there is something that all these things share in common that don't necessarily get answered in the police—[*inaudible*].

One is, in the case of pro basketball, here I am—I don't have a doubt in the world that, if I'd been good enough, I could have played pro basketball. I don't; if I'd been good enough, by God, I could have played. I was short, fat, and slow by today's standards. [*Laughter*] I couldn't play. Doesn't have anything to do with my race; I don't have a doubt in the world. If I have a child, I don't have a doubt in the world that my child can play if he or she is good enough. So that's the first threshold. Without regard to race—I think we can all agree with that. In whatever setting, people have to know if they're good enough, they can play; and if they need a hand up to prepare themselves, that they can get it.

The second thing is, in the case of the black women doctors who delivered the septuplets—which is not always the case in the case of police, which is why I agree with the Vice President—in the community which was of a different race, there was no question about whether they could do their job in a way that would be fair to everybody. In the case of the white fireman who risked his life to go in and get the last two black kids in the Chicago fire, he made a statement that was louder than any words I will ever utter, that he was in tune with the people in that community. He was in tune enough that he was willing to lay his life down to save those two little children. Nobody will ever care again whether that guy is on their fire or sitting idly out in front of the fire station, as I hope he will be.

So there's two criteria. One is, can you play if you're good enough, whatever the thing is? Two is, does everybody in the community have confidence that the people in the positions, whatever they are, have sufficient concern about them, are consistently involved with them, that

whatever is supposed to be done is going to get done?

I think in the case of the fireman and the doctors and the basketball players, the answer is yes. I think in the case of huge numbers of urban police departments, huge numbers of the business sector, huge sections of higher education, you can't say that the answer is yes. That's why I'm hung up about it. But I don't think that—I think the reason that I'd get frustrated if the debate is only about affirmative action, is if we win 100 percent of the debate, we're talking about 10 percent of the people. If you win 100 percent of the debate, we're still just talking about 10 percent of the people. What about everybody else?

Ms. Chavez. That has been our argument.

Ms. Thernstrom. But, why don't you have confidence that we can train policemen the way we train firemen so that when a policeman shows up at the door, it doesn't matter what the race of that policeman is?

The President. What I don't have confidence in is that in the police departments where there is not affirmative action, that there is a selection process that is not race-based.

Ms. Thernstrom. Why not go after the problem instead. It's like college admissions; instead of going after the problem of the failure of our schools in the K–12 years, we say, "Okay, we're going to shut our eyes to that problem, and we're going to preferentially admit them and hope something——

The President. What about all the people who are sitting around waiting for that to happen? Are we just going to let them drift away?

[*Former Peace Corps Director Elaine Chao, senior fellow, Heritage Foundation, commended the President and Vice President for their initiative and leadership in the area of race relations but stated that the debate left out Asian-Americans almost entirely. She related her experience as an immigrant and said that her family got through by knowing they would not always be in that condition. She stated that it was disheartening to find that equal opportunity did not always mean a level playing field and gave examples of affirmative action programs working against Asian-Americans. Mr. Connerly urged that, given the brief time available, the discussion not focus on affirmative action but on the broader subject of race and suggested that the overall timeframe for the national debate be extended. Ms. Thernstrom stated that the President's Advisory Board on Race was too monolithic. The group then discussed the diversity of the board.*]

The President. Go ahead. Lynn, you haven't talked enough.

[*Former Representative and former Secretary of Labor Lynn Martin stated that average Americans are really further along than they are given credit for, but that diversity implies differences in perception which people must move beyond. She advocated moving forward with a moderate checklist and reasonable goals.*]

The President. One thing—let me just ask you all to think about this because I agree—one of the things I do agree with, what Ward said, is that I—before you came in here I was holding my head saying, "Oh my God, those people are coming in here, and we've got to stay here for 4 hours—[*inaudible*]." But let me—nearly everybody agrees that the laws, that are on the books, against discrimination based on race against individuals should be enforced.

Ms. Thernstrom. Everybody agrees with that.

Ms. Chavez. Everybody in this room.

The President. We are grossly under—we have never properly funded the EEOC, but to be fair, we also need to look at—and this may be kind of a bridge between what we've been arguing about and what we agree on—there's a lot of interest—and Chris has given me some information on this—about trying to develop some sort of way the EEOC can get rid of its backlog in part by drawing up consent orders that would go beyond litigation and would change the way people treat their employees, not necessarily on a race—not a race-based treatment but the way you develop, the way you recruit, the way you reach out. And one of the—to go back to Lynn's checklist—one of the things we would like to get everybody to agree to is a certain approach on that, on kind of a comprehensive approach to getting rid of the accumulated backlog of race claims and where you go from there.

The other thing I would like to just say, because I know we're going to have to wrap up pretty soon, is I agree with you, we need a structure for the discussion which permits us to continue to talk, sharply identify in a nonrhetorical way our differences, and ask if there

is some way to build on this, so we can actually get something done.

I talked to J.C. Watts on the phone; he called me last night, and I was out of pocket, and I called him this morning, and we talked for 20 to 30 minutes because he was—[*inaudible*]—and it was an interesting conversation. I just think, if you're willing, I'm willing to make this not a one-shot deal but to continue to work on this. I really sympathize with how the immigrant—Asian immigrant—particularly first generation Asians feel with the shift in criteria.

Ms. Chao. We're just learning the rules, and goddamn it, they change them on us. [*Laughter*]

The President. The real issue here is, if you go back, there's lot of thought being given in the private schools and universities—and Governor Kean, who runs a great one, can talk about it—that a lot of these private universities are thinking, okay, now, what if the colleges, if all the public institutions end affirmative action in their admissions process and they don't really—the State doesn't come up with a comprehensive alternative they'd like, where you've got all the colleges maybe taking over public schools, in effect, in terms of their college prep, so you get to—you maintain the diversity of the student body population with non-race-based policies; then will the private institutions basically have to carry the burden of educating a more diverse student body—or unless we're going to resegregate higher education like we once had?

So there's a reexamination about whether—I'm not saying that what you said is—how you described it, that that's the right way to do it, but there is a genuine, I think, reassessment about whether test scores plus grades should be the only predictor of success in college and success later, the only definer of merit, and whether we can assume that there is somehow an absolute character to that. As a matter of fact, the test scores were—[*inaudible*]—they have been a pretty good rough indicator.

But you know, look at what Texas is doing. It's interesting when you look at Texas, I mean, it's this desperate attempt, I think—desperate sounds critical; I'm not being critical. But people are looking around and trying to find a way to honor America, be fair, and still have a society where everybody's got a chance. Keep in mind, go back to basketball and our view of the doctors in Iowa, the people have got to believe everybody had a chance.

[*Ms. Chavez stated that it was not good public policy to have different rules for different groups and that the agreed criteria must be equally applied to every individual.*]

The President. You wouldn't be opposed to affirmative efforts that were not race-based, would you?

Ms. Chavez. That's right. I wouldn't because——

The President. And if they're not race-based, they——

[*Ms. Chavez stated that affirmative action efforts that were not raced-based but aimed at educational disadvantage, social disadvantage, or economic disadvantage would be acceptable but should involve more than just letting people in the door. She said she resented the assumption that minorities were incapable of meeting the same standards. The Vice President said that while human nature was vulnerable to prejudice, people have the ability and the national responsibility to overcome this vulnerability and its consequences. He stated that cross-cultural contacts were obviously rewarding, that opportunities for them should be more available, and that affirmative efforts must keep going forward. Mr. Canady stated that conservatives did not want to end the effort but did want to stop classification based on race.*]

The President. Let me ask you a question. One of the things that tickled me about—since I grew up in the South, in addition to being—[*inaudible*]—or the race problems in the country, we were all so obsessed with athletics. One of the things that tickled me about the California affirmative action vote was that there was—preference vote—is that there was an exception made for athletes. So you can give a preference for athletes to get into Berkeley, so Berkeley can have a nice football team and a nice basketball team.

The Vice President. Alumni giving.

The President. But the A student who doesn't get into Berkeley, the Asian A student who doesn't get into Berkeley is just as hurt because he didn't get in so everybody could be tickled at the next basketball game as he would have been hurt if some A student who grew up in a black family in Oakland and didn't go to a good high school and therefore didn't make quite as high a score on the college board—he still loses the opportunity. He just loses it

to a basketball player instead of a kid with thick glasses who struggled late at night in Oakland to make good grades but didn't quite make a high enough college board score to get in. What's the difference? Why is it justified? Why is athletic discrimination so wonderful and the race discrimination——

Participant. Well, you can get rid of it. If you want to sign an Executive order——

Participant. And alumni discrimination as well.

Mr. Connerly. Mr. President, I have to say that this has been a great party until now, but just as we're—the clock is ticking, we're ready to go out the door, you ruined my weekend with those very—[*laughter*]——

The President. Is that not true? If it's not true, I don't want to falsely accuse you.

Mr. Connerly. ——very loaded questions, very loaded statements that command far more than the 5 or 10 minutes we have left. Our Founders—they talked for hours about human nature as the basis of what kind of Government we were going to develop. And it's frightening to me—it is truly frightening to me, at the characterization of human nature, Mr. Vice President, that you portray, because it suggests that we cannot rise above it——

The Vice President. No, I said specifically, we can.

Mr. Connerly. ——unless Government is there demanding, demanding, that we be held accountable. The presumption of our people, the presumption of our Nation is that we're good people, that we can be fair, and that we will do the right thing. There are going to be some out there that are going to do wrong, and we'll bring those into line. But it's not that we are prone to do bad. And the whole question here about athletes and alumni, my God, any of us can be athletes or alumni. It has nothing to do with our skin color.

The President. I didn't say anything about alumni.

Mr. Connerly. Well, he did. But there are just certain traits here that we as a society are making a judgment about——

The President. The only point I made—[*laughter*]—don't get our two speeches mixed up. The only point I'm trying to make is, if you ever have any—if you decide what the criteria of academic merit is, and let's say you decide the criteria is the grades plus the college boards—this is the only point; I'm making a narrow point. If you decide the criteria is the grades plus the college boards, and then you decide—you make a decision, which I think you could make a compelling argument is a legitimate decision, that athletics is an important part of university life, that it enriches the lives of all the other students who are there; you can make that argument—but the point is, once you make that argument, that's the argument you could also make for having a racially diverse student body. I was making a very—I'm not making a wholesale assault.

Now, here's my problem with this whole deal—I know we've got to go, so I want to give you a chance to say what we really said before, which is, how do we give structure to this and what do you think the next step should be? And I'll give anybody else a chance. Look, when I was a Governor, I became the first Governor in the history of the country to sponsor legislation to require—[*inaudible*]—certified. I believe I passed the first law requiring kids in the whole State to have to pass an exam before they could actually go on to high school, because I didn't like the high school graduation—I thought that was closing the barn door after the cattle left. The reason I have consistently supported affirmative action programs—but I really have tried to change them and make them work—is not because—I basically think all that stuff you said is right. I am sick and tired of people telling me poor minority kids who live in desperate circumstances, that they can't make it. I think they should be told they can make it but they have to work harder to make it, and then I think we should give them a hand up to make it. I am tired of that. The reason I have supported affirmative action programs is very different, is—I have done it because I didn't want to see all these kids be sacrificed to a principle that I agree with, because the practice of life would not be fixed in time to give them a chance—number one.

And number two, I have had the same feeling about police departments and fire departments and business environments and university admissions that I felt about the athletes—that I really thought that the institutions were better off and the white majority or whoever else, was better off if there was some intermixing because of the world they're going to live in.

But I am always—I think we should all be uncomfortable, those of us who support this,

for giving something to somebody when we deprive somebody that was otherwise more deserving, by the traditional criteria, of getting it. But I think on balance, that's why I've been very strongly—but I have never wanted to not have high standards, not be demanding, not do things. I mean, I've paid a pretty good price for this—[*inaudible*]—and I'm not ashamed of having done it. I think that the kids in my State are better off because of it.

But we need to figure out, to recognize that what we'd really like is for people without regard to their race to be able to do the kind of business, go to the kind of schools, have the kind of public service jobs, and live in the kind of integrated environment that they choose if that is the choice they make, because there would be no differences in traditional measures of merit and how they did, so that people would be making their own choices and having their own choices. I think that's—we all agree that that's the world we want.

So I'd like to know what you think the next step should be. If you want to stay involved in this, you want to keep talking to us, you want to keep working with us, and you want to get some more different kind of people in here, what do you think we ought to do now?

[*Gov. Kean explained that he accepted the invitation to sit on the President's Advisory Board on Race because he believed it was the first time in his life a President was willing to take on this issue and to try to establish a dialog, and he believed it could do some good. He said that initially he believed the board had been too narrow, but that it was opening up to a broad spectrum of ideas. Ms. Thernstrom said she thought this was a wonderful meeting and that if this continued, it might go somewhere.*]

The President. That's what I think.

Ms. Thernstrom. Yes. We're feeling each other here. We're kind of making—it's a first kind of stiff beginning, but that we might really——

The Vice President. I resemble that remark. [*Laughter*]

The President. If you all are willing to do it and you will help us figure out a way to structure it, I'll do it. Let me just give you—I'll just give you one—outside this door, probably sitting there—I don't know if she's still there—is my diarist for the White House who has lately been in the paper because—[*inaudible*]—[*laughter*]—her name is Janis Kearney. Her daddy was a sharecropper, and her mother was a domestic. And they had 17 children; 13 of them have college degrees, 5 of them are lawyers, and all 17 of them have a first name that starts with the letter "J"—I don't know how they—[*laughter*]—most of them went to school in Arkansas. One of them went all the way to Harvard. And some of them had affirmative action, and some of them didn't, and they all did fine.

Look, somewhere in here there's a way that we can get to where we're trying to do—stop talking past each other and start working together. I cannot believe that 90 percent of the people in this country don't want the same kind of country in terms of racial matters. And I will do my best to find a way for us to move beyond the—[*inaudible*]—honestly and respectfully state our differences and figure out a way to work together. Because it is obvious, if you do not believe that there is any inherent, God-given difference among people based on race, then the differences that we have today must have been rooted in the mistakes that have been made in the past or the breakdown of social institutions or personal institutions like the family, the education system, and the networking of people in business and others. There has to be a way to rebuild those institutions, and we have to do it together.

I think it would be a shame if we didn't try to do this together. I'm trying to put this beyond partisan politics. I'm not trying to use you. I said that deal about the athletics because I might have voted for the athletic thing, too, but I've always been with the race is like athletics and not different from athletics. That's all. So we need to go.

If you have—in addition to your suggestions, which Governor Kean is for, I want to know if you've got process ideas about how we can discipline this debate and to move it forward.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:43 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Christopher Edley, consultant to the President's Advisory Board on Race. This outreach meeting was part of "One America: The President's Initiative on Race." A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Deployment of Military Forces for Stabilization of Areas of the Former Yugoslavia

December 19, 1997

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

In my report to the Congress of June 20, 1997, I provided further information on the deployment of combat-equipped U.S. Armed Forces to Bosnia and other states in the region in order to participate in and support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-led Stabilization Force (SFOR), and on the beginning of the withdrawal of the NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR), which completed its mission and transferred authority to the SFOR on December 20, 1996. I am providing this supplemental report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to help ensure that the Congress is kept fully informed on continued U.S. contributions in support of peacekeeping efforts in the former Yugoslavia.

We continue to work in concert with others in the international community to encourage the parties to fulfill their commitments under the Dayton Peace Agreement and to build on the gains achieved over the last 2 years. It remains in the U.S. national interest to help bring peace to Bosnia, both for humanitarian reasons and to arrest the dangers the fighting in Bosnia represented to security and stability in Europe generally. Through American leadership and in conjunction with our NATO allies and other countries, we have seen real and continued progress toward sustainable peace in Bosnia. We have also made it clear to the former warring parties that they are ultimately responsible for implementing the Peace Agreement.

The United Nations Security Council authorized member states to establish the follow-on force in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1088 of December 12, 1996. The SFOR's tasks are to deter or prevent a resumption of hostilities or new threats to peace, to consolidate IFOR's achievements and to promote a climate in which the civilian-led peace process can go forward. Subject to this primary mission, SFOR has provided support, within its capabilities, to civilian organizations implementing the Dayton Peace Agreement.

During its mission. SFOR has successfully deterred the resumption of hostilities by patrolling the Zone of Separation, inspecting and monitoring heavy weapons cantonment sites, and providing support to civilian agencies. The SFOR has made significant achievements in demining, as well as major progress in efforts to restore road, rail, and air transportation links within Bosnia and Herzegovina. The SFOR has contributed to efforts to bring persons indicted for war crimes into custody in The Hague. The SFOR's support to civilian peace implementation tasks has been significant.

United States force contribution to SFOR in Bosnia remains approximately 8,500. United States forces participating in SFOR are U.S. Army forces that were stationed in Germany and the United States. Other participating U.S. forces include special operations forces, airfield operations support forces, air forces, and reserve component personnel. An amphibious force is normally in strategic reserve in the Mediterranean Sea, and a carrier battle group remains available to provide support for air operations.

All NATO nations and 20 others, including Russia and Ukraine, have provided troops or other support to SFOR. Most U.S. troops are assigned to Multinational Division, North, centered around the city of Tuzla. In addition, approximately 3,000 U.S. troops are deployed to Hungary, Croatia, Italy, and other states in the region in order to provide logistical and other support to SFOR. Since June 1997, U.S. forces have sustained a total of three fatalities, none of which was combat-related.

A U.S. Army contingent remains deployed in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia as part of the United Nations Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP). This U.N. peacekeeping force observes and monitors conditions along the border with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Albania, effectively contributing to the stability of the region. Several U.S. Army helicopters are also deployed to provide support to U.S. forces and UNPREDEP as required. Most of the approximately 350 U.S. soldiers participating in these missions are assigned to the 1st Battalion, 6th Infantry, 1st Armored Division. The U.N. Security Council voted December 4, 1997, to authorize a final extension of the UNPREDEP mandate through August 31,

1998, at which time UNPREDEP will be terminated.

A small contingent of U.S. military personnel is also serving in Croatia in direct support of the Transitional Administrator of the United Nations Transitional Administration in Eastern Slovenia (UNTAE). These personnel are expected to be redeployed when UNTAES's mandate expires on January 15, 1998, and a follow-on U.N. civilian police operation continues in the region.

In order to continue the progress we have seen in the last 6 months and to create conditions for a self-sustaining peace, yesterday I announced that the United States would in principal take part in a security prescence in Bosnia when SFOR withdraws this summer.

I have directed the participation of U.S. Armed Forces in these operations pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive, and in accordance with various statutory authorities. I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed about developments in Bosnia and other states in the region. I will continue to consult closely with the Congress regarding our efforts to foster peace and stability in the former Yugoslavia.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting a Certification Required by the Ratification Resolution of the Chemical Weapons Convention

December 19, 1997

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

In accordance with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 24, 1997, I hereby certify that:

In connection with Condition (3), Establishment of an Internal Oversight Office, the internal audit office of the Preparatory Commission was expanded into the Office of Internal Oversight of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons upon the establishment of the Organization.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on the Lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979

December 19, 1997

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

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12924 of August 19, 1994, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

The President's Radio Address
December 20, 1997

Good morning. In this season of hope and special time for our loved ones, I'd like to share some thoughts on what all Americans can do to strengthen our families. Specifically, I want to talk about our efforts to protect our children from drugs, the most dangerous enemy of childhood. Nothing can cause more pain and heartbreak in a family or cause more harm to a child's future than the use and abuse of drugs.

We should be very proud that drug use among all Americans has fallen by one-half since 1979. But in recent years teenage drug use was rising. Today I have some good news.

A second major survey on drug use this year has confirmed that for the first time since 1991, our teenagers are beginning to turn away from drugs. In a report I'm a releasing today, the Department of Health and Human Services has found that the increasing rates of teen drug use are leveling off and, in some cases, decreasing. Today's eighth graders are less likely to have used drugs over the past year, and just as important, they are more likely to disapprove of drug use. This change in attitudes represents a glimmer of hope in our efforts to protect our children from drugs. But our work is far from over.

The most effective strategy we have against drugs begins at home. It's a fight that can be won at kitchen tables all across America. This holiday season, as we spend some hard-earned time with our families, I urge all parents to sit down with their children, as Hillary and I have done, and share a simple and important lesson: Drugs are dangerous; drugs are wrong; and drugs can kill you.

But Government can also do its part to help parents keep their children safe from drugs. Over the past 5 years, our administration has put in place a comprehensive national plan to fight drugs at all levels. We're putting 100,000 community police on our streets. We've cracked down on meth dealers and seized their labs. We've expanded mandatory drug testing for parolees and demanded that drug offenders get the treatment they need to live productive lives. We've worked with neighboring countries to prevent drugs from crossing our borders in the first place and built new community coalitions against drugs.

Most importantly, we fought to protect the safe and drug-free schools program that helps to keep drugs out of classrooms and away from children. The historic Balanced Budget Act I signed this summer also includes $195 million for a national youth antidrug media campaign. Our goal is to make sure that every time a child turns on the TV, listens to the radio, or surfs the Internet, he or she will get the powerful message that drugs can destroy your life.

But we can't ever forget that the best drug enforcement prevention effort still is parents teaching their children the difference between right and wrong when it comes to drugs. So once again, I call upon our parents to build on the progress we're making by talking frankly to your children about the destructive consequences of trying and using drugs.

As we celebrate the blessings of the year just past, let's all work to ensure that every child can look forward to a safe, healthy, and hopeful new year.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6 p.m. on December 19 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on December 20.

Remarks to the Community in Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina
December 22, 1997

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, I think we should give a round of applause to Farouk and to Masha. They did a wonderful job, and I'm very proud of them. [*Applause*]

I thank the Sarajevo Philharmonic, President Izetbegovic, President Zubak, members of the Bosnian Government; to the religious leaders who are here, the representatives of civilian and voluntary agencies from around the world, the members of the American delegation; to Senator and Mrs. Dole, Members of Congress; General Shelton, General Clark, General Shinseki; to the people of Sarajevo and the people of Bosnia.

Let me say that all of us from the United States are very honored to be here, to gather in the dawn after a long darkness. For us this is a season of celebration, and we give thanks that the will for peace has triumphed over the weapons of war. At the edge of the 21st century, we come here to resolve to build a new era, free of the 20th century's worst moments and full of its most brilliant possibilities.

What my family and I and our party have seen in the streets of Sarajevo has been deeply moving to us. Only a little more than 2 years ago, men, women, and children ran the gauntlet of snipers and shells in a desperate search for water. Now they walk in security to work and school. Then, sheets of plastic covered nearly every window. Now there is mostly glass, and plastic is rare. Then, people lived in the rubble of bombed out buildings. Now they have roofs over their heads, heat, electricity, and running water. Then, Sarajevo was mired in a deep freeze of destruction. And now, through your labors, it has begun to thaw and to grow anew in the sunlight of peace. Then, shops were barren and cafes were empty. Now, they are filled with food and alive with conversation.

And my wife and daughter and I just had some of that conversation and some pretty good coffee, I might add. [*Laughter*] We just came from a coffee shop where we were talking to a number of young people who work and study here from all different ethnic backgrounds, people determined to build a common future, to let go of the destructive past. And I went around the table and let every one of them tell me whatever they wanted to say. And then I said, "Now, what is the most important thing the United States could do to help you on your way?" And in unison they said, "Stay for a while longer."

Then the time came for us to come here. And Hillary and Chelsea and I walked outside the coffee shop, and there's a beautiful church just across the street, and in front of the church there were three American soldiers who happened to come from a unit from Richmond, Virginia. And we walked over to shake hands with the soldiers, all enlisted personnel. And one of them said, "We're so happy to be here. These are good people, and it's a good thing we're doing."

We in the United States are proud of our role in Bosnia's new beginning. Look at the group who came here today from our Government: the Secretary of State; three four-star generals; 10 Members of Congress, prominent Members of Congress from both political parties; my distinguished opponent in the last Presidential election, Senator Dole, and Mrs. Dole. Americans care a lot about Bosnia; without regard to their party or their political differences, they care about the people.

We also have distinguished citizens here who have worked with nongovernmental organizations. They are a part of the amazing international force of human endeavor that we have seen brought to bear in this remarkable land in the last couple of years; people from all around the world waging a day-to-day campaign of renewal with you. We are proud that we played a role in helping you to silence the guns and separate the armies, to rebuild roads and factories, to reunite children with their families and refugees with their homes, to oversee democratic elections and open the airwaves to voices of tolerance, to call to account those accused of war crimes. We are here because you decided to end the suffering and the slaughter, and because we rejected the prospect of another needless war spreading in the heart of Europe, and because citizens all over the world were literally heartbroken by your suffering and determined to ease it.

To everyone who has taken part in IFOR and SFOR and civilian projects large and small,

I'd like to say a simple thank you. And God bless you all for what you have done and what you will do to change the face and the future of Bosnia.

Most of all I come before you with a message for those in whose hands the future of Bosnia lie, its leaders and its people. For in the end, the future is up to you, not to the Americans, not to the Europeans, not to anyone else.

Two years ago in Dayton, Ohio, the leaders of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia made a fateful choice for peace. But their responsibility and yours did not end there on that day. In fact, it only began. Your responsibility is to turn the documents signed in Dayton into a living reality, to make good on the pledge to bring Bosnia together as one country, with two multiethnic parts, sharing a common destiny. Those who rise to that responsibility will have the full support of the United States and the international community. Those who shirk it will isolate themselves. The world which continues to invest in your peace rightfully expects that you will do your part. More important, the people of this country expect results and they deserve them.

You have accomplished much, but there is much more to do. You have established the joint institutions of democracy. Now you must work within them, sharing power as you share responsibility. You have vowed to welcome back those displaced from their homes by war. Now you must vote for the return program so that they actually can come back with stronger protections for minorities and more job creation. You are working to restore Bosnia's economy. Now you must build up the laws to attract assistance and investment and root out the corruption that undermines confidence in economies.

You have begun to turn the media from an instrument of hate into a force of tolerance and understanding. Now you must raise it to international standards of objectivity and access and allow an independent press the freedom to thrive. You are taking the police out of the hands of warlords. Now you must help to reform, retrain, and reequip a democratic force that fosters security, not fear. You have pledged to isolate and arrest indicted war criminals. Now you must follow through on that commitment, both for the sake of justice and in the serving of lasting peace.

Most of all, the leaders here, you owe it to your country to bring out the best in people, acting in concert, not conflict; overcoming obstacles, not creating them; rising above petty disputes, not fueling them. In the end, leaders in a democracy must bring out the best in people. But in the end, they serve the people who send them to their positions.

And so to the people of Bosnia, I say today, you must make your desire for peace and a common future clear to the leaders of each group. And you must then give leaders the absolute support they need to make the hard decisions for a common future. The people of Bosnia can make it happen. The example that ordinary citizens set among your neighbors, the standards that you demand from your leaders will determine this nation's fate.

After such a hard war, fighting aggressively for peace is difficult. So many have lost mothers and fathers, husbands and wives, sons and daughters. So many wounds are deep and scars still fresh. Energy may be short, at a time when an extraordinary effort of will is required to wrench yourself from the past and to begin to build a future together. How many people who have suffered as Farouk has suffered can stand clearly, unambiguously for the cause of peace and a common future. Many must if you are to succeed. And many of you are trying to do that in religious and civic settings of all kinds. I thank all of those who are making organized efforts to build a common future, especially those who are mobilizing women, because they know so painfully how important reconciliation and reconstruction are to your families and your children's future.

What I want all of you to believe today is that you can do it. In our time, from Guatemala to South Africa, from El Salvador to Northern Ireland, people are turning from conflict to conciliation. Still, the impulse to divide, if not to actually fight and kill, over ethnic or religious or racial differences, runs deep in human nature across the globe. It seems to be rooted in a fear of those who are different from ourselves and a false sense of superiority and security that separation and striving for supremacy seem to offer.

In America for a long time, one race literally enslaved another. It took the bloodiest war in our history to break the chains of bondage and more than 100 years of effort since then to root out their consequences. And we're still working at it. But we grow always stronger as

we let more and more of our fears and prejudices go. The more we recognize that, as we live and work and learn together, what we have in common is far more important than our differences. So that across all those differences, together we affirm our devotion to faith and to family. We seek opportunity for all and responsibility from all. We believe we are immeasurably stronger as one America than as a collection of separate, hostile camps. And this is a point of special importance to you. We find that affirming our Union allows us the security to respect, even to celebrate, our differences.

As we in America look ahead to a new century, we have people from over 180 different racial and ethnic groups who now call America home. We have embarked on a great national dialog across those groups about how we can live and prosper together in a new millennium. I would urge all of you to do the same thing here, to find more opportunities at the grassroots; to reach across the lines of division for the sake of your children and your future. I know that especially to the young people here, finding strength in your diversity may seem like an act of faith that requires quite a leap.

Many young people recall little before the war. One teenage Sarajevan said recently, "It's not just a question of starting again. It's a question of just starting." But I think it is important that all of you remember and teach that the war did violence not only to Bosnia's people but also to its history, its own tradition of tolerance. Just minutes from here, standing within yards from one another are a mosque, an Orthodox church, a Catholic church, and a synagogue, reminding us that generations of Muslims, Orthodox Christians, Catholics, and Jews live side by side and enrich the world by their example here, build schools and libraries and wondrous places of worship. Part of that population laid down their tools on Friday, part on Saturday, and part on Sunday. But their lives were woven together by marriage and culture, by work and common language and a shared pride in a place all could call home. That past should be remembered. And you should do everything in your power to make it a prolog. History can be your ally, not your enemy.

I am persuaded, having served in this office for 5 years, that the real differences around the world today are not between Jews and Arabs; Protestants and Catholics; Muslims, Croats, and Serbs. The real differences are between those who embrace peace and those who would destroy it, between those who look to the future and those who cling to the past, between those who open their arms and those who are determined to clench their fists, between those who believe that God made all of us equal and those foolish enough to believe they are superior to others just because of the color of their skin, of the religion of their families, of their ethnic background. This is a very small nation on an increasingly small planet. None of us has the moral standing to look down on another, and we should stop it.

I was thrilled that the Sarajevo symphony played before I was introduced to speak. Its violinist and cellist, percussionist and flutist, played together before the war, stayed together during the war, answered the mortars and shells with the sounds of music. Seven of the members were killed—Muslims, Croats, and Serbs. Well, they're still here, and they're still Muslims, Croats, and Serbs. And to tell you the truth, I know the tuba players from the violinists, but I can't tell the Muslims from the Croats from the Serbs. The harmony of their disparate voices—the harmony of their disparate voices—is what I hear. It reminds me of Bosnia's best past, and it should be the clarion call to your future.

Here at the dawn of the new millennium, let us recall that the century we are leaving began with the sound of gunfire in Sarajevo. And let us vow to start the new century with the music of peace in Sarajevo.

To the people of Bosnia I say, you have seen what war has wrought; now you know what peace can bring. So seize the chance before you. You can do nothing to change the past, but if you can let it go, you can do everything to build a future. The world is watching, and the world is with you. But the choice is yours. May you make the right one.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:55 a.m. at the National Theater. In his remarks, he referred to Farouk Sabanovic and Masha Mishdin, who introduced the President; Alija Izetbegovic, Presidency Chairman, and Kresimir Zubak, Presidency Member, National Government, Bosnia-Herzegovina; former Senator Bob Dole and his wife, Elizabeth, president, American Red Cross; Gen. Henry H. Shelton, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Gen. Wesley K. Clark, Supreme Allied Commander,

Europe; and Gen. Eric K. Shinseki, Commander, U.S. Army, Europe. The President also referred to the NATO-led Implementation Force in Bosnia (IFOR) and the NATO-led Stabilization Force in Bosnia (SFOR).

Remarks to the Troops in Tuzla, Bosnia-Herzegovina
December 22, 1997

The President. Thank you for your laid-back welcome. [*Laughter*] Thank you, General Ellis. Ladies and gentlemen, I have come here with a great delegation of Americans, including the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Army, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe; many other distinguished military officials and officials from the White House; and a truly astonishing delegation from Congress, of both Democrats and Republicans together.

We have Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska; Senator Joe Biden of Delaware; Senator Joe Lieberman of Connecticut; Senator Dan Coats of Indiana; Representative John Kasich of Ohio; Representative Jack Murtha of Pennsylvania; Representative Ike Skelton of Missouri; Representative Elijah Cummings of Maryland; Representative Mac Collins of Georgia—anybody from Georgia? [*Cheers*] Representative John Boehner of Ohio; and Representative Steve Buyer of Indiana—anybody here from Indiana? [*Cheers*] I'm proud of all of them.

And let me say, we came here for two reasons today. We came here, first of all, to say thank you to all of you, to say what you are doing for your country is a good and noble thing. You are doing it well, and we are grateful. We know it's tough to be away from home at Christmas time. We know it's hard to be away from your families. But you are doing something profoundly important.

The second reason we came here was so that we could go to Sarajevo and see the leaders of the Muslims, the Croatians, and the Serbs, and tell them that they made an agreement at Dayton that we are doing our dead-level best to help them enforce, and they promised that they would live and work together and build one country without ethnic prejudice or unfairness to any group; that we would not only end a war, that they would build a peace together; and that we in the United States were determined not only to do our part but we expected them to do theirs. And these good people in Bosnia, these little children, who have suffered so much, they deserve leaders who honor the commitments they made at Dayton and build a better, brighter future.

And we wanted to do that with one voice, without regard to party. So I want to say a special word of thanks to Senator Bob Dole and Mrs. Elizabeth Dole for coming. And I would like to give—Senators talk like this all the time; I don't quite know how to do it, but I think this is called yielding a portion of my time. I'd like for Bob Dole to come up here and say a few words.

[*At this point, former Senator Bob Dole made brief remarks.*]

The President. Thank you, Senator Dole. Thank you for not reading my speech. [*Laughter*] I like the one you gave.

Let me first of all say that I'm delighted to be here with the Iron Soldiers of the 1st Armored Division, with the 2d Armored Calvary and all of the other units of Task Force Eagle. But I also want the people back home to know, through our friends in the press who are here, that there are a lot of National Guardsmen and Reservists here. And I thank all of you.

Now, Hillary and I, along with the phone time that you all get—I hope you enjoy that hour on the telephone. I know you're all sitting there thinking, "Am I going to use it all at one time or am I going to divide it up? Am I going to call four people or just one?" Decisions, decisions!

We were able to bring some school supplies over here with us, some toys as well. And I know you're going to be able to distribute those to children here who are needy and deserving. I want to thank especially Lieutenant Colonel Mark Little, who started the program to take care of these children who have been so hurt

in this war and who's given thousands of Americans the chance to serve through it.

A few moments ago we gave some of those presents to some Bosnian children, and I wish all of you could have been there with me. I wish all of you could have been with Hillary and Chelsea and me earlier today when we sat around a table in a coffee shop in Sarajevo and talked to a dozen young people, Muslims, Serbs, Croats, all from Bosnia. And I said, "You know, I'm going to see our soldiers today, and if we could do one more thing for your country, what would you like us to do?" And every one of them, it was like a chorus, they said, "Stay. Stay just a little longer. We can't—we're not ready yet, but the young people want peace. We don't understand why we're supposed to hate each other. We don't want that kind of future. Please stay."

And then we walked outside this coffee shop in Sarajevo, and there were three American soldiers, who happened to be from Virginia across the street, standing in front of a church. And Hillary and Chelsea went over there, and I got out, and I went over and shook hands with them. And they said, "We are really proud to be here because we are doing a good thing." You are doing a good thing, and I hope you are proud to be here. America is proud of you.

I also want to tell you that I have enjoyed sort of sampling your life, walking in the mud—[*laughter*]—imagining what it would be like to spend 6 months in those beautiful tents. [*Laughter*] I like those Kevlar seats in the Humvee. [*Laughter*] I have heard all about the wonderful cuisine. We're going to have dinner, and who knows, maybe I'll even get near-beer and vegetable lasagna. [*Laughter*]

We're having a good time, and we're all cheering. But I want you to be serious with me just for a minute. And when you go to bed tonight, and you wonder what you're doing here, I want you to think about this. These people, for nearly 4 years in this country, fought the bloodiest war in Europe since the end of World War II; massive numbers of people displaced from their homes, huge number of children made orphans, lots of young people walking around without limbs, horrible things happened to people. And because of what you and our other allies did—our NATO allies and our allies from Russia, from Poland, from other non-NATO countries—you know that the country has stayed on the path of peace instead of going back into bloodshed. Without you, that would not have happened. Without you, the warring parties never would have disengaged, and more than—listen to this—more than 370,000 of them were combatant troops. They've gone back to civilian life now. Without you, there would still be mortars and cannons firing. Now, more than 6,500 heavy weapons have been destroyed and the rest put under international supervision. Because of you, free and fair elections have been held. There is freedom of movement; police reform has begun. A lot of the airwaves now are filled with information instead of vicious, partisan hatred.

Bosnia is no longer the powder keg at the heart of Europe because of you. And I cannot thank you enough. Your children and your grandchildren will look back on this moment and know that you have done something not only of surpassing importance but something that is profoundly good.

We gave you a mission, and you delivered. So when you go to bed tonight, thank God that you were given the chance to do something like this. A lot of people live their whole lives and never ever, ever are able to give something so profoundly important to others as the gift you have given to the children of Bosnia. Thank you, and God bless you for it.

Let me also say that even though this has been a remarkably nonviolent mission, it has not been free of risks. I was thinking today coming here to Tuzla that in August a couple of years ago, when we were working on the peace process, we lost three remarkable people, Bob Frasure, Joe Kruzel, and Nelson Drew, who were part of our team trying to make a peace agreement. And their vehicle crumbled on a weak road, and they were killed in a horrible accident. We had a couple of other accidents on the road. We lost one soldier who was killed when he walked over to a mine and just kneeled down and started dealing with it.

But the most important thing I was thinking about today, from a purely personal point of view, is that it wasn't so very long ago that my good friend, the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, was here in Tuzla. He spent the last day of his life here before his plane crashed. And I want to tell you, I've seen the pictures. He had a very happy last day because he was here with the men and women of the United States Armed Forces, glorying in and participating in this mission.

I also want to say to you that in spite of all you have done, I think it is imperative that we not stop until the peace here has a life of its own, until it can endure without us. We have worked too hard to let this go.

I thank the Members of Congress from both parties who have come here out of concern for you and your work. I want to say a special work of thanks again to Senator Dole. He said something to me on the phone the other day; he says so many things that are funny and pithy that if I start stealing his lines without attribution, I'll get in trouble. So I want to tell you—he said this to me. We were talking about Bosnia, and he said, "Look, it's worked." He said, "I didn't necessarily agree with everything you did, but on the whole this thing has worked. And this is like being in a football game, and we're ahead. It's the fourth quarter. Who wants to walk off the field and forfeit the game? We ought to stay here, finish the game, and take home the win for the world and for freedom." And that's exactly what I intend to do, thanks to what you have proven that America can stand for and that we can accomplish. And again I say, thank you very, very much.

One other thing, just for my information. How many of you here are on your second tour here? [*Cheers*] I met a young man today; I said, "How long have you been in the Army?" He said, "I've been in the Army 5 years." And he said, "The last time I saw you, I was in Haiti." He said in 5 years he's done two tours in Haiti and one tour in Bosnia. Just sort of laying around, you know. [*Laughter*]

I don't think many Americans understand exactly how deep the burdens are on our men and women in uniform today. Because we have downsized the military in the aftermath of the cold war, when we take on these responsibilities, it is very hard for a lot of people. We rotate these missions a little more rapidly than we would like to. We draw out Reservists and Guardsmen more often than we would like to. But you have always done what you were asked to do. And you have always delivered for America.

So on this Christmas season I ask the American people, who will see this on television tonight or tomorrow, to remember what we owe to the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen, the marines of the Armed Forces at home and around the world, in the Persian Gulf, on the DMZ in Korea, here in Bosnia. Our Nation is at peace and our people are secure because of you. Our country can grow stronger and more prosperous. Our people can live out their dreams. Our children can sleep well because of you. Your sacrifice makes this possible.

I think that one of the things that you may wonder is whether people back home know you're here and appreciate what you're doing. Since you've done it so well, there aren't any visible problems, and you make it look easy.

I got a fascinating letter the other day from the mother of a soldier stationed in Camp Eagle, Specialist Christina Campbell. And the mother said, "So as you get busy spreading holiday cheer, don't forget the peacekeepers and those they hold dear." And Specialist Campbell actually wrote a poem. So I want to tell you, I took just a little bit out of it, because I want you to know that at this Christmas you are in the hearts of the American people. And her words are your words. Listen to these; she says, "No, this is not our soil, and it's not our own fight. But if you've seen what I have, then you know that it's right."

God bless you all, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:30 p.m. at Club 21. In his remarks, he referred to Maj. Gen. Larry R. Ellis, USA, commander, 1st Armored Division.

Message on the Observance of Christmas, 1997

December 22, 1997

Warm greetings to everyone celebrating Christmas.

At this time of year, when the nights grow longer and often colder, our lives are brightened and our hearts warmed by the lights of Christmas. So much light surrounds our memories and celebration of Christmas: candlelight in the windows, colored lights twinkling on the tree,

children's faces lit with a joy that is reflected in their parents' eyes. The beloved Christmas story itself is a story of light, for, as the Gospel of John tells us, Jesus came into the world as "the true Light" that illumines all humankind.

Almost 2,000 years later, that Light still shines amid the dark places of our world. It is reflected in the lives of so many quiet and generous people who strive daily to make life better for others—feeding the hungry, caring for the ill and elderly, cherishing and nurturing children. It radiates from the hearts of those who work for peace and justice in their communities, our nation, and the world. It shines in the efforts of men and women striving to break down the walls of fear, ignorance, and prejudice that cast shadows across too many lives and prevent us from becoming the people God intended us to be.

May all who celebrate Christmas this year rejoice in the special gifts of light that it brings: the love that warms our hearts, the faith that lights our journey, and the hope that promises us a bright future. Hillary and I wish you joy and peace during this Christmas season and much happiness in the New Year.

BILL CLINTON

Message on the Observance of Kwanzaa, 1997

December 22, 1997

Warm greetings to everyone observing Kwanzaa.

As America embarks on a season of renewal and reconciliation, the principles of Kwanzaa—unity, self-determination, collective work and responsibility, cooperative economics, purpose, creativity, and faith—ring true not only for African Americans, but also for all Americans. By emphasizing the importance of family in our lives and the blessings that come with a true commitment to community, opportunity, and responsibility, the celebration of Kwanzaa can help us to enter the future as a stronger nation and a more compassionate and united people.

The symbols and ceremony of Kwanzaa, evoking the rich history and heritage of African Americans, remind us that our nation draws much of its strength from our diversity. As millions of Americans observe Kwanzaa this year, let us renew our commitment to realizing America's promise as a land where all people are free to pursue our common dreams—to live in peace, to provide for our families, and to give our children the opportunity for a better life.

Hillary joins me in sending best wishes for a joyous Kwanzaa.

BILL CLINTON

Statement on the Death of Esther Peterson

December 22, 1997

Hillary and I were saddened to learn of the death of Esther Peterson. She was the mother of the modern consumer movement, a woman who dedicated her life to improving the standard of living for all Americans. In her long career, she was a trusted adviser to President Kennedy, President Johnson, and President Carter. I was grateful for her sage counsel and for her service to this country. As a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations, she was dedicated to promoting American values at home and abroad. She will be greatly missed. Our thoughts and prayers are with her children and grandchildren.

Statement on the Death of Dawn Steel
December 22, 1997

Hillary and I were saddened to learn of the death of Dawn Steel. She was a pioneer in the film industry, blazing a trail for a new generation of young women, and setting a standard of achievement for all. Our lives have been enriched by her talent, and she will be missed. Our thoughts and prayers are with her husband, her daughter, and with all her family.

Remarks at a Hanukkah Celebration and an Exchange With Reporters
December 23, 1997

The President. Hello, everybody. Before we light the menorah, I'd like to make a brief statement. First of all, I'd like to welcome the Jewish Primary Day School students here and their principal, Susan Koss. I'd like to thank Mayrim Baram, who is not here, who lives in Israel, who did this magnificent, magnificent menorah for us. It's very, very beautiful. Dr. Amatzia Baram, his son, and Mrs. Baram are in the audience today, and through them, I'd like to thank his father for this really beautiful menorah. I will treasure it always. And it's been up in the White House during the holiday season, so many people have come in here and have seen it.

This evening I join the rest of the country in wishing you a happy Hanukkah. Tonight Jews across America and the world are celebrating the victory of the Maccabees over their oppressors and the Miracle of Lights that marked their triumph. This joyous holiday also reminds us of our precious right to religious freedom, a right we all hold dear as Americans, a right that is the very first one written into our Bill of Rights. Like the Maccabees, we must vigilantly oppose religious prejudice whenever we find it.

I know that your teachers and rabbis have instilled in you the values of compassion, justice, and tolerance. And if you have courage to follow those values, you can be the Maccabees of our time.

This year we will also celebrate the 50th anniversary of the creation of the modern State of Israel, the land where the miracle of Hanukkah occurred such a long time ago. But our prayers to God this holiday will be for peace in the land of Israel, for the tranquility of its people, for a bright and hopeful future for all the children of the Middle East, children that are very much like you.

Now as Danny Lew lights the menorah, I wish you all once again a very happy Hanukkah.

Danny.

[*At this point, Danny Lew lit the menorah.*]

Health Care Task Force Civil Case

Q. Mr. President, can we—if we have time for just one question. A Federal judge the other day had some very tough words for Ira Magaziner. But so far there's been no public comment from the White House. It seems like if that accusation was unfair, Mr. Magaziner is entitled to a public defense. And if it was fair, the public is entitled to an explanation of why somebody on the White House staff might mislead a judge.

The President. First of all, it's a fair question, but because of what we've been doing the last few days and because of what we've been—the holiday season, I honestly haven't read the judge's opinion, nor have I asked anyone on the staff for a response to it. So I'd like to ask you to just give me a pass until tomorrow or so. I'll be happy to answer it, but I don't want to give you the wrong answer.

I was a little skeptical when I read the news story, because I believe I know what the facts were, so I was quite skeptical when I read the news story. But I think it's a very fair question; we should answer the question. I just don't think I'm prepared to do it now. And I'll be ready tomorrow. I'll ask someone, and you can ask me tomorrow.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, what about the Middle East peace process? Is it going to take—Hanukkah celebrates—it's a celebration of miracles; what is it going to take to rekindle the Middle East peace process?

The President. Well, I'm actually quite hopeful. I think, first it takes a reaffirmation to the process of peace, which means that there should be a high level of security associated with the process itself. And I think there's general belief that the Palestinian Authority has redoubled its efforts on security. The Israeli Cabinet has seemed to adopt the position that said that they would be for another withdrawal consistent with the Oslo accords. There appears to be other discussion in Israel over the questions, the long-delayed questions about the airport and the port and the safe transit from the West Bank to Gaza.

So I'm actually quite hopeful that in the coming year we'll have progress not only between the Israelis and Palestinians but also between Israel and Syria. I think the openness is there, and I think that many people are sobered by the consequences of the absence of a viable peace process. So maybe it's just the holiday season, but I'm feeling pretty upbeat about it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:25 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mayrim Baram, an Israeli who lost a son in the 1973 Yom Kippur War, his surviving son, Amatzia Baram, and his daughter-in-law, Bonnie Baram Belkin; Susan Koss, director, and Danny Lew, student, Jewish Primary Day School of the Adas Israel Synagogue; and U.S. District Judge Royce C. Lamberth.

Statement on the Death of Sebastian Arcos Bergnes

December 23, 1997

Hillary and I were saddened to learn of the death of Sebastian Arcos Bergnes, a courageous and tireless activist for human rights, democracy, and freedom in Cuba.

Mr. Arcos dedicated his life to peaceful change in his beloved homeland. He was a man of honor and dignity who commanded enormous respect around the world for the sacrifices he made and the good work he did for the people of Cuba. As one of the founders of the human rights movement in Cuba, he blazed a trail which has inspired many others who cherish individual liberties. He was an example to us all and will be missed.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his son and daughter and the rest of the family who will carry on the effort to secure human rights in Cuba.

Statement on the Oklahoma City Bombing Trials

December 23, 1997

Two years ago, I told the families of the 168 innocent men, women, and children who perished in the Murrah Federal Building that they had lost too much, but they had not lost America, and that we would stand by them for as long as it took.

The dedicated team of prosecutors and investigators who brought these cases to a successful conclusion have helped to fulfill that promise. The Nation is deeply in their debt.

I know that no verdict in a court of law can ease the loss of a loved one. But the successful prosecution of Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols should offer a measure of comfort that all Americans stand with the families of Oklahoma City.

Statement on Deferred Enforced Departure for Haitians
December 23, 1997

Today I have directed the Attorney General and the Immigration and Naturalization Service to defer for one year the deportation of Haitians who were paroled into the United States or applied for asylum prior to December 31, 1995. This action implements the commitment I made to address the situation of Haitians when I signed immigration legislation last month offering relief to Central Americans and others. It will shield these Haitians from deportation while we work with Congress to provide them long-term legislative relief.

Haitians deserve the same treatment we sought for Central Americans. Like Central Americans, Haitians for many years were forced to seek the protection of the United States because of oppression, human rights abuses, and civil strife at home. Many of them have established strong ties and made significant contributions to our communities. And while we have been encouraged by Haiti's progress following the restoration of democratic government in 1994, the situation there remains fragile. Staying the deportation of these Haitians and obtaining for them permanent legislative relief will help support a stable and democratic Haiti—which, in turn, is the best safeguard against a renewed flow of Haitian migrants to the United States.

Memorandum on Deferred Enforced Departure for Haitians
December 23, 1997

Memorandum for the Attorney General

Subject: Measures Regarding Certain Haitians in the United States

Over the past several decades, many Haitians have been forced to flee their country because of human rights abuses and civil strife and have sought the protection of the United States. A significant number of these Haitians were brought into the United States from Guantanamo Bay Naval Base by President Bush following the overthrow of President Aristide in 1991. Other Haitians arrived here through other means and were paroled or applied for asylum. Many of these Haitians continue to be without legal status in the United States.

Pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct the foreign relations of the United States, I have determined that it is in the foreign policy interest of the United States to defer for 1 year the deportation of any Haitian national who was paroled into the United States before December 31, 1995, or who filed for asylum before December 31, 1995, and who has been continuously present in the United States since that date.

Accordingly, I now direct you to take the necessary steps to implement for these Haitians:

1. deferral of enforced departure from the United States for 1 year from the date of this memorandum; and
2. authorization for employment for 1 year from the date of this memorandum.

This directive shall not apply to any Haitian national: (1) who has been convicted of an aggravated felony; (2) who is found to be a persecutor of others within the meaning of 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(42); (3) whose removal you determine is in the interest of the United States; (4) whose presence or activities in the United States the Secretary of State has reasonable ground to believe would have potentially serious adverse foreign policy consequences for the United States; (5) who voluntarily returned or returns to Haiti or his or her country of last habitual residence outside the United States; (6) who was deported, excluded, or removed prior to the date of this memorandum; or (7) who is subject to extradition.

These measures shall be taken as of the date of this memorandum.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on the Comprehensive Trade and Development Policy for Africa

December 23, 1997

Dear Mr. _____:

I am pleased to submit the third of five annual reports on the Administration's Comprehensive Trade and Development Policy for Africa as required by section 134 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. This year marks a watershed in our economic and trade relations with the countries of Africa.

On June 17, I announced a new strategy to promote economic growth and opportunity in Africa. The Partnership for Growth and Opportunity in Africa opens the door to real, positive change, as only nations carrying out serious reforms will reap the full benefits. Those that strengthen their democracies, reform their trade regimes, and invest in their people will see their efforts pay off in increased trade that will create new jobs, increase wages, spur growth, and improve the quality of life for their people. Also this year the United States Congress has had before it the African Growth and Opportunity Act. This legislation and our initiative constitute a collective American effort to help fulfill the promise of a stable, prosperous, and democratic Africa. I urge the Congress to pass quickly the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Our goal remains the achievement of sustained economic development for Africa and we continue to be guided by the conviction that economic development in Sub-Saharan Africa will benefit both Africans and Americans. African countries continue to make progress toward political and economic reform, but this progress is fragile and must be supported.

The Administration's Partnership for Growth and Opportunity in Africa has five key elements. First, we intend to provide increased access to our markets for African exports. The most committed African reformers will receive the greatest access. In the future, the United States will be prepared to negotiate free trade agreements with these countries. Congressional action is particularly important if we are to implement successfully these elements of the Partnership. This report discusses the steps we are currently taking to ensure improved access for African and American products in our respective markets and to bring about increased mutually beneficial trade.

Second, we will increase technical assistance to enable African countries to take the fullest advantage of these new programs. This report discusses the ways that we are assisting African countries to undertake reforms that will enable them to grow through increased trade and investment.

Third, we are working to increase private investment in Sub-Saharan Africa. Through the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), we have created a new $150 million equity fund to finance increased private investment, and will create funds up to $500 million for infrastructure investment. We also are undertaking an initiative to strengthen the transportation infrastructure in Africa.

Fourth, we will work to eliminate bilateral debt for the poorest of the reforming nations, and maintain our leadership in the effort to reduce their debts to the multilateral institutions. This report highlights the progress we have made working with our Economic Summit Partners and with the international financial institutions to ensure that we have a coordinated approach to reducing African debt and its adverse impacts on African economic reform and development.

Fifth, the United States will hold annual economic meetings at the ministerial level with all reforming African nations. In the last 6 months we have held more discussion with African leaders on trade and investment matters than ever before, and we expect this dialogue will intensify in the future.

The Administration will continue working with the Congress, the U.S. private sector, the countries of Africa, and our trading partners, to implement policies that promote reforms and result in increased trade, investment, and development in Africa.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Jesse Helms, chairman, and Joseph R. Biden, Jr., ranking member, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Bill

Archer, chairman, and Charles B. Rangel, ranking member, House Committee on Ways and Means; William Roth, chairman, and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, ranking member, Senate Committee on Finance; Benjamin A. Gilman, chairman, and Lee H. Hamilton, ranking member, House Committee on International Relations.

Statement on Assistance for the Homeless
December 24, 1997

Today—on the eve of Christmas and the first day of Hanukkah—it is important for all Americans to come together as one community and remember those who are less fortunate, particularly our fellow citizens without the warmth and security of a home. I applaud the many Americans who dedicate their lives—and the hundreds and thousands of volunteers who work tirelessly—to help provide shelter, food, and dignity to homeless men, women, and children.

As long as there are children waking up in America on Christmas morning without the comfort of a warm home, we have more work to do. Religious and community organizations are doing their part to help alleviate homelessness. The Federal Government must do its share too.

That is why I have asked Secretary Cuomo to announce today that my next budget will provide an additional $327 million for homeless assistance—if enacted, one of the largest dollar increases ever. My new budget will request $1.15 billion to help move the homeless from the streets to self sufficiency—a 40-percent increase over this year. This amount includes 34,000 vouchers to help individuals and families who are[1] now homeless celebrate future holidays in a place they can call "home." These funds will help create safer places for our children to grow up, more stable families, and a stronger American community. I look forward to working with Congress to achieve this needed assistance for the homeless.

The President's Radio Address
December 27, 1997

Good morning. The holidays are a time when families come together to celebrate the season with love. And they remind us of our bonds of duty to care for one another. Today I'd like to talk to you about how we're expanding the shield of Medicare protection to honor our parents and grandparents in important new ways in the new year.

Looking back over 1997, it's clear that we achieved major reforms of the Medicare system that will help Americans live healthier, happier, longer lives. This year's bipartisan balanced budget agreement reaffirmed our commitment to preserving and strengthening Medicare. We extended the life of the Medicare Trust Fund until at least 2010. We made Medicare protection more affordable for low-income Americans. We modernized the Medicare system by expanding choice, opening up competition, and controlling costs. And we created a blue ribbon commission to examine ways to ensure that Medicare will serve baby boomers and our children as well as it has served our parents.

Now, as part of the balanced budget agreement, we're also implementing expanded Medicare benefits to provide greater protection to Americans in the fight against cancer. On New Year's Day, we'll introduce a series of changes in Medicare that will make screening, prevention, and detection of cancer more affordable and frequent. We're ringing in the new year

[1] White House correction.

resolved to take new steps in our battle against cancer, one of mankind's oldest foes.

First, we will guarantee the option of annual mammograms for every woman over 40 and, by waiving the deductible, we'll make annual breast cancer screenings more affordable. Right now, nearly half of older women do not get regular mammograms. By making mammograms more accessible and detecting cancer earlier, we can significantly increase the likelihood of successful treatment for this disease. Hillary has conducted a longstanding campaign to encourage older women to get these crucial tests, and these new changes will bring us closer to success in those efforts.

Second, we're expanding coverage for the early detection of cervical cancer. We have sophisticated tests to pick up early signs of cervical cancer, and from now on, Medicare will pay for regular access to this lifesaving technology.

And third, for the first time we'll now cover regular examinations for colon/rectal cancer. Most Americans don't receive this important preventive test, but when we catch this cancer early, we can beat it more than 90 percent of the time.

Nearly every American family has been touched by the shadow of cancer. My own mother passed away just about 4 years ago from cancer, and especially at this time of year, I miss her a lot. So many other families have the same story. That's why these actions are so important. By detecting cancer early on, we offer our loved ones one of the greatest gifts of all, the gifts of life, health, and many holidays to come.

Thanks for listening. Happy holidays, and have a happy and healthy New Year.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:16 p.m. on December 24 in the Map Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on December 27.

Statement on the Health Care Task Force Civil Case

December 29, 1997

While the Department of Justice is still reviewing whether to appeal Judge Lamberth's ruling, I am quite confident that Mr. Magaziner acted appropriately. Any suggestion to the contrary is unfair and unsupported by the facts and the findings of the U.S. Attorney's Office in its 1995 investigation of this matter.

The U.S. Attorney's Office concluded that "there is no basis to conclude that Mr. Magaziner committed a criminal offense in this matter. There is no significant evidence that his declaration was factually false, much less that it was willfully and intentionally so."

Mr. Magaziner is, and will remain, a valued member of my administration.

NOTE: In the statement, the President referred to U.S. District Judge Royce C. Lamberth.

Statement on Vandalism of the Islamic Star and Crescent Display on the Ellipse

December 29, 1997

I strongly condemn the vandalism of the Islamic star and crescent displayed on the Ellipse in front of the White House. This year for the first time, an Islamic symbol was displayed along with the national Christmas tree and the menorah. The desecration of that symbol is the embodiment of intolerance that strikes at the heart of what it means to be an American.

It is especially hurtful that such an act would occur at a time when so many communities are

coming together to celebrate their respective religions. The holiday season holds special meaning for us in America, where freedom of religion is one of the cornerstones of our democracy.

This administration will continue to fight against such acts of desecration and hate crimes that tear at the fabric of community life in America. Desecration of a religious symbol motivated by prejudice and hatred hurts us all.

Statement on the Presidential Legal Expense Trust

December 30, 1997

Hillary and I want to thank the thousands of people who contributed so generously to the Presidential Legal Expense Trust. We also want to thank Michael Cardozo, the executive director of the Trust, the cochairs, Father Theodore Hesburgh and Nicholas Katzenbach, and the other trustees, John Brademas, Ronald Olson, Elliot Richardson, Michael Sovern, John Whitehead, and Barbara Jordan, who served until her death in 1996. Hillary and I are immensely grateful for their assistance.

In light of the trustees' decision to dissolve the Trust, we have asked the Counsel's office to advise us concerning the ethical and legal requirements that would govern any future efforts to address both the substantial legal fees already accumulated and those that will be generated by the need for ongoing representation.

Message on the Observance of Ramadan

December 30, 1997

Warm greetings to everyone observing the holy month of Ramadan.

For millions of Muslims across our nation and around the world, Ramadan marks the time when God revealed the Holy Quran to the Prophet Muhammad. During this sacred month, the ninth in the Islamic lunar calendar, devout Muslims concentrate on their faith, study the Quran, and discipline themselves through fasting between dawn and dusk. They seek to answer Islam's call to a life of piety, justice, and peace and to draw closer to God and to one another through many hours spent in prayer and contemplation.

Ramadan is a powerful reminder to all of us that the true riches of life are found, not in material goods, but rather in the gifts of the spirit: the ever-present guidance and bountiful mercy of God, the love of family and friends, and the freedom to worship according to one's own conscience and convictions.

As the crescent moon once again heralds the coming of this season of faith and spiritual renewal, Hillary and I extend best wishes for a memorable observance.

BILL CLINTON

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 31.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting a Certification Required by the Ratification Resolution of the Chemical Weapons Convention

December 31, 1997

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Chairman:)

In accordance with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 24, 1997, I hereby certify that:

In connection with Condition (9), Protection of Advanced Biotechnology, the legitimate commercial activities and interests of chemical, biotechnology, and pharmaceutical firms in the United States are not being significantly harmed by the limitations of the Convention on access to, and production of, those chemicals and toxins listed in Schedule 1 of the Annex on Chemicals.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Jesse Helms, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Subject Index

Abortion. *See* Health and medical care
Acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS). *See* Health and medical care
Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997—1612
Advancement of Colored People, National Association for the (NAACP)—966
Advisory. *See* other part of subject
Aeronautics and Space Administration, National—1455
Aerospace industry—965, 987, 993, 1445
Affirmative action. *See* Civil rights; Education
Afghanistan, illicit drug production and transit—1529
AFL-CIO. *See* Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, American Federation of
Africa
  See also specific country
  President Clinton's future visit—1050
  Relations with France—907
  Relations with U.S.—907, 1095
  U.S. Special Envoy for promotion of democracy—1837
  U.S. Special Envoy to Great Lakes region—1842
  U.S. trade and development policy, report—1824
African-Americans
  See also specific subject
  Economic opportunities—970
  Education—970, 975, 978, 979, 1240
  Employment—1043
  Politics—980
  Slavery and reparation issues—1050
African/African-American Summit, Fourth—1831
Agriculture, Department of
  Chief Financial Officer—1832
  Civil rights improvement efforts—1843
  Secretary—1158, 1179, 1284-1286, 1592
  Under Secretaries—1830
Agriculture, family farmers—1843
Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998—1604, 1624
AIDS. *See* Health and medical care
AIDS Policy, Office of National. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Air Force, Department of the
  Chief of Staff—1021, 1032
  50th anniversary—1190
  Secretary—1839
  Under Secretary—1835
Alabama, storms, flooding, and high winds—1831
Albania, emigration policies and trade status—1727
Algeria, U.S. Ambassador—1837
Ambassadors. *See* specific country or region
American Heritage Rivers initiative—1153
American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, Institute of—1840
American Legion—914
American University—1136
America's Heritage Abroad, Commission for the Preservation of—1840
AmeriCorps—1001, 1007, 1107, 1669
Amtrak (National Railroad Passenger Corporation)—1691, 1833
Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997—1691
Andean Trade Preference Act—1718
Angola
  Economic sanctions—1765
  National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA)—1231, 1232, 1765
  U.S. national emergency—1231, 1232, 1765
Antigua and Barbuda
  Extradition treaty with U.S.—1029
  Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S.—1127
APEC. *See* Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum
Archives and Records Administration, National—1105, 1504, 1505
Arctic Research Plan, U.S.—1025
Argentina
  Ambassador to U.S.—1834
  Extradition treaty with U.S.—1030
  Freedom of the press—1394
  Major non-NATO ally status—1385
  1994 attack at Israeli-Argentine Mutual Association in Buenos Aires—1394
  President—1376, 1388, 1389, 1393, 1399, 1838, 1843
  President Clinton's visit—1376, 1378, 1388, 1389, 1391, 1399, 1838
  Relations with U.S.—1395
  Trade with U.S.—1389, 1391
Arkansas
  Democratic Party events—1256, 1760
  Little Rock Central High School—1233, 1239
  President's visits—981, 1233, 1237, 1239, 1253, 1256, 1259, 1836
Arkansas Millennium Ball—1840
Armed Forces, U.S.
  See also specific military department; Defense and national security
  Anthrax vaccinations—1787
  Base closures and conversions—1577
  Deployment to stabilize former Yugoslavia—1811
  Military air crashes—934, 1182
  Women in the military—1779
Armenia, Nagorno-Karabakh region, U.S. Special Negotiator—1834
Arms and munitions
  See also Defense and national security; Law enforcement and crime; Nuclear weapons

Arms and munitions—Continued
Arms control negotiations and agreements—1209, 1503, 1545, 1560, 1640, 1812, 1828
Chemical and biological weapons—1503, 1543, 1812, 1828
Export controls—1111, 1426, 1561
Firearms industry, handgun child safety efforts—1331
Landmines—1172, 1183, 1185, 1648, 1649
Organization of American States arms trafficking convention—1560
Trade in military articles and services—1169, 1386, 1426
Army, Department of the
Assistant Secretary—1838
Under Secretary—1833
Arts and Humanities Month, National—1266
Arts and the Humanities, National Foundation on the
Arts, National Endowment for the—943, 1107, 1477, 1844
Humanities, National Endowment for the—1107, 1262, 1477, 1835, 1839
Arts and the Humanities, President's Committee on—1107
Arts, National Council on the—1838
Arts, National Medal of—1261, 1269, 1836
Aruba, illicit drug production and transit—1529
Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum—1632, 1657, 1661, 1840, 1842
Asia-Pacific region
See also specific country
Economic crisis—1632, 1650, 1653, 1721, 1774
Infrastructure development—1661
South Pacific Regional Environment Programme agreement—1512
Trade with U.S.—1651, 1653
Asia Society—1424
Assassination investigations—946, 948
Assessment Governing Board, National—1630
Atlantic Tunas, International Commission for the Conservation of—1839
Australia, mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S.—1192
Austria, U.S. Ambassador—1834
Automobile industry—1299, 1411, 1837
Aviation. *See* Aerospace industry
Azerbaijan
President—1038, 1829, 1832
Relations with U.S.—1038
U.S. Ambassador—1834

Bahamas, illicit drug production and transit—1529
Bahrain, U.S. Ambassador—1834
Balanced Budget Act of 1997—1051, 1053, 1082, 1086
Banking—1759
Barbados
Extradition treaty with U.S.—1035
Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S.—1128
Belize
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
U.S. Ambassador—1832
Beretta—1331
Black Entertainment Television—1047
Black Journalists, National Association of—973, 1829
Black Leadership Forum—1832
Board. *See* other part of subject
Boeing—965, 987, 993, 1445
Bolivia
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
U.S. Ambassador—1830
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Helicopter tragedy—1192
National Government Tripartite Presidency
Presidency Chairman—1814, 1844
Presidency Members—1814, 1844
NATO peacekeeping role—1775, 1794, 1811, 1818
Peace efforts—1780, 1793, 1796, 1815
President Clinton's visit—1766, 1775, 1814, 1817, 1844
Serb Republic (Republika Srpska) President—1844
U.S. Ambassador—1830
U.S. military role—954, 964, 1539, 1766, 1775, 1793-1797, 1811, 1812, 1817
War crimes—912, 921, 929, 942, 949, 960, 965, 1789, 1795, 1796
Boy Scouts of America—1027
Boys Nation—1001, 1831
Brazil
Education agreement with U.S.—1356, 1365
Energy agreement with U.S.—1356
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
Minister of Extraordinary Sports—1372
Peaceful nuclear cooperation agreement with U.S.—1459
President—1352, 1354, 1365, 1368, 1370, 1838, 1843
President Clinton's visit—1347, 1352, 1354, 1365, 1367, 1372, 1838
Relations with U.S.—1347, 1349, 1353, 1360
Trade with U.S.—1360
United Nations Security Council, role—1363
Broadcasting Board of Governors—1832, 1838
Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes—1833
Budget, Federal
Balanced budget agreement—1024, 1030, 1037, 1039, 1043, 1047, 1051, 1053, 1064, 1250
Continuing resolutions for fiscal year 1998—1278, 1419
Fiscal year 1998—951, 958, 986, 988, 1014, 1278, 1419
Fiscal year 1999—1286
Homeless assistance—1825
Line item veto—1042, 1063, 1067, 1082, 1084, 1086, 1301, 1303, 1364, 1366, 1367, 1377, 1378, 1396, 1479, 1557, 1623, 1624, 1692
Burma
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
U.S. national emergency—1729
Business and industry
Defense conversion—1577
Electronic commerce—897
Pollution prevention and reduction—1295, 1299
Quality achievement and improvement—1799
Small business—1056

Business and industry—Continued
Welfare-to-work programs—1593, 1606, 1610

California
Affirmative action proposition—1049
President's visits—1008, 1194, 1198, 1200, 1204, 1577, 1578, 1580, 1585, 1588, 1835, 1841
San Carlos Charter Learning Center—1194
Cambodia
Co-Prime Ministers—950
Danger to U.S. citizens, U.S. policy—950
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
Campaign financing. *See* Elections
Canada
Pacific salmon dispute with U.S.—1647
President Clinton's visit—1646, 1652, 1653, 1655, 1657, 1661, 1842
Prime Minister—948, 1646, 1842
Tax protocol with U.S.—1218
U.S. Ambassador—1655, 1829
Cancer Panel, President's—1843
Capital Budgeting, Commission to Study—1840
Caribbean region
See also specific country
Drug control cooperation with U.S.—1748
Extradition treaties with U.S.—1029
Legal assistance treaties with U.S.—1127
Census, Bureau of the. *See* Commerce, Department of
Central America. *See* specific country; Latin America
Central Intelligence Agency—1169, 1831, 1837, 1839
Cessna—1592
Chemical and biological weapons. *See* Arms and munitions
Child Care, White House Conference on—992
Children and youth
See also specific subject
Adoption—1556, 1612
Child care—992, 1268, 1413, 1469, 1473
Child support—1288
Crime and violence, juvenile—983, 1652, 1688, 1723
Drug abuse, juvenile—1341, 1379, 1813
Early childhood development and learning—1468
Gun control—983
Handguns, child safety locks—1105, 1331
Immunizations initiative—990
Internet, family friendly controls—960
Medications, safe use to treat children—1098
Tobacco products, juvenile use—939, 1081, 1157, 1179-1181
Chile
President—1842
U.S. arms sales—1386
China
Environmental initiative with U.S.—1446, 1453
Fisheries agreement with U.S.—963
Foreign Minister—1653
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
Chief Executive—1835
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
Human rights—1428, 1446-1448

China—Continued
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
Peaceful nuclear cooperation with U.S.—1445, 1448, 1450, 1453
President—1141, 1424, 1444, 1445, 1452, 1456, 1466, 1520, 1524, 1526, 1652, 1840
Relations with Russia— 1451
Relations with Taiwan—1445, 1449, 1789
Relations with U.S.—1424, 1444, 1445, 1451, 1452, 1466, 1520, 1785
Tiananmen Square—1448
Tibet—1451
Trade with U.S.—1445
China Education Foundation, U.S.- —1424
Christmas—1718, 1764, 1819
Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation—1831
Cities
Community development—1342, 1500, 1735
Empowerment zones—1500, 1735
Citizens Medal, Presidential—1746
Civil rights
Affirmative action—977, 978, 1049, 1329, 1518, 1680, 1699, 1721, 1780, 1786, 1802
Discrimination—1518, 1522, 1680
Employment non-discrimination legislation—1517
Genetic screening, discrimination based on—956, 1404
Housing discrimination—1272
Little Rock Nine—1233, 1239, 1259
Race relations—972, 1048, 1141, 1161, 1233, 1239, 1616, 1681, 1682, 1777, 1802
Racial diversity—974, 1020, 1042, 1094, 1141, 1225, 1246, 1273, 1292, 1325, 1329, 1431, 1605, 1617, 1697
Religious exercise and expression in the Federal workplace, guidelines—1102, 1104
Sexual orientation, discrimination based on—1517, 1522
Climate change, global. *See* Environment
Coast Guard, U.S. *See* Transportation, Department of
Colombia
Drug control cooperation with U.S.—1379
Illicit drug production and transit—1096, 1373, 1397, 1529
Narcotics traffickers, U.S. national emergency—1096, 1373, 1397
Colorado
Governor—1413, 1475, 1633, 1637
President's visit—1631, 1633, 1637, 1842
Storms, heavy rain, flooding, mudslides, landslides, and ground saturation—1832
Combined Federal Campaign—1021
Commerce, Department of
Assistant Secretaries—1833
Census, Bureau of the—1267, 1284
Export Administration, Bureau of—1833
Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National—1279
Secretary—897, 900, 901, 1461, 1462, 1465
Standards and Technology, National Institute of—1834

Commerce, Department of—Continued
Under Secretaries—1834, 1841
Weather Service, National—1279
Commerce, international
Boeing-McDonnell Douglas merger—987, 993
Electronic commerce—895, 898, 901
Export controls—1100, 1812
Exports, U.S.—1115, 1149, 1164, 1173, 1324, 1350
Fast-track trade authority—995, 1148, 1171, 1173, 1223, 1244, 1250, 1283, 1321, 1346, 1350, 1369, 1383, 1435, 1459, 1462, 1465, 1476, 1493, 1495, 1497, 1499, 1502, 1505, 1507-1511, 1514, 1521, 1530, 1531, 1648, 1837
Food safety initiative—1283, 1285
Free and fair trade—895, 1239, 1344, 1346, 1356, 1358, 1359, 1381, 1391, 1476, 1495, 1499
Global integration—1206, 1381
Intellectual property, treaties—1022
Most-favored-nation trade status—985, 1727
North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)—942, 1350, 1383
Trade expansion, U.S.—1495, 1499, 1503
Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, Departments of—1666, 1692
Commission. *See* other part of subject
Committee. *See* other part of subject
Commodity Credit Corporation—1831
Commodity Futures Trading Commission—1836
Communications
Computer medical records, privacy guidelines—1166
Electronic commerce, global trade—895, 898, 901, 1380
Internet
Expansion—895, 902, 1380
Family friendly controls—960
Juvenile drug abuse, media campaign—1341
Telecommunications services payments to Cuba—1152
Television rating system—938
World Radiocommunications Conference—1839
Communications Commission, Federal—1065, 1159, 1196, 1832, 1835
Community Development Financial Institutions Fund—1735, 1737
Community Reinvestment Act—1342
Comoros, Ambassador to the U.S.—1841
Computers. *See* Communications; Education
Computing and Communications, Information Technology, and the Next Generation Internet, Advisory Committee on High Performance—1840
Conference. *See* other part of subject
Congo, Democratic Republic of the, U.S. Ambassador—1842
Congress
Black Caucus—1160
Hispanic Caucus—1175
House minority leader—959
Members, meetings with President—1155, 1719, 1832, 1836, 1837, 1840, 1841, 1843
Congress—Continued
NATO expansion, ratification role—917
Senate majority leader—959
Senate minority leader—959
Speaker of the House of Representatives—959, 1476, 1530
Women's Issues, Congressional Caucus for—1403
Congressional Medal of Honor Society—1237
Congressional Space Medal of Honor—1792
Conservation
See also Environment
American Heritage Rivers initiative—1153
Energy conservation and conversion—1358
Forest preservation—1566
Wilderness and wildlife preservation—1109, 1168, 1332, 1578
"Consumer Bill of Rights and Responsibilities"—1618, 1621
Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry, Advisory Commission on—1618, 1621
Costa Rica, U.S. Ambassador—1833
Council. *See* other part of subject
Credit Union Administration, National—1832
Croatia, U.S. Ambassador—1839
Cuba
Democracy and human rights—962
President—1520
Relations with U.S.—1520
Telecommunications services with U.S.—1152
Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996—962, 963
Customs Service, U.S. *See* Treasury, Department of the
Cyprus
Conflict resolution—925, 1512
Extradition treaty with U.S.—1021
U.S. Special Coordinator—1837
U.S. Special Emissary—925
Czech Republic, NATO expansion—904, 1773

Defense and national security
Counterterrorism efforts—1322
Export controls, U.S. national emergency—1100, 1812
Information infrastructure, protection against strategic attack—1022
Pollard espionage case—1306
Stand-Clark-Squillacote espionage case—1306
Terrorists threatening Middle East peace efforts, U.S. national emergency—1059
Weapons of mass destruction, U.S. national emergency—1542
Defense Appropriations Act, 1998, Department of—1322, 1366, 1367
Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, National—1611
Defense, Department of
Deputy Secretary—1830
Drug interdiction efforts—1748
Force Health Protection Program—1515
Funding—1322
Joint Chiefs of Staff—964-966, 1274, 1276

Defense, Department of—Continued
Secretary—912, 923, 964, 1211, 1577, 1621, 1748, 1835
Strategic Command—1211
Under Secretaries—1832, 1839
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board—1832
Democratic Business Council—1072, 1089, 1143, 1606, 1708
Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee—989, 1008, 1469, 1738
Democratic Governors' Association—1546
Democratic Leadership Council—1433
Democratic Mayors, National Conference of—1092
Democratic National Committee—1077, 1147, 1198, 1204, 1226, 1248, 1319, 1326, 1334, 1465, 1473, 1475, 1477, 1480, 1548, 1572, 1580, 1588, 1610, 1633, 1637, 1684, 1741, 1752, 1756, 1760, 1837
Democratic Party
See also specific State
Elections—1783
Finances—1783
Fundraising—1489, 1496, 1640, 1644
Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee—1405, 1598, 1686
Denmark
President Clinton's visit—951-954, 1829, 1830
Prime Minister—952, 953, 1829
Queen—952, 1829
Relations with U.S.—952, 954
Department. *See* other part of subject
Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal—1841
Development, Agency for International. *See* Development Cooperation Agency, U.S. International
Development Cooperation Agency, U.S. International
Development, Agency for International (AID)—1835, 1837, 1838
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)—1833, 1837
Digital Television Broadcasters, Advisory Committee on Public Interest Obligations of—1839, 1842
Diplomacy, U.S. Advisory Commission on Public—1832
Disability, National Council on—1831
Disarmament, Conference on—1838
Disaster assistance
Alabama storms, flooding, and high winds—1831
Colorado storms, heavy rain, flooding, mudslides, landslides, and ground saturation—1832
Guam torrential rains, high winds, high surf, and tidal surges—1843
Idaho storms, flooding, and mudslides—1831
Illinois thunderstorms and flash flooding—1835
Iowa winter storm—1842
Michigan storms, tornadoes, and flooding—1830
Minnesota storms, high winds, tornadoes, and flooding—1833
Montana storms, ice jams, snowmelt, flooding, and soil saturation—1831
Nebraska snowstorms, rain, and strong winds—1840
New Jersey storms and flooding—1836
Northern Mariana Islands
Disaster assistance—Continued
Super Typhoon Keith—1843
Typhoon Paka, rains, high winds, high surf, and tidal surges—1844
Texas thunderstorms and flooding—1829
Vermont rainfall, high winds, and flooding—1831
Washington snowmelt and flooding—1831
Wisconsin thunderstorms and flooding—1829
Discrimination. *See* Civil rights
District of Columbia
Appropriations legislation—1614
Budget—943
Rescue plan—1068
Revitalization efforts—1056, 1614, 1725, 1784
Djibouti, U.S. Ambassador—1834
Dolphin Conservation Program Act, International—1109
Dominica
Extradition treaty with U.S.—1029
Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S.—1127
Dominican Republic, illicit drug production and transit—1529
Drug abuse and trafficking
See also Law enforcement and crime
Drug control strategy, national—1748
Illicit drug production and transit—1096, 1373, 1397, 1529
International cooperation to combat—1343, 1344, 1379
Juvenile drug abuse—1341, 1379, 1813
Prevention and treatment efforts—1341, 1379
Drug Control Policy, Office of National—988, 1747, 1832, 1838

Economic Advisers, Council of—1840
Economic Cooperation and Development, Organization for, U.S. Representative—1837
Economic Council, National—1475
Economy, international
See also Commerce, international
Asian economic crisis—1632, 1650, 1653, 1721, 1774
Global integration—1206
Economy, national
Goals—1287
Growth—959, 1066, 1115, 1149, 1221, 1267, 1286, 1477, 1509, 1514, 1723
Stock market—1523
Ecuador
Ambassador to U.S.—1834
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
Education
Affirmative action—1049, 1781, 1786, 1788
Arts and humanities programs—1254, 1477
Bilingual education—1387, 1743
Charter schools—969, 1194, 1398, 1467, 1513, 1554
College grants and loans—1513, 1554
Electronic information, access and literacy—970, 980, 1196, 1262, 1554
Foreign study programs—1384
Funding—1094, 1174, 1193, 1270, 1513
Goals—1109, 1398, 1435, 1440, 1464
Hispanic high school dropout rate—1176

Education—Continued
International cooperation—1356, 1365
Literacy campaign, national—1133, 1245, 1401
Low income area schools—1694
Low performing public schools—1442
Postsecondary education and job training—1242, 1245, 1414, 1424
Safe and drug-free schools programs and efforts—970, 979, 1260, 1723
School choice—1240, 1270, 1272
School construction and renovation—969
Standards, national—967, 976, 999, 1018, 1118, 1123, 1134, 1175, 1193, 1222, 1246, 1251, 1270, 1398, 1401, 1422, 1436, 1441, 1466, 1501, 1513, 1549, 1553, 1630, 1840
Teachers—968, 969, 976, 1272, 1420, 1424, 1554
Education, Department of
Assistant Secretary—1839
Deputy Secretary—1831
Secretary—966, 973, 997, 1102, 1104, 1110, 1133, 1174, 1196, 1401, 1420, 1442, 1536, 1723, 1835
Educational Excellence Partnership—902
Egypt
President—1841
Terrorist attack in Luxor—1595, 1841
U.S. Ambassador—1837
El Salvador, Ambassador to U.S.—1834
Election Commission, Federal—1027, 1065, 1159, 1833, 1841
Elections
Campaign finance reform—1027, 1065, 1071, 1140, 1145, 1159, 1229, 1238, 1243, 1251, 1268, 1269, 1289, 1304, 1307, 1309, 1382, 1459, 1524, 1776, 1782
Foreign. *See* specific country
Foreign involvement in U.S. elections, allegations—929, 931, 1348, 1524
Investigation of 1996 campaign financing—1214, 1285, 1302, 1308, 1347-1349, 1357, 1361, 1523, 1689, 1692
Soft money system—1027, 1065, 1305
Elementary School Principals, National Association of—997
Emergency Management Agency, Federal—1832, 1835, 1837
Employment and unemployment
Employment non-discrimination legislation—1517
Job training and education—1500, 1502
Empowerment zones. *See* Cities
Energy
Brazil-U.S. energy agreement—1356
Conservation and conversion—1358
Nuclear energy, peaceful cooperation agreements—1445, 1453, 1459, 1603
Renewable fuels—1031
Solar energy—1410
Venezuela-U.S. energy agreement—1343, 1344
Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998—1352, 1396
Energy, Department of
Assistant Secretaries—1830, 1832
Chief Financial Officer—1832
Energy, Department of—Continued
Energy Regulatory Commission, Federal—1839
General Counsel—1831
Nuclear weapons laboratories—1211
Secretary—1211, 1343, 1408, 1411
Under Secretary—1832
Entertainment industry—938
Environment
See also Conservation
Environmental negotiations and agreements—1512
Global climate change—993, 1041, 1139, 1145, 1279, 1294, 1296, 1356, 1399, 1409-1412, 1426, 1654, 1675, 1676, 1719, 1745-1747, 1835, 1843
International cooperation—1280, 1356, 1359, 1364, 1446, 1453, 1512
Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change—1745-1747, 1843
Lake Tahoe region—1002, 1005, 1007
Pollution prevention and reduction—1295, 1364, 1409-1412
Water quality—1578
Environmental Protection Agency—1408, 1578, 1834, 1840
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—1832, 1843
Eritrea, Ambassador to U.S.—1834
Espionage. *See* Defense and national security
ESPN—1842
Estonia, President—1842
Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council—928, 1830
Europe
See also specific country
NATO expansion—904, 910, 913, 917, 919, 922, 954
Trade with U.S.—965
Europe, Organization for Security and Cooperation in—1834, 1839
European Union—993, 1718, 1843

Fast-track trade authority. *See* Commerce, international
Federal. *See* other part of subject
Florida
Democratic Party event—1750
Governor—1474, 1750
Lighthouse Elementary School in Jupiter—1464
President's visits—1461, 1464, 1465, 1469, 1473, 1475, 1477, 1480, 1747, 1750, 1752, 1756, 1840, 1843
Food and Drug Administration. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997—1624, 1626
Foreign Assets Control, Office of. *See* Treasury, Department of the
Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998—1665
Foreign policy, human rights—989, 1732
France
Extradition treaty with U.S.—938
NATO expansion—907
President—907, 1829, 1841

France—Continued
Relations with Africa—907
Relations with U.S.—905, 907
U.S. Ambassador—1831
Freedom, Presidential Medal of—1276
Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board, J. William—1830

Gambia, Ambassador to U.S.—1834
General Services Administration—901, 1190, 1838
Geographic Society, National—1408
George Bush Presidential Library—1504, 1505
Georgetown University Medical Center—1079
Georgia, Republic of
President—983, 1829, 1831
Relations with U.S.—983
Germany
Chancellor—905, 1843
President—1831
Relations with U.S.—905
Ghana, Ambassador to the U.S.—1841
Girls Nation—1020, 1831
Glock—1331
Government agencies and employees
Community service programs—1002
Electronic commerce—899
Federal advisory committees—1190
Food safety, efforts—1283, 1285
HIV prevention and education—1678
Pay—1117
Religious exercise and expression in the workplace—1102, 1104
Smoking ban at Federal facilities—1082
Solar roof initiative for Federal buildings—1410
Governors' Association, National—1013
Great Lakes Fisheries Commission—1842
Greece
Relations with Turkey—1790
U.S. Ambassador—1833
Grenada
Extradition treaty with U.S.—1029
Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S.—1127
Guam
Governor—1061
South Korean airplane crash—1061
Typhoon Paka, torrential rains, high winds, high surf, and tidal surges—1843
Guatemala, illicit drug production and transit—1529
Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses, Presidential Advisory Committee on—1515
Guyana
President—1789
U.S. Ambassador—1829

H & R 1871—1331
Haiti
Deferred enforced departure for Haitians in U.S.—1823
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
Immigration—1565, 1823
U.S. Ambassador—1837
U.S. military role—1722
Hanukkah—1797, 1822
Hate crimes. *See* Law enforcement and crime
Health and Human Services, Department of
AIDS Policy, Office of National—1678
Assistant Secretaries—1156, 1832, 1834
Deputy Secretary—1283
Food and Drug Administration—929, 1098, 1179, 1283
Indian Health Service—1080
Juvenile drug abuse, report—1813
Medicare and Medicaid—987, 1066, 1165, 1525, 1526, 1689, 1759, 1825
Secretary—956, 990, 991, 1080, 1098, 1158, 1179, 1283, 1285, 1286, 1618, 1621, 1835
Surgeon General—1156, 1159
Women's Health Office—956
Health and medical care
Abortion—1340
Acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS)—1489, 1678
Cancer prevention and treatment—1826
Computer records, privacy guidelines—1166
Diabetes research—1079
Health care fraud and abuse—1166, 1759
Insurance—957, 959, 1164, 1267, 1404
International programs—1384, 1530
Mammography guidelines—1430
Medications to treat children—1098
Nursing homes—1070
Post-mastectomy hospital stays—1405
Quality and consumer protection—1164, 1430, 1618, 1621
Smoking-related diseases—1082
Women's health—1404
Health Care Task Force, civil case—1826
Heckler and Koch—1331
Highway Administration, Federal. *See* Transportation, Department of
Historic Preservation, Advisory Council on—1831, 1838
Holocaust-era assets, investigation—987
Holocaust Memorial Council, U.S.—1831, 1842
Holy See, U.S. Ambassador—1404, 1835
Home Mortgage Corporation, Federal—1832
Homosexuals, discrimination based on sexual orientation. *See* Civil rights
Hong Kong. *See* China
HOPE scholarships. *See* Taxation, tuition tax credit
Housing
Homeless assistance—1825
Low income housing—1736
Housing and Urban Development, Department of
Assistant Secretaries—1833, 1843
Chief Financial Officer—1832
General Counsel—1833
Hate crimes victims, assistance—1534
Homeless assistance—1825
Housing Enterprise Oversight, Office of Federal—1833
Fair housing promotion grants—1272
Innovative Home Program—1737
Partnership with Cessna—1593

Housing and Urban Development, Department of—Continued
Secretary—1272, 1592, 1736, 1738, 1825, 1838
Secretary, former—1759
Human rights. *See* specific country or region; Foreign policy; United Nations
Human Rights Campaign—1516
Humanities Medal, National—1261, 1269, 1836
Humanities, National Endowment for the. *See* Arts and the Humanities, National Foundation on the
Hungary
NATO expansion—904, 1773
U.S. Ambassador—1836

Iceland, President—1831
Idaho, storms, flooding, and mudslides—1831
Illinois
Democratic Party event—1706
President's visits—973, 1439, 1706, 1708, 1829
Thunderstorms and flash flooding—1835
Immigration and naturalization
Citizenship for legal immigrants—1385
Enforcement of legislation—1565, 1823
Immigration reform transition legislation—996, 1380, 1565
Permanent immigration status—1178
Refugee admissions—1036
Immigration and Naturalization Service. *See* Justice, Department of
Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, Illegal—996
Immigration Reform, Commission on—1277
Independence Day—903, 916
India
Extradition treaty with U.S.—1219
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
Prime Minister—1835
Relations with U.S.—1072, 1785
U.S. Ambassador—1836
Indian Gaming Commission, National. *See* Interior, Department of the
Indian Health Service. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Indians, American. *See* Native Americans
Indonesia, President—1842
Information Agency, U.S.—1424, 1832, 1838
Infrastructure
Asia-Pacific region, infrastructure development—1661
Information infrastructure, protection against strategic attack—1022
Infrastructure Protection, Advisory Committee to the President's Commission on Critical—1839
Infrastructure Protection, President's Commission on Critical—1830, 1833, 1835, 1839
Intelligence. *See* Central Intelligence Agency
Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998—1623
Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters—1126
Inter-American Foundation—1832, 1839
Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, Department of the—1565, 1623
Interior, Department of the
Assistant Secretaries—1835, 1838, 1841
Indian Gaming Commission, National—1832, 1834
Wildlife Refuge System, National—1332
Internal Revenue Service. *See* Treasury, Department of the
International. *See* other part of subject
Internet. *See* Communications
Investigation, Federal Bureau of. *See* Justice, Department of
Iowa, winter storm—1842
Iran
Economic sanctions—1113, 1468
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
President—1767, 1779
Relations with U.S.—1767, 1779
U.S. national emergency—1113, 1186, 1278, 1663
U.S. policy—1468, 1779
Iraq
Economic sanctions—1032, 1033, 1776
Human rights—936, 1035, 1217
Humanitarian assistance—936, 1034, 1217
Kurdistan Democratic Party—935, 1216, 1217
No-fly zones—934, 1216
Patriotic Union of Kurdistan—935, 1216
President—1215, 1494, 1508, 1510, 1519, 1557, 1564, 1673, 1722, 1776, 1789
Reparations to Kuwait—937, 1218, 1674
United Nations Security Council resolutions—934, 1033, 1034, 1215, 1494, 1542, 1553, 1670
United Nations weapons inspections—1494, 1501, 1502, 1504, 1507, 1508, 1510, 1519, 1531, 1542, 1553, 1557, 1564, 1592, 1615, 1629, 1632, 1647, 1652, 1670, 1776, 1841, 1842
U.S. military role—934, 1216, 1539, 1564
U.S. national emergency—1032, 1033
Weapons of mass destruction—935, 1494, 1508, 1510, 1519, 1670
Ireland
Ambassador to U.S.—1834
Prime Minister—906, 1766
Tax convention with U.S.—1231
U.S. Special Adviser for economic initiatives—1836
Ireland, Northern. *See* Northern Ireland
Islamic star and crescent, vandalism of Ellipse display—1826
Israel
See also Middle East
Hamas leader, assassination attempt—1302, 1306, 1307
Man of Peace Award—1627
President—1306, 1837
Prime Minister—1026, 1719, 1778, 1781, 1831
Terrorist attacks in Jerusalem—1026, 1038, 1129
U.S. Ambassador—1836
Italian-American Foundation, National—1430
Italy
Deputy Prime Minister—1430
U.S. Ambassador—1834

Jamaica
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
U.S. Ambassador—1837
Japan
Prime Minister—1653, 1745, 1746, 1843
Trade with U.S.—1395
U.S. Ambassador—1833
Jewish Federations, Council of—1604
Jordan
Ambassador to U.S.—1834
Crown Prince Hassan—1836
Judicial system—1253
Justice, Department of
Assistant Attorney General, Acting—1767
Attorney General—988, 1059, 1096, 1285, 1347-1349, 1357, 1533, 1537, 1689, 1690, 1692, 1723, 1767, 1823
Civil Rights Division—1495, 1518, 1534, 1605, 1721, 1728, 1744, 1767
Hate crimes, enforcement efforts—1533
Immigration and Naturalization Service—1277, 1823
Investigation, Federal Bureau of (FBI)—1287, 1303, 1534, 1689, 1690, 1782
Solicitor General—963, 1835

Kansas
Governor—1592
President's visit—1592, 1841
Kazakhstan
Emigration policies and trade status—1727
Peaceful nuclear cooperation agreement with U.S.—1603
President—1602, 1841
Relations with U.S.—1602
Kennedy Center. *See* Smithsonian Institution
Kentucky, death of students in Paducah—1688
Knight-Ridder Newspapers—1679
Korea, North, humanitarian assistance—1185
Korea, South
Economy—1651, 1677, 1774
President—1842
U.S. Ambassador—1835
Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization—1557
Korean Peninsula peace efforts—1630
Kurdistan Workers Party—936
Kuwait, U.S. Ambassador—1837
Kwanzaa—1820
Kyrgystan, emigration policies and trade status—1727

Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, American Federation of—1219
Labor Day—1116
Labor, Department of
Assistant Secretaries—1833, 1835, 1839
Labor Statistics, Bureau of—1835
Occupational Safety and Health Administration—1833
Partnership with Cessna—1593
Secretary—966, 973, 1112, 1113, 1502, 1592, 1618, 1621
Women's Bureau—1838
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, Departments of—1553, 1555
Labor issues
See also specific industry
Amtrak labor dispute—1833
United Parcel Service (UPS) labor dispute—1042, 1068, 1110, 1112, 1113
Labor Relations Authority, Federal—1130, 1832
Labor Relations Board, National—1840
Landmines. *See* Arms and munitions
Laos, illicit drug production and transit—1529
Latin America
See also specific country
Drug control cooperation with U.S.—1748
Free and fair trade—1356, 1359, 1369, 1381, 1390, 1391
Health care access—1384
Human rights—1382
Immigration—996, 1381, 1565
Relations with U.S.—1397
Technology access—1380
Trade with U.S.—1383
United Nations Security Council, role—1363
Latvia, President—1842
Law enforcement and crime
See also Drug abuse and trafficking
Capital punishment—1683
Child pornography—961
Cocaine sentencing guidelines—988, 1049
Community policing—1577
Crime prevention efforts—1415, 1576
Domestic violence—1382
Extradition treaties—926, 937, 938, 1021, 1029, 1030, 1035, 1036, 1219
Gun control—983, 1193, 1327, 1331, 1560, 1575, 1577
Hate crimes—1533, 1535, 1631, 1702, 1826
Indian country, enforcement programs—1116
Juvenile crime and violence—983, 1652, 1688
Legal assistance treaties and conventions—925, 926, 1126-1128, 1192
Organization of American States arms trafficking convention—1560
"Top Cop" awards—1330
Violent crime decline—984, 1287, 1576, 1652
Lebanon, Ambassador to U.S.—1834
Legal Expense Trust, Presidential—1827
Legal Services Corporation—1833
Liberia, Presidential inauguration, U.S. delegation—1832
Libraries and Information Science, National Commission on—1840
Line item veto. *See* Budget, Federal
Lithuania
Ambassador to U.S.—1841
President—1842
U.S. Ambassador—1829
Luxembourg
Extradition treaty with U.S.—926
Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S.—925

Luxembourg—Continued
U.S. Ambassador—1837

Malaysia, illicit drug production and transit—1529
Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards—1798
Maldives, U.S. Ambassador—1836
Mali, President—1841
Malta, U.S. Ambassador—1836
Man of Peace Award—1627
Management and Budget, Office of—1621
Maritime affairs
Pacific salmon, Canada-U.S. dispute—1647
Dolphin protection—1109
Fisheries agreement—963
Maryland
Four Seasons Elementary School in Gambrills—1133
President's visits—902, 1133, 1829, 1837, 1842
Massachusetts, President's visit—1112, 1119-1122, 1129, 1131, 1833, 1834
Master Lock Co.—1105
Mauritania, Ambassador to U.S.—1834
McDonnell Douglas—965, 987, 993
Medal. *See* other part of subject
Medicare and Medicaid. *See* Health and Human Services, Department of
Medicare, National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of—1719
"Meet the Press"—1519
Mental Retardation, President's Committee on—1838, 1844
Merit Systems Protection Board—1840
Merrill Lynch Credit Corp.—1799
Metropolitan Baptist Church, Newark, NJ—1310
Metropolitan Baptist Church, Washington, DC—1724
Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority—1840
Mexico
Ambassador to the U.S.—1841
Elections—920
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
Migratory birds and game mammals protocol with U.S.—1168
President—1386, 1557, 1560, 1562, 1577, 1839, 1841
U.S. Ambassador—988, 1070, 1141, 1157, 1158, 1168, 1788, 1831
Michigan, storms, tornadoes, and flooding—1830
Mickey Leland National Urban Air Toxic Research Center—1834
Microsoft Corp.—961, 1067
Middle East
See also specific country; Palestinian Authority
Peace efforts—1062, 1069, 1129, 1186, 1306, 1307, 1309, 1719, 1781, 1822, 1831, 1833, 1836, 1842, 1843
Terrorists threatening peace efforts, U.S. national emergency—1059
U.S. Special Coordinator—1038, 1063, 1831
Midwest Technology Corp.—1086
Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998—1277, 1301, 1303, 1557
Millennium program—1106, 1262, 1492
Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, Federal—1834
Minnesota, storms, high winds, tornadoes, and flooding—1833
Missouri
Democratic Party event—1596
President's visits—1086, 1089, 1596, 1598
Monetary Fund, International—1841, 1650, 1651, 1677, 1774
Mongolia
Emigration policies and trade status—985
U.S. Ambassador—1834
Montana, storms, ice jams, snowmelt, flooding, and soil saturation—1831
Montenegro (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia)
Economic sanctions—1714
U.S. national emergency—1714
Morocco, U.S. Ambassador—1834
Mortgage Association, Federal National—1830
Most-favored-nation trade status. *See* Commerce, international

NAACP. *See* Advancement of Colored People, National Association for the—966
NAFTA. *See* Commerce, international
Nagorno-Karabakh region. *See* Armenia
National. *See* other part of subject
Native Americans
Diabetes prevention—1080
Law enforcement programs—1116
Tribal governments—1567
NATO. *See* North Atlantic Treaty Organization
Navy, Department of the, Under Secretary—1835
Nebraska, snowstorms, rain, and strong winds—1840
Netherlands, Ambassador to the U.S.—1841
Netscape Communications—961
Nevada
Lake Tahoe region—1002, 1005, 1007
President's visits—1002, 1005, 1007, 1013, 1567, 1572, 1831
New Jersey
Democratic Party events—1315, 1484
President's visits—1310, 1315, 1319, 1484
Storms and flooding—1836
New York
Arrests in terrorist bombing plot—1038
Bronx Overall Economic Development Corp.—1737
Democratic Party events—1482, 1486
1996 TWA Flight 800 crash off Long Island—965
President's visits—1205, 1213, 1214, 1482, 1486, 1731, 1733, 1738, 1741, 1745, 1835
New York Times—1842
Nigeria
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
U.S. Ambassador—1836
North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). *See* Commerce, international
North Atlantic Council—922
North Atlantic Treaty Organization—904-911, 913, 917, 920, 922, 924, 927, 928, 930, 939, 941, 1126, 1773, 1829, 1830, 1834
North Carolina
Governor—1413, 1420

North Carolina—Continued
Helicopter crash at Fort Bragg—934
Northern Ireland
Cease-fire—985
Irish Republican Army (IRA)—985
Peace efforts—906, 956, 1766
Sinn Fein—985
Ulster Unionist Party—1837
Northern Mariana Islands
Super Typhoon Keith—1843
Typhoon Paka, rains, high winds, high surf, and tidal surges—1844
Norway, U.S. Ambassador—1838
Nuclear weapons
Arms control negotiations and agreements—1209, 1545, 1640, 1788
Nonproliferation—1425, 1692
Nuclear Weapons Council—1211
Test ban treaty—1209, 1545

O.F. Massberg & Sons—1331
OAS. *See* States, Organization of American
Occupational Safety and Health Administration. *See* Labor, Department of
Office. *See* other part of subject
Ohio, President's visit—1693, 1695, 1704
Oklahoma City National Memorial—1100, 1333
Oklahoma City National Memorial Act of 1997—1333
Oklahoma, 1995 Federal building bombing in Oklahoma City—1100, 1333, 1822
One America in the 21st Century: The President's Initiative on Race—972, 974, 1020, 1042, 1106, 1108, 1141, 1146, 1178, 1235, 1240, 1261, 1271, 1533, 1535, 1605, 1616, 1679, 1693, 1695, 1705, 1744, 1777, 1780, 1802, 1830, 1834, 1843
Organization. *See* other part of subject
Orthodox Christian Church, Ecumenical Patriarch—1835, 1839
OSCE. *See* Europe, Organization for Security and Cooperation in
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC). *See* Development Cooperation Agency, U.S. International

Pakistan
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
Prime Minister—1835
Relations with U.S.—1785
Palau, Ambassador to U.S.—1841
Palestinian Authority—1069, 1719, 1831
Panama, illicit drug production and transit—1529
Papua New Guinea, Governor General—1656
Paraguay, illicit drug production and transit—1529
Parcel Service, United (UPS)—1042, 1068, 1110, 1112, 1113
Partnership Council, National—1832, 1844
Partnership For Peace—1126
Peace Corps—1107
Pennsylvania, President's visits—966, 1219, 1226, 1323, 1326, 1829, 1837
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, Advisory Committee to the—1838
"Performance Today"—1491
Personnel Management, Office of—1837
Peru, illicit drug production and transit—1529
Philippines, President—1843
Poland
Extradition treaty with U.S.—937
Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S.—926
NATO expansion—904, 939, 941, 1773
President—939, 941, 1830
President Clinton's visit—939, 941, 1830
U.S. Ambassador—1834
Police Organizations, National Association of—1330
Portugal, U.S. Ambassador—1837
Postal Service, U.S.—1099, 1834
Presidential. *See* other part of subject
President's. *See* other part of subject
Prison Industries Board, Federal—1844
Professional Teaching Standards, National Board for—1420
Public Broadcasting, Corporation for—1833, 1841
Public Diplomacy, U.S. Advisory Commission on—1830, 1840
Public Radio, National—1491
Puerto Rico, statehood—1384

Race initiative. *See* One America in the 21st Century: The President's Initiative on Race
Race, President's Advisory Board on—966, 972, 975, 1048, 1162, 1271, 1693, 1777
Railroad industry, labor dispute—1833
Railroad Retirement Board—1843
Ramadan—1827
Red Cross, American—1835
Refugees. *See* specific country; Immigration and naturalization
Religious exercise and expression. *See* Civil rights
Religious leaders, meetings with President—1615, 1835, 1839
Research. *See* Science and technology
Reserve Officers Association—914
Reserve System, Federal—1097, 1830, 1841
Rhode Island, President's visit—1111
R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.—939
Rock the Vote—1585
Romania
NATO expansion—909, 946, 947
President—942, 944, 1830
President Clinton's visit—942, 944, 946, 947, 1830
U.S. Ambassador—1836
Rosh Hashana—1277
Russia
Chemical Weapons Convention, ratification—1503
Foreign Minister—1213
Mir space station—965
NATO expansion—906, 911, 931
President—1213, 1503, 1632, 1640, 1788, 1842
President Clinton's future visit—1788
Relations with China—1451

St. Kitts and Nevis, extradition treaty with U.S.—1029

St. Lucia
Extradition treaty with U.S.—1029
Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S.—1127
St. Vincent and the Grenadines, extradition treaty with U.S.—1029
Saudi Arabia, 1996 terrorist bombing of U.S. military complex—1785
Savings Are Vital to Everyone's Retirement Act of 1997—1622
Saxophone Club—1200, 1323
Schools. *See* specific State; Education
Science and technology
Genetic screening—956, 1404
Medical research—1099
Research and development, funding—1771
Science and Technology Policy, Office of—1834, 1836
Science Foundation, National—1107
Science, National Medal of—1770
Science, President's Committee on the National Medal of —1841
Scientists and Engineers, Presidential Early Career Awards for—1839
Secret Service, U.S. *See* Treasury, Department of the
Securities and Exchange Commission—1835
Security Council, National—1215
Security Telecommunications Advisory Committee, National—1834
Serbia (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia)
Economic sanctions—1714
U.S. national emergency—1714
Service Employees International Union—1162
SigArms—1331
Singapore
Prime Minister—1842
U.S. Ambassador—1837
Slovenia, Ambassador to the U.S.—1841
Small Business Administration—1737, 1838
Smith and Wesson—1105, 1331
Smithsonian Institution, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts—1725, 1843
Social Security—1066, 1526
Social Security Administration—1834
Social Security Advisory Board—1836
Solectron Corp.—1799
South Africa, Deputy President—1831
South Carolina, President's visit—1844
South Pacific Regional Environment Programme agreement—1512
Southeast Asian Nations, Association of—1842
Space program
International cooperation—1456
Mars Pathfinder—915, 947
Mir space station—965
Report—1455
Shuttle—1842
Spain
King—909, 1829, 1830
President Clinton's visit—917, 919, 922, 923, 927, 928, 1829, 1830
President of the Government (Prime Minister)—919, 921, 928, 1829
Relations with U.S.—906
Spain—Continued
U.S. Ambassador—924
Special Counsel, Office of—1841
Sports
Baseball—1432, 1829
Basketball—1119, 1120, 1432, 1838, 1842
Sri Lanka
Ambassador to the U.S.—1841
U.S. Ambassador—1836
Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act—1099
Stanford University—1835
STARBRIGHT World On-line Computer Network—1457
State, Department of
Ambassadors. *See* specific country or region
Assistant Secretaries—1731, 1834, 1836
Chief of Protocol—915, 1838
Deputy Assistant Secretary—1839
Religious freedom promotion, report—989
Secretary—904, 912, 923, 939, 1036, 1038, 1059, 1062, 1096, 1102, 1129, 1186, 1207, 1215, 1322, 1343, 1403, 1424, 1558, 1719, 1773, 1779, 1781, 1831, 1835, 1841, 1842
Special Adviser for economic initiatives for Ireland—1836
Special Envoy for promotion of democracy in Africa—1837
Special Envoy to Africa's Great Lakes region—1842
Special Negotiator for Nagorno-Karabakh—1834
Treaties and conventions, reports—925, 926, 937, 938, 1021, 1022, 1029, 1030, 1035, 1036, 1127-1129, 1168, 1192, 1209, 1219, 1231
Under Secretary—1216, 1675, 1745, 1746
U.S. Representative to Organization of American States—1833
States, Organization of American—1126, 1560, 1731, 1833
Sudan
Economic sanctions—1492
U.S. national emergency—1492
Surface Transportation Board—1833, 1840
Suriname, Ambassador to U.S.—1834
Sweden
Ambassador to U.S.—1834
U.S. Ambassador—1837
Switzerland, former U.S. Ambassador—1722, 1728
Syria, U.S. Ambassador—1842

Taiwan
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
Relations with China—1445, 1449, 1789
Tajikistan, emigration policies and trade status—1727
Tanzania, President—1843
Taurus Firearms—1331
Taxation
Bilateral tax conventions and agreements—1218, 1231
Capital gains—1056
Child credit—1055
Disadvantaged areas initiatives—1055
Flat tax—1522
Individual retirement account contributions—1055

Taxation—Continued
Low income housing investment credit—1736
Renewable fuels tax incentives—1031
Sales tax, national—1522
Small business tax cuts—1056
Tax cut legislation—1031
Tax cut proposals—952, 1064, 1720, 1778, 1787
Tax incentives to hire people off welfare—1056
Tax return information confidentiality—1058
Tax system reform—1778
Tobacco taxes—1057
Tuition tax credit and deduction—1055, 1110, 1245
Taxpayer Browsing Protection Act—1058
Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997—1051, 1054, 1082, 1086
Teachers, American Federation of—1220
Technology, National Medal of—1770
Telecommunication Union, International—1839
Telecommunications. *See* Communications
Television. *See* Communications; Entertainment industry
Terrorism. *See* specific State, country, or region; Defense and national security
Texas
President's visits—1242, 1248, 1504, 1505
San Jacinto Community College in Houston—1242
Thunderstorms and flooding—1829
Thailand, illicit drug production and transit—1529
Thanksgiving—1665, 1841, 1842
3M Dental Products Division—1799
TNT—1842
Tobacco
See also Children and youth, juvenile use of tobacco products
Industry—929, 939, 1072, 1082, 1158, 1172, 1179-1181, 1186
Taxes—1057
Togo, U.S. Ambassador—1834
Trade agreements. *See* specific country; Commerce, international
Trade Commission, Federal—993, 1841, 1843
Trade Policy and Negotiations, Advisory Committee for—1830, 1843
Trade Representative, Office of the U.S.—897, 900, 1424, 1510, 1829, 1831, 1838, 1843
Transportation
See also specific industry
Air crashes—934, 965, 1061, 1182
Mass transit and subsidized transportation—977, 1691
Welfare to work transportation—1017
Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, Department of—1438, 1479
Transportation, Department of
Associate Deputy Secretary—1839
Coast Guard, U.S.—966, 1747, 1748
Highway Administration, Federal—1837
Secretary—1747, 1831, 1838
Transportation Safety Board, National—1832, 1836
Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998—1339, 1377, 1378
Treasury, Department of the
Assistant Secretaries—1830, 1836, 1838
Treasury, Department of the—Continued
Customs Service, U.S.—1189, 1747, 1748
Foreign Assets Control, Office of—1059, 1097, 1188, 1232, 1374, 1716, 1730
Internal Revenue Service—1058, 1270, 1338, 1778, 1832
Secret Service, U.S.—1837
Secretary—897, 900, 901, 1059, 1096, 1415, 1575, 1577
Treaties and conventions. *See* specific country, region, or subject; State, Department of
Trinidad and Tobago
Extradition treaty with U.S.—1036
Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S.—1128
U.S. Ambassador—1834
Tropical Shipping Co.—1461
Tunisia
Ambassador to the U.S.—1841
U.S. Ambassador—1835
Turkey
Prime Minister—1840, 1844
Relations with Greece—1790
U.S. Ambassador—1834
Turkmenistan, emigration policies and trade status—1727
21st Century Production Agriculture, Commission on—1844

Ukraine
NATO expansion—927, 932
President—927, 933, 1830
U.S. Ambassador—1837
United Kingdom
Ambassador to the U.S.—1841
Northern Ireland. *See* Northern Ireland
Prime Minister—906, 1829, 1837, 1841
U.S. Ambassador—1831
United Nations
General Assembly—1205, 1214, 1835, 1837, 1838, 1843
Human Rights, Universal Declaration of—1731
Peace and security role—1206
Secretary-General—1214, 1841
Security Council—1207, 1363
U.S. participation, report—1130
U.S. Representatives—912, 1216, 1731, 1832, 1835, 1837, 1838, 1843
U.S. *See* other part of subject
Urban League, National—1042
Uruguay, U.S. Ambassador—1837
Uzbekistan
Emigration policies and trade status—1727
U.S. Ambassador—1833

Vatican. *See* Holy See
Venezuela
Counternarcotics assistance—1343, 1344
Energy agreement with U.S.—1343, 1344
Illicit drug production and transit—1529
President—1342-1345, 1393, 1838
President Clinton's visit—1342-1345, 1838
Relations with U.S.—1342, 1344

Vermont, rainfall, high winds, and flooding—1831
Veterans
  Benefits—1614
  Gulf war veterans' illnesses—1515
Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, Departments of—1437, 1479
Veterans Affairs, Department of
  Acting Secretary—1688
  Assistant Secretary—1840
  Deputy Secretary—913, 1688, 1836
  Force Health Protection Program—1515
  Inspector General—1834
  John D. Dingell Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center—923
  Secretary—1539, 1621, 1829
  Under Secretary—1837
Veterans' Compensation Rate Amendments of 1997—1614
Veterans Day—1539
Vice President
  Conference on the international agreement on greenhouse gas emissions—1675, 1676, 1745, 1746
  Electronic commerce strategy—901
  Investigation of 1996 campaign financing—1214, 1309, 1692
  Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change—1745, 1746
  STARBRIGHT World On-line Computer Network—1457
  White House Conference on Climate Change—1293, 1296, 1297
  Voluntarism—1833
Vietnam
  Illicit drug production and transit—1529
  U.S. Ambassador—1841
Virginia
  Democratic Party events—1289, 1489
  President's visits—997, 1027, 1169, 1190, 1289, 1489, 1539
Voluntarism—1001, 1107, 1415, 1833

Washington
  Democratic Party events—1640, 1644
  President's visit—1640, 1644
  Snowmelt and flooding—1831
Weapons of Mass Destruction, Commission To Assess the Organization of the Federal Government To Combat the Proliferation of—1843
Weather Service, National. *See* Commerce, Department of
Welfare system
  Job creation efforts—1015-1017, 1314, 1323, 1328, 1593, 1606, 1610
  Reform—916, 1015-1017, 1048, 1087, 1268, 1308
  Welfare to work transportation—1017
White House Conferences
  Child Care—992, 1268, 1413
  Climate Change—1281, 1293, 1296, 1837
  Hate Crimes—1522, 1533, 1535, 1841
White House Millennium Program Office—1106
White House Office
  Assistants to President
    Chief of Staff to Chief of Staff—995
    Communications team—1829
    Counselor to President—1829
    Management and Administration—1837
    National Security Adviser—1216, 1424, 1837
    Press Secretary—1168, 1348, 1526
    Scheduling, Director—1829
    Speechwriting, Director—1829
  Counselor to the President and Special Envoy to the Americas—1343
  Deputy Assistants to President
    Deputy Press Secretary for Operations—1838
    Speechwriting, Deputy Director—1829
    Women's Initiatives and Outreach—1403, 1833
  Senior Advisers to President—1826, 1836
  Special Advisers to President—1836, 1844
  Special Counselor to President for fast-track trade legislation—995
  Special Envoy of President to Africa's Great Lakes region—1842
Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, National—1332
Wisconsin, thunderstorms and flooding—1829
Women's Bureau. *See* Labor, Department of
Women's Leadership Forum—1567
World Intellectual Property Organization—1022
World Radiocommunications Conference—1839
World Trade Organization—897, 898, 900, 965

Xerox Business Services—1799

Yemen
  Ambassador to U.S.—1834
  U.S. Ambassador—1834
Yom Kippur—1334
Young Democrats Council—1323
Yugoslavia, former. *See* specific country

Zimbabwe
  African/African-American Summit, Fourth—1831
  U.S. Ambassador—1834

Name Index

Aaliyah—1764
Aaron, David L.—1834, 1850
Abbey, George—1242
Abraham, Katharine G.—1835, 1850
Adams, Ricky—1457
Adelman, Lynn S.—1849
Adeniji, Felicia—1401
Adeniji, Victoria—1401
Adler, Dan—1585
Adler, Jenna—1585
Aguilar-Melancon, Lorenzo H.—1844
Ahern, Bertie—906, 1766
Albright, Madeleine K.—904, 910, 912, 923, 934, 939, 989, 1038, 1062, 1102, 1129, 1130, 1146, 1148, 1186, 1207, 1214, 1215, 1274, 1322, 1343, 1367, 1372, 1403, 1424, 1452, 1558, 1656, 1719, 1773, 1779, 1781, 1814, 1817, 1831, 1835, 1841, 1842
Alencar, Marcellor—1372
Alexander, Jane—1262
Alexander, Lamar—1015
Alexanderson, Lauren—1457
Alfonsin, Raul—1388
Alhadeff, Ken—1644
Aliyev, Heydar—1038, 1039, 1829, 1832
Allen, Yvonne—997
Altman, Stuart—1720
Altshuler, David—1731
Alvarez, Aida—1088, 1175, 1405, 1734, 1735, 1737
Amado, Jorge—1353
Ambrose, Stephen E.—1537, 1538
Anderson, Daisy—1842
Anderson, Katherine Milner—1833, 1847
Angelides, Phil—1581
Angell, John C.—1830, 1846
Angelos, Peter—902
Angelou, Maya—1724
Annan, Kofi—1205, 1208, 1214, 1512, 1557, 1841
Anthony, Beryl, Jr.—1148
Anthony, Leta—1259
Apuzzo, Virginia M.—1516, 1684, 1837
Arafat, Yasser—1026, 1063, 1069, 1307, 1309, 1320, 1628, 1629, 1719, 1831
Archabal, Nina M.—1264, 1836
Archer, Bill—1052
Archer, Dennis W.—1093, 1094
Archuleta, Katherine L.—1840, 1854
Arcos Bergnes, Sebastian—1822
Ariyoshi, George R.—1843
Armey, Richard K.—1052, 1238
Arrieta, Erwin Jose—1343
Arroyo, Anna—1699
Ashby, Christopher C.—1837, 1853
Augustine, Norman R.—902
Ayeroff, Jeff—1585
Aziz, Tariq—1510, 1672
Aznar, Jose Maria—904, 919, 922, 928, 1829

Babbitt, Bruce—1007
Babbitt, Harriet C.—1837, 1853
Bacall, Lauren—1726
Bacon, Nick—1237
Badeau, Aaron—1612
Badeau, Sue Ann—1612
Bagley, Elizabeth F.—1548
Bagley, Smith—1548
Bailey, F. Kenneth—1248
Bailey, James H.—1837, 1853
Bailey, Jeff—1003
Baird, Brian—1640, 1644
Baker, Gerard—1538
Baker, James A., III—1502
Bakewell, Danny J.—1160
Baldacci, John Elias—1469, 1472
Baldrige, Letitia—1798
Baldrige, Nancy—1798
Baldrige, Robert—1798
Baliles, Gerry—1289, 1293
Ballard, Ernesta—1834, 1850
Banks, Samuel—1747
Baram, Amatzia—1821
Baram Belkin, Bonnie—1821
Baram, Mayrim—1821
Barnette, Curtis H.—1843
Barr, Bob—1501
Barram, David J.—1093, 1838
Barry, Donald J.—1841, 1855
Barry, Marion S., Jr.—1160, 1724
Barshefsky, Charlene—897, 1149, 1350, 1424, 1510, 1759
Barzani, Massoud—935, 1216, 1674
Bates, Daisy—972, 973, 1233, 1259
Baucus, Max—1148, 1424
Baxter, Robert L.—1839
Bayh, Birch—1686
Bayh, Evan—1686
Bayh, Susan—1687
Bayles, Phil—1003
Beach, Gary—1373
Beals, Melba Pattillo—1234, 1261
Beatty, D.J.—1698
Beatty, Robert H., Jr.—1834, 1850
Beaubaire, David—1079
Beaubaire, Joan—1079
Beccaccio, Livio—1192
Becerra, Xavier—1008, 1175, 1177, 1413
Bednarcyzk, Betty—1166

Beebe, Mike—1237
Begala, Paul—1569, 1829
Belasa, Jamilla DeAbril—1373
Belton, Sharon Sayles—1835
Ben-Elissar, Eliahu—1627
Benkin, Eric—1190
Bennett, Robert S.—1067
Bennett, William J.—1777
Benton, Charles—1839
Bentsen, Ken—1242, 1245
Bentsen, Lloyd—953
Berg, Sven—1101
Berger, Mitchell W.—1752, 1756
Berger, Samuel R.—912, 964, 1169, 1186, 1216, 1274, 1368, 1424, 1451, 1837
Berkeley, Shelly—1568, 1570
Berman, Jason S.—995
Bernardina, Charles R.—1440
Berners-Lee, Tim—896
Berry, David A.—1264, 1836
Berry, M. John—1516, 1835, 1851
Berry, Marion—1256, 1258
Beyer, Donald S., Jr.—1289, 1489
Beyer, Megan—1289
Bibby, Michael—1432
Biden, Joseph R., Jr.—924, 1817
Bienenstock, Arthur—1836, 1851
Bingaman, Jeff—1177, 1406, 1553
Bingler, John H., Jr.—1847
Binney, Laury—1122
Birch, Elizabeth—1516
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr.—1169
Blagojevich, Rod R.—1440
Blair, Tony—904, 906, 910, 1480, 1524, 1829, 1837, 1841
Blank, Rebecca M.—1840, 1855
Blazeusz, Piotr—939
Bliley, Tom—1624
Blitstein, Robert—1439
Blix, Hans—1671
Blocker, Ananias—1161
Blumenthal, Sidney—1829
Blumenthal, Susan J.—956, 1836
Blythe, Frank—1839
Bodak, Leonard—1226
Bodine, Barbara K.—1834, 1847
Boehner, John A.—1817
Boggs, Corinne Claiborne (Lindy)—1404, 1835, 1850
Bojazhiu, Agnes Gonxha (Mother Teresa)—1131, 1132, 1156
Bond, Christopher S.—1086, 1599
Bondurant, Amy L.—1837
Bonior, David E.—1052
Bonosaro, Carol—1832
Bonsignore, Michael—1299
Booker, Felicia—1089
Borrego, Espiridion A.—1833, 1847
Bosworth, Stephen W.—1835, 1850
Bourgeois, Jean-Louis—1262
Bourgeois, Louise—1262, 1836
Bowen, Loretta—1546
Bowles, Erskine B.—995, 1042, 1052, 1073
Bowser, Bob—1315
Boxer, Barbara—1004, 1007, 1009, 1579, 1580
Brack, Reginald K.—1043
Brademas, John—1106, 1827
Bradley, Jodee—1592, 1595
Brame, Joseph R., III—1840, 1854, 1856
Brandon, Charles (Chase)—1169
Brazauskas, Algirdas—1842
Braziel, Deborah—1461
Breathitt, Linda Key—1839, 1854
Brennan, Mary—1023
Brennan, William J., Jr.—994, 1023
Breuer, Lanny—1347
Breyer, Charles R.—1846
Brimmer, Andrew F.—1798
Brittain, Willard—1840
Britton, Megan—1747, 1749
Bronfman, Edgar—987
Brooks, Genevieve—1733
Brooks, William—1160
Brown, Alma—1042
Brown, Fannie—1702
Brown, Hank—1840, 1855
Brown, James—1161
Brown, Jesse—913, 1688
Brown, Sam W.—1839
Brown, Sherrod—1693, 1705
Brown, Terrence J.—1835, 1851
Brown, Willie—1198, 1200
Brownback, Sam—1592
Browner, Carol M.—1408, 1578
Bruns, Judson L., III—1655
Bryan, Bonnie—1572
Bryan, Richard H.—1007, 1009, 1406, 1567, 1569, 1570, 1572, 1574
Bryant, Anne—997
Bryant, John—1839
Bryant, Wayne R.—1315, 1484
Bucha, Paul—1237
Buckney, Cozette—1440
Bumpers, Betty—990, 991
Bumpers, Dale—990, 991, 1258, 1406
Buono, Barbara—1315, 1484
Burke, James E.—1341
Burke, Lloyd L. (Scooter)—1237
Burleigh, A. Peter—1837, 1852
Burns, Ken—1537
Burns, R. Nicholas—1833, 1849
Burr, Richard—1266
Bush, Barbara—1505, 1506
Bush, George—1160, 1482, 1504-1507, 1514, 1608, 1714
Bush, George W.—1505
Bush, Laura—1505
Butler, Mikey—1457
Butler, Richard—1501, 1502, 1531, 1632, 1647, 1653, 1671, 1776
Butterworth, Bob—1750

Butzer, Hans-Ekkehard—1101
Butzer, Torrey—1101
Buyer, Stephen E.—1817
Byers, Brook—1196, 1204
Byrne, Brendan—1315

Cabana, Robert D.—1399
Cabaniss, Dale—1832, 1847
Cabe, Gloria—1760
Cabeza, Jose Luis—1394
Caesar, Shirley—1764
Caldera, Alicia—1342
Caldera, Rafael—1342, 1343, 1345, 1347, 1393, 1838
Cammermyer, Greta—1640, 1644
Camp, Dave—1556, 1612
Campbell, Christina—1819
Campbell, David—1833
Campbell, Elizabeth—1537
Campbell, John M.—1849
Canady, Charles T.—1804
Canosa, Irma—1652
Canosa, Jorge—1652
Canosa, Jorge Mas—1652
Canosa, Jose—1652
Canosa, Juan—1652
Capps, Laura—1444, 1541, 1548
Capps, Lisa—1444
Capps, Lois—1266, 1444
Capps, Todd—1444
Capps, Walter H.—1266, 1444, 1541, 1548
Caputo, A. Richard—1846
Cardin, Benjamin L.—1102
Cardoso, Fernando Henrique—1347, 1350, 1352, 1354, 1365, 1368, 1370, 1373, 1838, 1843
Cardoso, Ruth—1352
Cardozo, Michael—1827
Carey, Paul R.—1835, 1850
Carlin, John W.—1105, 1107, 1108
Carliner, Kathy—1413
Carlino, August—1153
Carlson, Arne H.—1020
Carmichael, Joe—1089, 1596
Carnahan, Mel—1016, 1086, 1089
Carneal, Kelly—1723
Carneal, Michael—1723
Carney, Timothy M.—1837, 1852
Carper, Tom—1013, 1016
Carr, Bob—1148
Carroll, Phil—1247
Carter, Betty—1262, 1836
Carter, Deana—1764
Carter, Jimmy—1160, 1429, 1505, 1507, 1514, 1629
Carter, Rosalynn—1505
Carvalho, Francisco—1372
Carville, James—1569
Case, Steven—960
Casey, Richard Conway—1846
Cash, Kriner—1122
Casserley, Michael—997
Castillo, Eric—1401
Castle, Michael N.—1015
Castro, Fidel—1520
Castro, Ida L.—1838, 1853
Catuna, Anuta—944
Cayetano, Benjamin J.—1020
Ceballo, Carmen—1733
Celeste, Richard F.—1836, 1851
Cerf, Vinton G.—896
Cerr, John—1105
Chafee, John H.—1556, 1612
Chaffee, Martha—1792
Chaffee, Roger B.—1792
Chambers, McHughson—1695
Chancellor, Van—1119
Chao, Elaine—1807
Charles, Dale—966
Charren, Peggy—1839
Chase, Bob—997
Chatah, Mohamad B.—1834
Chavers, Kevin G.—1833
Chavez, Linda—1803
Chavez-Thompson, Linda—1178, 1219, 1226, 1272, 1693
Chernomyrdin, Viktor—1092, 1213, 1481
Chico, Gary—1440
Chiles, Lawton—1474, 1750, 1754
Chirac, Jacques—904, 907, 910, 1829, 1841
Cho, Alfred Y.—1841
Chretien, Jean—1646, 1842
Christian, William H., Jr.—1303
Christopher, Warren M.—936, 1198, 1217, 1627
Chung, Johnny—1524
Ciorbea, Victor—1095
Cisneros, Henry G.—1092, 1759
Clark, Bill—1760
Clark, James Michael—1302
Clark, Jamie R.—1845
Clark, Wesley K.—949, 1747, 1814, 1817
Clay, William—1087
Clay, William (Bill)—1087, 1413
Clayton, Eva M.—1160
Cleaver, Emanuel, II—1413
Clerides, Glafcos—1512
Clinton, Chelsea—895, 909, 1111, 1112, 1131, 1182, 1241, 1248, 1256, 1643, 1656, 1814, 1835
Clinton, Hillary Rodham—909, 932, 992, 1017, 1024, 1052, 1076, 1098, 1106, 1111, 1131, 1132, 1153, 1156, 1194, 1261, 1262, 1288, 1353, 1370, 1382, 1403, 1404, 1413, 1429, 1430, 1439, 1480, 1556, 1568, 1605, 1612, 1618, 1627, 1636, 1640, 1656, 1707-1709, 1731, 1732, 1741, 1761, 1775, 1814, 1826, 1829, 1830, 1835, 1836
Close, Glenn—1655, 1764
Clyburn, James E.—1160
Clyburn, William, Jr.—1833, 1847
Coats, Dan—1817
Cohen, Mary Ann—1851
Cohen, William S.—912, 923, 964, 1169, 1182, 1184, 1190, 1274, 1577, 1748, 1835
Collender, Stanley E.—1840

Collins, Francis S.—956
Collins, Judy—1486
Collins, Mac—1817
Collins, Maria Antonietta—1380
Colman, Jeffrey D.—1847
Combra, Richard—1125
Conde, Luiz—1372
Connelly, Elizabeth A.—1482
Connelly, John—1226
Connerly, Ward—1803
Conrad, Kent—1083
Constantinescu, Emil—942, 944-946, 1830
Contreras, Hiram Arthur—1847
Conyers, John, Jr.—1832
Cook, Rebecca (Bekki)—1087
Cook, Suzan Johnson—1272, 1273, 1693
Cooper, Cardell—1834, 1847
Cooper, Cynthia—1120
Cordero, Vanesa—1700
Cordovez, Diego—1512
Corona, Barry—1086, 1088
Corrales-Diaz, Susan—1148
Corrigan, Robert A.—1401, 1402
Covas, Mario—1367
Coyle, Maureen—1120
Cranmer, Bob—1226
Creel, Harold J., Jr.—1516
Creighton, Jack—1027
Crocker, Ryan C.—1842
Cropp, Linda W.—1724
Crump, Harold C.—1839
Cruz, Frank—1839
Cummings, Elijah E.—1817
Cuomo, Andrew M.—1092, 1272, 1592, 1679, 1734-1736, 1738, 1741, 1744, 1777, 1825, 1838
Curiel, Carolyn—1175, 1832, 1847

Dailey, Jim—1233, 1237
Dailey, Patti—1233
Dalai Lama—1428, 1451
Daley, Margaret—1439
Daley, Richard M.—973, 1439-1441, 1488, 1801
Daley, William M.—897, 960, 1367, 1372, 1461, 1462, 1465, 1707, 1709, 1770, 1798, 1799
Dalton, John H.—1027, 1136
Dalton, Margaret—1136
Damrell, Frank C., Jr.—1846
Danner, Pat—1457
Darsch, Nancy—1120
Darwish, Elise—1194
Daschle, Thomas A.—959, 1025, 1052, 1083, 1405, 1406, 1493
Davis, Danny K.—1708, 1709
Davis, Tim—1693, 1704
Dawida, Audrey—1226
Dawida, Mike—1226
Dawson, Robert T.—1855
Day, Joseph B.—1842
de la Rua, Fernando—1376, 1388
Dean, Howard—1546, 1547
Deavenport, Earnest—1798
DeBusk, F. Amanda—1833, 1847
Decherd, Robert—1839
DeConcini, Dennis—1832
DeGeneres, Ellen—1522
DeGette, Diana—1631, 1637
Del Sol, Joseph A.—1226
Delaney, Mary—1079
DeLauro, Rosa L.—1413
Dellinger, Walter E.—963
Dellums, Ronald V.—1596
Delos Reyes, Raymond—1535, 1536
Dempsey, Joan A.—1837, 1855
Denktash, Rauf—1512
Denlinger, William J.—1190
Denver, John—1352
DeSalvo, Keeley Ardman—1254, 1255
Deutch, John M.—1843
Deutsch, Peter—1461, 1464, 1469, 1472
DeVito, Danny—1430
Devroy, Ann—1419
Devroy, Mark—1419
Devroy, Sarah—1419
DeWine, Mike—1099
Dial, Joseph B.—1836, 1852
Diaz, Ruben, Jr.—1734
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln—1747
Dickerson, Michael—1432
Dickey, Jay—1254
Dicks, Norman D.—1640, 1642, 1644
Diller, Barry—1839
Dinerstein, Robert D.—1844
Dingell, John D.—923, 1624
Dinkins, David—1487
Dixon, Linda—1760
Djabir, Ahmed—1841
do Nascimento, Edson Arantes (Pele)—1353, 1372
Dobriansky, Paula J.—1832, 1847
Dodd, Christopher J.—1099, 1560
Dodd, Thomas J.—1833, 1847
Doerr, Ann—1204
Doerr, John—1204
Dolan, Charles—1840
Dolan, Michael P.—1338
Dolan, William D., III—1289, 1489, 1491
Dole, Bob—1393, 1482, 1497, 1524, 1525, 1570, 1587, 1634, 1794, 1814, 1817, 1819
Dole, Elizabeth—1814, 1817
Dollar, Dennis—1832
Domenici, Pete V.—1025, 1052, 1080
Donley, Kerry J.—1489
Donnelly, Shaun E.—1836, 1851
Donvan, John—1784
Doolittle, John T.—1004
Dorgan, Byron L.—1083
Doria, Joseph V., Jr.—1315
Dorman, David W.—1840
Dorn, Nancy—1832
Dos Santos, Elmo Jose—1372
Dreier, David—1368, 1369, 1424

Drljaca, Simo—949
Du Bois, David—1724
Duffey, Joseph D.—1106, 1136, 1424
Dugan, Joyce—1079
Duhamel, William—1839
Duke, David A.—896
Duma, Frank—1734
Duncan, Dayton—1537, 1538
Dunn, James M.—1617
DuPree, James O.—1843
Durbin, Richard J.—1089, 1706, 1708, 1709
Dutko, Dan—1198, 1581, 1752, 1756
Dybkjaer, Lone—954
Dylan, Bob—1726

Eakeley, Douglas S.—1833, 1848
Eaton, Robert J.—1843
Eberhart, Ralph—1190
Echaveste, Maria—966, 1162, 1175, 1177, 1219, 1549, 1734
Eckford, Elizabeth—1233, 1234, 1261
Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I—1412, 1835, 1839
Edley, Christopher—966, 1781, 1807
Edmonds, James Terry—966, 1161, 1829
Edwards, A.G.—1089
Ehlmann, Steve—1087
Eisenhower, Dwight David, II—1505
Eisenhower, Julie Nixon—1505
Eizenstat, Stuart—962, 1675, 1677, 1745, 1746
Ekeus, Rolf—935, 1834
Ellington, David—1196
Ellis, Larry R.—1817
Ellison, Larry—1196
Emanuel, Rahm I.—1052, 1707, 1709
Enda, Jodi—1679
Engel, Eliot L.—1738
Engler, John—1018
Ensign, John E.—1009
Erwin, Mark—1837, 1853
Escudero, Stanley T.—1834, 1851
Eshoo, Anna G.—1196
Etheridge, Bob—1401, 1420, 1423
Evans, Paul—984
Evers-Williams, Myrlie—966, 1160

Fairfax, Ken—1655
Faisun, Sonny—1665
Fassett, Thomas White Wolf—1617
Fazio, Vic—1004, 1005, 1008, 1009, 1052, 1148, 1494, 1530, 1579, 1580, 1596
Fedrigotti, Carlos—1389
Feingold, Russell D.—1027, 1062, 1140, 1160, 1243, 1289
Feinstein, Dianne—1004, 1005, 1009, 1575, 1579, 1580
Feldman, Richard—1330
Feldman, Sandra—997, 1220
Felsen, Annette—1319
Fennel, Arthur—973, 975
Ferguson, Roger W., Jr.—1830, 1845
Ferrer, Fernando (Freddy)—1734, 1735
Ferris, William R.—1839, 1854
Fertitta, Paige—1248
Fertitta, Tilman—1248
Filosof, Dalia—1627
Fisher, George—1843
Fisher, Raymond C.—1846
Fisher, Richard W.—1838, 1843, 1853
Flake, Floyd H.—895, 1161
Flecha de Lima, Paulo Tarso—1368, 1372
Flores, David—1701
Fogel, Jeremy D.—1849
Fogleman, Ronald R.—966, 1021
Foglietta, Thomas M.—1431, 1834, 1849
Foley, Mark—1461, 1464
Foley, Robert T.—1539
Foley, Thomas S.—1833, 1849
Fontoura, Armando B.—1315
Ford, Betty—1505
Ford, Gerald R.—1160, 1504, 1505, 1507, 1514
Ford, Harold E., Jr.—1484
Ford, Harrison—1655
Ford, Wendell H.—1406
Forney, Bo—982
Forts, Ann—1844
Fossella, Vito—1482
Fowler, Ronald—1697
Fox, Sarah McCracken—1856
Fox, Thomas H.—1838, 1853
Frank, Joseph J.—912
Franke, Richard J.—1264, 1836
Franken, Al—1486
Franklin, John Hope—966, 972, 975, 1042, 1048, 1050, 1069, 1161, 1162, 1271-1274, 1693
Freeh, Louis J.—1689, 1690, 1782, 1785
Freeman, Harold P.—1843
Frei, Eduardo—1842
Freiriech, Dara—1319
French, David—1254, 1255
French, Jim—1254
French, Mary Mel—1838, 1853
Friday, Bill—1264
Friday, William—1836
Fried, Daniel—1834, 1851
Friedman, Cynthia—1567
Friedman, Michael A.—1098, 1283
Frisbee, Donna—1585
Frist, Bill—957
From, Al—1433
Frost, Martin—989, 1008, 1469, 1472, 1738
Furse, Elizabeth—1080, 1156
Furundzija, Anto—1793

Gabriel, Edward M.—1834, 1850
Gaffett, Kimberly H.—1111
Galinsky, Ellen—1473
Gallucci, Robert L.—1843
Ganchrow, Mandell—1840
Gansler, Jacques—1832, 1848
Garamendi, John R.—1578, 1580

Garcia, Richie—1474
Garcia, Robert—1738
Garcia, Terry D.—1845
Gardner, Danielle—924
Gardner, Richard N.—924
Garrett, Thaddeus, Jr.—1803
Gaviria, Cesar—1560
Gaw, Steve—1087
Gee, Robert W.—1832, 1848
Geithner, Timothy—1759, 1830, 1845
Gejdenson, Sam—895, 924
Gephardt, Richard A.—959, 989, 1008, 1087, 1089, 1160, 1238, 1351, 1404, 1469, 1472, 1719, 1738, 1783
Gerstner, Louis—895
Gibara, Samir—1700
Gibbons, Jim—1009
Gibbons, John H.—1770, 1792
Gibbons, Sam—1148
Giblin, Tom—1315, 1484
Gibson, Bynum—1256
Giffin, Gordon D.—1655, 1829
Giles, Conrad—1604
Gilman, Benjamin A.—924, 1169, 1560
Gilman, Ronald Lee—1846
Gingrich, Marianne—1155
Gingrich, Newt—959, 1025, 1051, 1052, 1080, 1155, 1305, 1404, 1459, 1462, 1476, 1482, 1494, 1507, 1508, 1525, 1530, 1531
Gips, Donald—1830
Gist, Arlee—1760
Gist, Harold—1760
Glaser, Jake—1098
Glaser, Paul Michael—1098
Glaser, Rob—1839
Glendening, Parris N.—1018, 1133, 1135
Glenn, John—1406, 1693, 1704, 1705
Glickman, Dan—1158, 1179-1181, 1284, 1592
Gober, Hershel—913, 1237, 1274, 1539, 1688, 1760, 1829, 1854
Goh Chok Tong—1842
Gold, Billie—1604
Gold, Dore—1604
Gold, Judy—1752
Goldin, Daniel S.—1792
Goldman, John—1198
Goldman, MeraLee—1106
Goldsmith, Martin—1491
Gollust, David—910
Golonka, Karen—1464
Gonzales, I. Miley—1830, 1845
Gonzalez, Henry B.—1176
Gonzalez, Vanessa—1457
Good, Mary L.—1299
Goodling, William F.—1501, 1502, 1840
Goodmon, Jim—1839
Gorden, Phillip—1079
Gordon, Bart—895
Gordon, John A.—1831, 1848
Gordon, Nathan G.—1237
Gore, Albert, Jr.—895, 897, 912, 938, 960, 964, 965, 970, 992, 994, 1003-1005, 1007, 1025, 1051, 1052, 1081, 1088, 1092, 1098, 1102, 1111, 1148, 1153, 1155, 1156, 1164, 1170, 1172, 1175, 1179, 1180, 1198, 1213, 1214, 1271, 1272, 1279, 1281-1283, 1288, 1293, 1297, 1308, 1309, 1315, 1323, 1338, 1408, 1420, 1426, 1432, 1446, 1452, 1455, 1457, 1458, 1480, 1481, 1499, 1506, 1553, 1554, 1577, 1599, 1603, 1618-1620, 1624-1627, 1675-1677, 1685, 1707, 1708, 1712, 1739, 1742, 1745, 1746, 1751, 1767, 1771, 1773, 1781, 1798, 1804, 1806, 1831, 1832
Gore, Tipper—1052, 1155, 1288, 1627
Goss, Porter J.—1169
Gould, Jane G.—1834, 1849
Gould, Ronald M.—1856
Goulet, Joe—1748
Gover, Kevin—1838, 1853
Graber, Susan—1846
Graham, Billy—1505
Graham, Susan L.—1841
Gramlich, Edward M.—1830, 1845
Grasmick, Nancy S.—1135
Graves, Denyce—1261
Graves, William—1592
Graves, William H.—966
Green, Ernest—1234, 1261
Green, Mark—1741
Green, Steven J.—1837, 1852
Greenberg, Maurice R.—1830
Greenspan, Alan—1841, 1855
Greenspun, Amy—1572
Greenspun, Brian—1572
Greenspun, Myra—1572
Greenwood, James C.—1099
Grey, Robert T., Jr.—1838, 1853
Grey-Johnson, Crispin—1834
Griffin, Richard J.—1834, 1849
Grimsson, Olafur—1831
Grisham, Henry Oren (Buddy)—1775
Grissom, Betty—1792
Grogan, Paul S.—1733
Grossman, Barbara—1143
Grossman, Steve—1092, 1143, 1145, 1147, 1323, 1334, 1552, 1606, 1709
Grundin, Catherine—1760
Guarini, Frank J.—1430
Guelar, Ramiro—1834
Guerra, Fernando—990
Guggenheimer, Elinor—1746
Gujral, Inder Kumar—1835
Gund, Agnes—1262, 1836
Gurria, Jose Angel—1560
Gutierrez, Carl T.C.—1061
Guzman, Alberto Maspons—1834
Gwin, James S.—1847

Hackney, Sheldon—1262
Hadley, Nicole—1688, 1723
Haft, Jessica—1464

Hagel, Chuck—1184
Hajjri, Abdulwahab Abdullah Al- —1834
Halfhide, Arnold T.—1834
Halfon, Joseph—1840
Hall, James E.—1836, 1852
Hall, Kathryn Walt—1834, 1849
Halpern, Cheryl F.—1832, 1848
Hamburg, Margaret Ann—1832, 1848
Hamdun, Nizar—1647
Hamilton, Arthur M.—1838
Hamilton, Lee H.—1156
Hammer, Susan—1830
Hammerschmidt, John Arthur—1832, 1848
Hammerschmidt, John Paul—1840, 1855
Hammonds, Derwin (Dee)—1704
Hampson, Thomas—1764
Hampton, Kym—1121
Hamre, John J.—1830, 1833, 1845
Hancock, Ian Francis—1842
Harjo, Joy—1838, 1853
Harman, Jane—1169
Harmon, Clarence—1087, 1089, 1596
Harmon, Herb—912
Harper, Sallyanne—1840, 1855
Harris, D. George—1843
Hartigan, Bridgette—1709
Hartigan, Laura—1709
Hartigan, Neil F.—1832
Hashimoto, Ryutaro—1653, 1745, 1746, 1843
Hatch, Orrin G.—1495
Havel, Václav—930
Hayes, Rita D.—1829, 1846
Haynes, Audrey Tayse—1403, 1833
Hays, Patrick Henry—1237, 1259
Heaney, Seamus—1629
Hebert, Curt, Jr.—1839, 1854
Heckler, Margaret M.—1403
Height, Dorothy—1160
Helms, Jesse—1070, 1158
Helveg Petersen, Niels—953
Hendrickson, C. Thomas—1072, 1143, 1606, 1760
Hendrickson, Jill—1760
Henley, Don—1265, 1836
Henry, Aaron—966
Henry, John W.—1469
Henry, Peggy—1469
Herman, Alexis M.—966, 973, 1088, 1110, 1112, 1113, 1219, 1502, 1553, 1592, 1618, 1724, 1784
Hermelin, David B.—1838, 1853
Hernandez, Esmerelda—1242
Hernandez, Marife—1741
Hernreich, Nancy—1760
Hertz, Harry—1798
Herzog, Roman—1831
Hesburgh, Theodore M.—1827
Heston, Charlton—1726
Hicks, Elizabeth—1724
Hicks, H. Beecher, Jr.—1724
Higgins, Kathryn O'Leary (Kitty)—1219
Hilley, John L.—1052
Hinojosa, Rubén—1177, 1368
Hitchcock, Wayne—1539
Hochberg, Fred P.—1516, 1838, 1853
Hoeper, Paul J.—1838, 1854
Holbrooke, Richard C.—925, 1512, 1790
Holden, Bob—1087, 1089
Holdren, John—994, 1297, 1298
Holmes, Joseph—1835
Holtzman, Elizabeth—1403
Holum, Barbara—1836
Homer, Pete—1106
Honeycutt, Van B.—1834
Honigman, Steven S.—1844
Hope, Bob—1458
Hope, Judith—1743
Hormel, James C.—1516, 1837, 1852
Horn, Stephen—1266
Horsley, John C.—1839, 1855
Horton, James F., Jr.—1242
Horton, Winter D., Jr.—1841, 1855
Howard, Jo Ann Jay—1832, 1847
Howard, Rudolph—1233
Hoyer, Steny H.—1052, 1133, 1401
Hrinak, Donna J.—1830
Huang, John—929, 1524
Huckabee, Janet—1233
Huckabee, Mike—1233
Hudson, William J.—1830
Huey, Wesley—1771
Hufstedler, Shirley—1277
Hukill, Una—1464
Hulshof, Kenny C.—1083
Hultin, Jerry MacArthur—1835
Hume, Cameron R.—1837, 1852
Hun Sen—950
Hunt, Carolyn—1413
Hunt, James B., Jr.—1018, 1413, 1417, 1420, 1422-1424
Hunter, Jim—902
Hunter, Robert E.—924
Hurtgen, Peter J.—1840, 1854
Hussein, Saddam—934-936, 1215, 1494, 1501, 1504, 1508, 1510, 1519, 1531, 1539, 1542, 1547, 1557, 1564, 1592, 1605, 1615, 1629, 1670, 1672, 1673, 1722, 1776, 1789

Ibarra, Christina—1695
Ibarra, Hector—1411
Ibarra, Mickey—1175, 1177, 1549
Ickes, Harold—1305
Igasaki, Paul M.—1831, 1843, 1847
Irons, Edith—1254
Isbell, Johnny—1242
Israel, Philip—1553, 1554
Israel, Tina—1553
Ivey, William J.—1844
Izetbegovic, Alija—1814, 1844

Jackson, Ian—1724
Jackson, Jesse—973, 1095, 1160, 1831, 1837
Jackson Lee, Sheila—1247, 1248

Jacobs, William—1136
Jaffe, Arthur M.—1841
Jaffe, Jeffrey—1835
Jagan, Janet—1789
James, Jessica—1688, 1723
James, Sharpe—1310
Jameson, Ronald—1023
Jamison, Phil—1254
Jandreau, Michael—1537
Janiszewski, Bob—1315
Jarvis, Charlene Drew—1798
Jefferson, David, Sr.—1310
Jefferson, Linda—1310
Jeffords, James M.—957, 1420, 1423
Jeffress, Charles N.—1833, 1848
Jelved, Jan—954
Jelved, Marianne—954
Jemison, Mae—1295
Jenkins, Martin J.—1846
Jennings, Christopher C.—1052
Jensen, Bodil—954
Jiang Zemin—1141, 1148, 1300, 1336, 1424-1426, 1444, 1445, 1452, 1456, 1466, 1520, 1524, 1526, 1652, 1676, 1840
Jochum, Sally Ann—1838
Johnson, B.F.—1310
Johnson, David T.—1834, 1851
Johnson, J.L.—1027
Johnson, Jacqueline—1760
Johnson, John H.—1709
Johnson, Lady Bird—1505
Johnson, Nancy L.—1403
Johnson, Robert B. (Ben)—966, 1161, 1760
Johnson, Robert M.—1100
Johnson, Tadd—1832, 1834, 1847, 1849
Jones, Brent—979
Jones, Daryl L.—1747, 1839, 1854
Jones, David C.—1184
Jones, G. Douglas—1848
Jones, Hilary—981
Jones, James R.—1148
Jones, Jan Laverty—1568
Jonsson, Lars—1640
Jonsson, Lori MacDonald—1640, 1642
Jordan, Ann—1334
Jordan, Barbara—1277, 1827
Jordan, Milton E.—1023
Jordan, Vernon—1042, 1334
Josey, Anita M.—1849
Joulwan, George A.—949
Joyner, Tom—1239
Jukes, Yvonne—1489
Jullian, Sarah—1578
Juncker, Jean-Claude—1719

Kahn, Mary Jo Ellis—956
Kahn, Robert E.—896
Kammer, Raymond G.—1834, 1849
Kansi, Mir Aimal—1170
Kantor, Michael (Mickey)—1149
Kaplan, Elaine D.—1841, 1855
Karadzic, Radovan—929, 1012, 1796
Karl, Thomas—1296
Karlmark, Gloria Ray—1261
Karpan, Kathleen M.—1845
Kasich, John R.—1025, 1052, 1817
Kassebaum Baker, Nancy—1065, 1779
Kates, John—1027
Katzen, Sally—1624
Katzenbach, Nicholas—1827
Kauffman, Bruce C.—1847
Kauzlarich, Richard D.—1830
Kean, Thomas H.—1020, 1273, 1805, 1808
Kearney, Janis F.—1259, 1760, 1810
Kearns, David T.—1802
Keating, Frank—1100
Keener, Mary Lou—1237, 1760
Keevey, Richard F.—1832, 1848
Kelley, Barbara—1420
Kelly, James A.—1420
Kelly, Raymond W.—984, 1330
Kelly, Sue W.—1413
Kempthorne, Dirk—1499
Kennard, William E.—1832
Kennedy, Edward M.—990, 991, 1024, 1401, 1533, 1536
Kennedy, Patrick J.—1469, 1472
Kennelly, Barbara B.—1556, 1612
Kernan, Joe—1686
Kerrey, J. Robert—1338, 1405, 1406, 1686, 1688
Kerrick, Donald—1830
Kerry, John F.—1496
Kerry, Teresa—1496
Kessler, David A.—1098, 1179, 1181
Kessler, Jason—1699
Khatami, Mohammad—1766, 1779
Kiley, Daniel Urban—1263, 1836
Kim Dae Jung—1774
Kim Yong-sam—1425, 1630, 1774, 1842
Kimball, Dale A.—1849
King, Betty E.—1731, 1835, 1838, 1850, 1853
King, Coretta Scott—1160
King, Garr M.—1853
King Juan Carlos I—909, 919, 1829, 1830
King, Susan—1835, 1850
Kingston, Maxine Hong—1265, 1836
Klasse, Dorothy F.—1579
Kleckner, Dean R.—1843
Klein, Jacques—949
Knight, Bob—1592
Knobel, Jonathan—1133
Knoll, Catherine Baker—1226
Kohl, Dorothy—1465
Kohl, Helmut—904, 905, 908, 910, 1106, 1843
Kohl, Herb—1413
Kohl, Sidney—1465
Konare, Alpha Oumar—1841
Koomson, Koby Arthur—1841
Koop, C. Everett—1098, 1159, 1179
Korge, Chris—1752, 1756

Korge, Irene—1756
Korowi, Wiwa—1656
Korth, Penne Percy—1840, 1855
Koss, Susan—1821
Kovacevic, Milan—949
Kraft, Clarence B.—1237
Krajisnik, Momcilo—1844
Kramek, Robert E.—966, 1747
Kramer, Orin S.—1840
Kriskovick, David—1192
Kuchma, Leonid—927, 933, 1830
Kuehl, Sheila James—1536, 1537
Kuklelka, Bolesaw—939
Kulakow, Robin—1578
Kupreskic, Vlatko—1793
Kurtzer, Daniel C.—1837, 1852
Kushner, Charles—1319
Kushner, Joshua—1319
Kushner, Nicole—1319
Kushner, Rae—1319
Kushner, Seryl—1319
Kwasniewski, Aleksander—939, 941, 1830
Kyles, Samuel Billy—1535, 1537
Kyota, Hersey—1841

La Camera, Paul—1839
La Porta, Alphonse F.—1834, 1849
Lachance, Janice R.—1837, 1844
Lader, Philip—1831, 1846
Ladner, Benjamin—1136
Lamberth, Royce C.—1821, 1826
Lamm, Dottie—1637
Lampson, Nick—1413, 1417
Lane, Neal F.—1770
Lang, Eugene—1148
Lang, Jeffrey—1759
LaNier, Carlotta Walls—1261
Lanier, Bob—1094, 1242, 1244, 1247, 1680
Lanier, Elyse—1242
Lansbury, Angela—1263, 1836
LaPaille, Gary—1706, 1708, 1709
Larocco, James A.—1837, 1853
Larson, Knute—1697
Lashof, Joyce—1515
Laster, Gail W.—1833, 1849
Lattimore, Patricia W.—1833, 1848
Lausel, Miguel—1741
Lautenberg, Frank R.—1025, 1051, 1052, 1320, 1484, 1485
LaVelle, Avis—1707, 1709
Lavine, Gary J.—1840
Lawrence, Diana—1474
Lawrence, M. Larry—1722, 1728
Lawrence, Shelia Davis—1728
Lay, Ken—1247
Leahy, Andrew—1028
Leahy, Patrick J.—1184, 1546
Leal, Luis—1265, 1836
Lee, Bill Lann—972, 1161, 1175, 1495, 1518, 1534, 1586, 1602, 1605, 1688, 1719, 1721, 1729, 1744, 1767, 1846
Lee, Charles R.—1833, 1834
Lee Hoi Chang—1774
Lehman, Bruce A.—1835
Lehman, Nicholas—974
Leon, Rene Antonio—1834
Leonard, Thomas—1830
Leone, Lorna—1133
Leone, Richard—1840
Levin, Sander M.—1413
Levin, Susan Bass—1315
Levine, James—1263, 1836
Levitsky, Melvyn—1372
Levy, David—1840
Lew, Danny—1821
Lew, Jacob J.—1052
Lewis, Phillip G.—1834
Lewis, Wilma A.—1855
Lichtenstein, Roy—1269, 1276
Lichtman, Miryam—1319
Liebarth, Dave—1696
Lieberman, Evelyn S.—1424
Lieberman, Joseph I.—1433, 1817
Liebman, Wilma B.—1840, 1854
Lindsay, Sam A.—1856
Lindsey, Bruce—1068, 1110, 1760
Linen, Jonathan—1042
Lipez, Kermit—1854
Lippe, Paul—1196
Little, Mark—1817
Liverman, Diana—1296, 1297
Llewellyn, J. Bruce—1843
Lobo, Rebecca—1121
Locke, Gary—1641
Locke, Mona Lee—1641
Lopez, Jose—1153
Lopez, Linda—1310
Lott, Trent—959, 1025, 1052, 1155, 1157, 1158, 1493, 1636, 1638
Lott, Tricia—1155
Loury, Glenn C.—1680, 1781
Lowey, Nita M.—1403, 1731, 1738
Lowry, Glenn D.—1477
Lubick, Donald C.—1838, 1853
Luckasson, Ruth—1844
Lucy, William—1160
Luebben, Lonnie—1254
Lugar, Richard G.—1070, 1157
Lynch, John A.—1315
Lynn, James T.—1840
Lynn, William J., III—1839, 1854
Lyons, James—1003, 1836

MacColl, Macdara—895
Mack, James F.—1829
MacKay, Buddy—1747, 1750, 1752, 1756, 1757
Macks, Manual—981
MacNeil, Robert—1264
Magaziner, Ira—895, 897, 1821, 1826
Magazzu, Lou—1323
Magness, Sharon—1633

Maher al-Sayed, Ahmed—1627
Majak, R. Roger—1833, 1849
Major, John—1524
Malcor, Dennis—1028
Maldon, Alphonso, Jr.—1836, 1852, 1854
Maloney, Carolyn B.—1266, 1738
Maloney, Sean—1516
Mandela, Nelson—1198, 1235
Manilow, Lewis—1708
Manilow, Susan—1708
Mansfield, John E.—1832
Marbley, Algenon L.—1847
Marchman, Kevin E.—1843
Marcus, Stanley—1851
Markey, Edward J.—895
Marmer, Lynn—1630
Marrero, Victor—1731, 1833, 1837, 1848
Marshall, Susanne T.—1840, 1855
Marshall, Thurgood, Jr.—1161
Martin, Beverly Baldwin—1855
Martin, Lynn—1807
Martin, Mahlon—1259
Martin, Will—1839
Martinez, Martha Dixon—1303
Marty, Martin E.—1265, 1836
Marvel, L. Paige—1854
Maser, David—1323
Masloff, Sophie—1226
Mason, David M.—1841
Mason, Richard—1761
Massery, Hazel Brown—1234
Massiah-Jackson, Frederica A.—1847
Mastro, Randy M.—1734
Masur, Richard—1839
Mathews, Sylvia M.—966, 1633
Matsui, Robert T.—1148, 1424, 1530, 1580
Matter, David—1226
Matthews, David—1760
Matz, A. Howard—1854
Mauro, Garry—1242, 1248
Mbeki, Thabo—1092, 1481, 1831
McBride, Ann—1304
McCabe, Jerry—1323
McCaffrey, Barry R.—988, 1106, 1274, 1341, 1343, 1372, 1747-1749
McCain, John—1027, 1062, 1140, 1160, 1243, 1289
McCoy, Ann—1760
McCoy, Grady—1760
McCulloch-Lovell, Ellen—1106
McCurdy, Dave—1433, 1843
McCurry, Michael—1071, 1348, 1526, 1785, 1789
McCuskey, Michael P.—1847
McDermott, Jim—1368, 1369, 1640, 1642, 1644
McDonald, Randy—1620
McDonald, Tom—1834, 1849
McDougall, Gay J.—1731
McFarland, Steven T.—1103
McFerran, Kenneth Ray—1848
McGahey, Richard M.—1839, 1854
McGinty, Kathleen A.—1003
McGowan, Gerald S.—1837, 1852
McGreevey, Jim—1310, 1315, 1319-1321, 1484, 1501
McGuire, Cyril Kent—1839, 1856
McKendra, Fatima—1233
McKenna, Regis—1196
McKinney, Cynthia A.—1832
McLarty, Donna—1760
McLarty, Thomas F. (Mack)—1343, 1368, 1369, 1372, 1395, 1475, 1760
McLelland, Stanley L.—1837, 1852
McMahon, Patricia M.—1850
McMath, Sidney—1237, 1254, 1255
McNamara, Robert M., Jr.—1839, 1855
McVeigh, Timothy—1822
McWherter, Ned Ray—1709
Medina, Evaline—1439
Medina, Mary—1439
Meehan, Martin T.—1239, 1304
Meek, Kendrick—1750
Mejdoub, Noureddine—1841
Mellon, Paul—1265, 1836
Mellow, Robert J.—1226
Melnick, Leah—1192
Menem, Carlos Saul—1376, 1388, 1389, 1393-1395, 1399, 1400, 1838, 1843
Menem, Zulema Maria—1388
Menendez, Robert—1484
Meri, Lennart—1842
Mernissi, Sarah (Sally)—1420
Meshal, Khaled—1302, 1306
Messinger, Ruth—1486
Metzler, Cynthia—1840
Meyer, Christopher—1841
Meyer, Russ—1592-1594
Mfume, Kweisi—966, 1160
Michener, James A.—1397
Miguel, Cesar—1399
Mikkelsen, Kramer—954
Mikulski, Barbara A.—924, 939, 1406
Miller, Aaron D.—1831
Miller, Bob—1004, 1005, 1007, 1009, 1013, 1016, 1567, 1569, 1570, 1572, 1574
Miller, Christine O.C.—1855
Miller, Daniel—1367
Miller, George—1009, 1401, 1553
Miller, John—1257
Miller, John P.—1840
Miller, Michael J.—1303
Miller, Sandy—1013, 1572
Miller, Thomas J.—1837
Mincberg, Eliot—1103
Minor, Deborah—1204
Minor, Halsey—1204
Minow, Newton—1839
Mintz, Mary—1136
Mishdin, Masha—1814
Mitchell, George J.—1766
Mitchell, Maurice—1760
Mitchell, Tianka—1259
Mkapa, Benjamin—1843

Molina, Mario J.—1841
Mondale, Walter F.—1065
Moniz, Ernest J.—1832, 1847
Montgomery, William D.—1839, 1854
Moon, Elvin—1833
Moon, Norman K.—1853
Moore, Duncan T.—1834, 1852
Moore, Mary Tyler—1079
Moore, Minyon—966, 1161, 1707, 1709
Moose, George—1832
Moran, James P.—1489
Morella, Constance A.—1403
Moreno, Carlos R.—1847
Moreno, Rita—1745
Morgan, Jonathan—1695
Morgenthau, Robert M.—1731
Morrison, Michael—1001
Moseley-Braun, Carol—1706-1711, 1714
Moses, Alfred H.—946
Mother Teresa (Agnes Gonxha Bojazhiu)—1131, 1132, 1155
Mothershed-Wair, Thelma—1261
Moulton, Gary E.—1538
Moynihan, Daniel Patrick—1148, 1351
Muashir, Marwan—1627, 1834
Mubarak, Hosni—1595, 1841
Mugabe, Robert—1207
Munteanu, Semida—944
Murguia, Janet—1175
Murphy, G. Patrick—1846
Murphy, Laura W.—1160
Murphy, Reg—1408
Murphy, Tom—966, 1226
Murray, Patty—1640, 1644
Murtha, John P.—1817

Nakada, Jim—1007
Nalle, Sean—1724
Nash, Bob—1161, 1259, 1760
Nathanson, Jane—1008
Nathanson, Mark—1008
Nazarbayev, Nursultan—1602, 1603, 1841
Nesbitt, William—1192
Netanyahu, Binyamin—1026, 1130, 1307, 1309, 1320, 1575, 1629, 1719, 1778, 1781, 1831
Ngwenyama, Nokuthula—1492
Nichols, Mark—1477
Nichols, Terry—1822
Nixon, Jay—1089, 1596, 1598, 1599, 1601, 1602
Nogales, Luis—1840
Norick, Ronald J.—1100
Norman, Jessye—1727
Norment, Hanley—966
Norton, Eleanor Holmes—1068, 1403, 1724, 1832
Nunn, Sam—1833
Nussman, J. Michael—1839

Oakley, Phyllis E.—1836, 1853
Obey, David R.—1555
Ochoa, Ellen—1242
O'Cleireacain, Carol—1840
O'Connor, Patrick J.—1440
Oden, Tanya—1592, 1595
O'Donovan, Leo J.—1293
Oh, Angela—1272, 1694
O'Hara, John—1023
O'hUiginn, Sean—1834
O'Keefe, Kevin M.—1707, 1709, 1830
Olson, Lute—1432
Olson, Lyndon L., Jr.—1837, 1852
Olson, Ronald—1827
O'Neill, Beverly—997
Owen, Gus A.—1840
Owens, Major R.—1160

Pachios, Harold C.—1830, 1846
Pacino, Al—1430
Padgett, Marvin—1192
Padron, Eduardo—1464
Paige, Ralph—1843
Palacios, Rebecca—1420
Pallmeyer, Rebecca R.—1847
Pallone, Frank, Jr.—1484, 1738
Palmisano, Anthony—1303
Palnick, Lazar—1226
Panetta, Leon—1430
Panetta, Sylvia—1431
Parks, Rosa—969
Parris, Mark Robert—1834, 1849
Pascoe, B. Lynn—1834, 1851
Pascrell, Bill, Jr.—1484
Patton, Paul E.—1018
Payne, Donald M.—1042, 1310, 1311, 1484, 1832
Payne, L.F., Jr.—1289, 1491
Payne, Susan—1489
Paz, Stanley—997
Peacock, Andrew—1105
Pecanha, Flavia—1372
Peer, Wilbur—1760
Pele (Edson Arantes do Nascimento)—1353, 1372
Pell, Claiborne—1266
Pelosi, Christine—1201
Pelosi, Nancy—1266
Peña, Federico—1175, 1299, 1343, 1408, 1411
Penelas, Alex—1752, 1756, 1758
Penelas, Lilliam—1752
Penner, Rudolph—1840
Pensky, Carol—1568
Peres, Shimon—1627-1629
Perry, William J.—1198, 1274
Peters, Darren—1760
Peters, F. Whitten—1835, 1852
Peters, Mary Ann—1655
Peters, Vivian—1760
Peterson, Douglas (Pete)—1841
Peterson, Esther—1820
Pickering, Thomas R.—1216
Pierce, Harry—1537
Pifer, Steven K.—1837, 1852
Pinzler, Isabelle Katz—1767
Pippen, Scottie—1709

Pitofsky, Robert—897
Pitta, Celso—1368
Platt, Lewis—1843
Platt, Nicholas—1424
Plavsic, Biljana—929, 1844
Plaza, Eva M.—1833, 1848
Plusquellic, Donald L.—1693, 1701, 1704
Polese, Kimberly—1197
Pollard, Jonathan—1306
Polster, Dan A.—1847
Poneman, Daniel—1843
Pooler, Rosemary S.—1855
Porter, John Edward—1555
Porter, Ralph—1734, 1762
Portman, Rob—1338
Pottorff, Jo Ann—1630
Powell, Colin—1001, 1028, 1627, 1669, 1703, 1832
Powell, Edward A., Jr.—1840
Powell, Michael K.—1832
Powell, Whitney Symone—1718
Prescott, Gene—1752, 1756
Presel, Joseph A.—1833, 1850
Price, Hugh—1042
Primakov, Yevgeniy—1213
Prince Charles—1131
Prince Harry—1121, 1131, 1132
Prince Hassan—1836
Prince Ranariddh—950
Prince William—1121, 1131, 1132
Princess Diana—1121, 1131, 1132
Proctor, Stuart—1665
Prodi, Romano—904
Proffitt, Kathryn L. Haydock—1836, 1852
Prom, Ahjah—1724
Pryor, David H.—1253, 1254, 1762, 1763
Puck, Barbara—1585
Puck, Wolfgang—1585
Puczynski, Sandra—1079
Puente, Tito—1263, 1836
Pugh, Jim—1750

Qian Qichen—1452, 1653
Quayle, Dan—1505
Quayle, Marilyn—1505
Queen Margrethe II—952, 953, 1829
Queen Sofia—909, 919, 1829, 1830

Rabin, Leah—1627-1629
Rabin, Yitzhak—1628, 1629
Radcliff, Jere—1027
Radd, Victoria L.—995
Raines, Franklin D.—958, 1052, 1068, 1143, 1724
Raiser, Molly M.—915
Ralph, Regan—1098
Ralph, Sam—1098
Ralston, Joseph W.—913, 964, 1184
Ramirez, Saul N., Jr.—1845
Ramos, Fidel—1843
Ramos, Jorge—1378
Rangel, Charles B.—1025, 1052
Rangel, Jorge C.—1846
Raphel, Robin Lynn—1835, 1850
Rasaputram, Warnasena—1814
Rasco, Carol H.—1402
Rasmussen, Poul Nyrup—952, 953, 954, 1829
Rattner, Steven L.—1840
Ratzker, Menno—1840
Ravitch, Diane S.—1630
Ray, James Earl—946
Reagan, Nancy—1505
Reagan, Ronald—1070
Reed, Bruce N.—1158, 1179, 1180
Reed, Jack—1111, 1413
Reeder, Joseph R.—1027
Reicher, Dan—1832, 1848
Reid, Harry—1003, 1005, 1007, 1009, 1567, 1569, 1570, 1572, 1574
Reid, Landra—1572
Reiner, Rob—1413
Rendell, Edward—1323, 1324, 1326
Reno, Janet—953, 984, 988, 1100, 1285, 1308, 1330, 1347-1349, 1357, 1360, 1381, 1533, 1537, 1665, 1676, 1689, 1690, 1692, 1723, 1748, 1767, 1769, 1782, 1830
Reyes, Carolina—1175
Reyes-Heroles, Jesus—1841
Reyes, Silvestre—1177
Rhea, Carolyn—1752
Rhee In Je—1774
Riady, James—1349
Rice, Norman B.—1640, 1644
Richards, Ann—1248
Richardson, Bill—912, 1175, 1216, 1367, 1372, 1731, 1837, 1852
Richardson, Elliot—1827
Riley, Ann—1102
Riley, Richard W.—966, 967, 973, 997, 999, 1018, 1019, 1093, 1102, 1106, 1110, 1125, 1133, 1134, 1177, 1196, 1288, 1367, 1372, 1401, 1402, 1414, 1416, 1420, 1422, 1424, 1535, 1537, 1553, 1554, 1616, 1701, 1723, 1835
Ripken, Cal, Jr.—902
Ripken, Kelly—902
Rivas, Miguel Angel Burelli—1343
Rivera, Dennis—1741
Robards, Jason—1263, 1836
Robb, Charles S.—1289, 1292, 1293, 1489, 1490
Robb, Lynda—1489
Robbins, Jerome—1727
Roberts, Pat—1592
Roberts, Roy—1027
Roberts, Terrence—1261
Roberts, Victoria A.—1847
Robertson, Jeanne—1204
Robertson, Kirk K.—1833, 1849
Robertson, Sanford R. (Sandy)—1204, 1433
Robinson, Mary—1208, 1732
Rockefeller, Jeanette E.—1728
Rockefeller, John D., IV—1024, 1406, 1556, 1612
Rodham, Dorothy—1439
Rodham, Hugh, Jr.—1439

Rodham, Tony—1439
Rodriguez, Arturo—1220
Rodriguez, Manny—1637
Rodriguez, Teresa—1380
Roemer, Tim—1424
Rogers, Valerie—1473
Rohatyn, Felix G.—1831, 1846
Romer, Roy—1019, 1072, 1077, 1175, 1413, 1475, 1480, 1612, 1631, 1633, 1637, 1684, 1685, 1752, 1756
Romero-Barceló, Carlos A.—1177
Rominger, Richard—1283, 1578
Ronda, James P.—1538
Ronnel, Jennifer—1760
Ronnel, Steve—1760
Root, Paul—1254
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana—1747
Rosado, David—1734
Rosapepe, James C.—1836, 1851
Rosen, Hilary—1585
Rosen, Jack—1760
Rosen, Phyllis—1760
Ross, Betsy McCaughey—1315, 1741, 1743
Ross, Dennis B.—1026, 1038, 1063, 1130, 1309, 1831
Ross, Stanford G.—1836, 1853
Ross-Stein, Jill—1323
Rossotti, Charles O.—1832, 1848
Roth, William V., Jr.—917, 924, 928, 958, 1052
Rowland, F. Sherwood—994
Rubin, Nancy H.—1731, 1848
Rubin, Robert E.—897, 984, 1052, 1073, 1271, 1338, 1415-1417, 1475, 1559, 1650, 1759, 1763
Rubin, Robert M.—1840
Rubin, Vera C.—1841
Rudman, Warren B.—1515
Ruebel, Marion—1693, 1703, 1704
Rufe, Roger T.—1747
Ruff, Charles F.C.—1302, 1347, 1348
Ruiz, Jose Luis—1842
Ruiz, Tom—1197
Rupel, Dimitrij—1841
Rush, Bobby L.—973, 1708
Russert, Tim—1519
Russom, Semere—1834
Ryan, June—1747
Ryan, Michael E.—1032
Ryun, Jim—1592

Saban, Cheryl—1588
Saban, Haim—1588
Sabanovic, Farouk—1814, 1815
Sack, Robert D.—1855
Sakalauskas, Stasys—1841
Salinas, Maria Elena—1378
Salmon, Mary Anne—1760
Sampson, Cheunee—1533, 1534
Sanders, Erica—1698
Santer, Jacques—1719
Saperstein, David—1103
Sarbanes, Paul S.—1133
Sasser, James M.—1456
Sasser, Mary—1456
Satalino, Stephen—1079
Satcher, David—1156, 1161, 1850
Saunders, Norm—1747
Sava, Samuel G.—997, 1001
Savocchio, Joyce A.—1831
Sawyer, Thomas C.—1693, 1703-1705
Schell, Paul—1640, 1644
Scher, Peter L.—1831, 1846
Schermerhorn, Lange—1834, 1848
Schlossberg, Caroline Kennedy—1505
Schmid, Greg—1578, 1579
Schnitzer, Tammie—1536
Schoonover, Brenda B.—1834, 1848
Schottler, Gail—1637
Schroeder, Don—1323
Schroeder, Patricia—1403
Schumacher, August, Jr.—1830, 1831, 1845
Schumaker, Edward E., III—1834, 1849
Schwartz, Mark—1100
Schwarzkopf, H. Norman—1457, 1458, 1502
Schweickart, Russell L.—1295
Scott, Judith A.—1838
Scott, Marsha—1516, 1760
Scott, Robert C.—1489
Scott, Shelby—1839
Scott, Thomas E.—1845
Scotto, Thomas J.—1330
Scully, Robert T.—1330
Segal, Eli—1076, 1087, 1088, 1592, 1594, 1830
Seidman, Ricki—1585
Selig, Bud—902
Selig, Helen—1254
Seligson, Michelle—1416
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr.—1770, 1792
Serio, Charles Vincent—1848
Serna, Joseph, Jr.—1581, 1832
Serrano, José E.—1266
Shabazz, Betty—966, 1160
Shackelford, Lottie—1259, 1760
Shah, Niranjan S.—1846
Shalala, Donna E.—956, 957, 990, 991, 1080, 1088, 1098, 1106, 1156, 1158, 1179, 1180, 1283, 1284, 1417, 1612, 1618, 1624, 1835
Shalikashvili, Brant—1275
Shalikashvili, Joan—1274, 1275
Shalikashvili, John M.—913, 941, 964, 1184, 1274, 1276
Shalvey, Don—1194
Shanker, Albert—1220, 1222
Shapiro, Robert B.—1087, 1088
Shapiro, Robert J.—1841, 1855
Sharif, Nawaz—1835
Sharma, Neal—1136
Shattuck, John—1731
Shaw, Kikuyu—1553
Shays, Christopher—1239, 1304
Shea, Edward F.—1849
Shea, Thomas—1516

Shelby, Richard C.—1169
Shelton, Carolyn—964, 1627
Shelton, Henry H.—964, 1627, 1814, 1817
Sherren, Joseph—1718
Shevardnadze, Eduard—983, 1011, 1829, 1831
Shikes, Larry—984
Shinseki, Eric K.—1814
Shipler, David K.—1696
Shipley, Walter—1734
Sid'Ahmed, Ahmed Ould—1834
Siegel, Patty—1419
Silverman, Barry G.—1856
Simon, Jeanne Hurley—1840, 1855
Simon, Miles—1432
Singel, Mark—1226
Siragusa, Charles J.—1845
Sisisky, Norman—924
Skaggs, David E.—1631, 1637
Skelton, Ike—1817
Sklar, Richard—1837, 1852
Slater, Cassandra—1760
Slater, Cathryn Buford—1831
Slater, Rodney E.—973, 977, 1021, 1093, 1095, 1106, 1160, 1219, 1259, 1724, 1747, 1760, 1831, 1838
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh—956, 957, 1405
Smiley, Tavis—1047, 1239
Smith, Adam—1640, 1642, 1644
Smith, Cheryl—980
Smith, Craig T.—1548, 1684
Smith, Dean—1838
Smith, Gordon—924
Smith, LaVay—1201
Smith, Marshall S.—1831, 1846
Smith, Maurice—1760
Smith, Robert—1266
Smith, Tom E.C.—1844
Smulyan, Jeffrey H.—1605
Snowe, Olympia J.—957, 1403, 1405
Snyder, Vic—1256, 1258
Socarides, Richard—1516, 1684
Soderberg, Nancy E.—1837, 1843, 1852, 1853
Soeharto—1842
Sohn, Gigi—1839
Solana, Javier—922, 927, 928, 949, 1829
Solomon, Gerald B.H.—924
Solomont, Alan D.—1072, 1077, 1092, 1143, 1145, 1147, 1198, 1248, 1250, 1319, 1323, 1606, 1709, 1752, 1756, 1760
Soref, Jeffrey—1684
Sosnik, Douglas B.—1465
Sovern, Michael—1827
Specter, Arlen—1401, 1533, 1843
Sperling, Gene—1052, 1177, 1268, 1338, 1475, 1569
Spielberg, Steven—1457
Spielvogel, Carl—1838, 1853
Spina, Samuel A.—1315
Spitalnik, Deborah—1844
Spratt, John M., Jr.—1025, 1052, 1555
Springer, Marlene—1482
Spurlin, Virgil—1254
Squillacote, Theresa Marie—1302
Staley, Carolyn Yeldell—1254
Stand, Kurt Alan—1302
Stanton, Robert—1106
Starnes, Michael—1592
Starr, Kenneth—1761
Steeh, George C. III—1851
Steel, Dawn—1821
Stefani, Phil—1708
Steger, Kayce—1688, 1723
Stein, Herbert—1840
Stella, Frank D.—1430
Stenholm, Charles W.—1083
Stephanopoulos, George—1548, 1774
Stern, Andrew—1162
Stern, Marc—1103
Stevens, George, Jr.—1764
Stevens, Michael—1764
Stevens, Ted—1817
Stewart, James M. (Jimmy)—903
Stokes, Louis—1457, 1693, 1704, 1705
Story, Richard W.—1850
Stout, Diann—1226
Stout, Phil—1226
Strausberg, Chinta—977
Strauss, Karen Peltz—1839
Strauss, Leon—1598
Strauss, Mary—1598
Streett, Mary—1760
Streett, Stephanie—1760, 1829
Stroger, John—1440, 1709
Strong, Ben—1723
Sturdivant, John N.—1455
Sturdivant, Michelle—1455
Suarez, Carlos—1399
Sullivan, Maggie—1439
Sullivan, Mary Anne—1831, 1846
Summers, Lawrence H.—1052, 1338, 1650, 1759
Summitt, Pat—1432
Sunstein, Cass R.—1839
Sweeney, John J.—1219, 1413, 1415
Swenson, Leland—1106
Swenson, Leland H.—1843
Swiecicki, Marcin—939
Swindle, Orson—1841, 1843, 1856
Swing, William Lacy—1842
Swoopes, Sheryl—1120
Swygert, H. Patrick—1724
Swygert, Sonja—1724

Tablante, Carlos—1343
Taft, Julia V.—1834, 1849
Takamura, Jeanette C.—1834, 1849
Talabani, Jalal—935, 1216, 1674
Talbott, Strobe—1198
Tanoue, Donna A.—1841, 1856
Tarnow, Arthur J.—1851
Tarullo, Daniel K.—1475
Tatum, Beverly Daniel—1697
Tauber, Joel—1604

Tavakoli, Jamshid—1664
Tavakoli, Keyvan—1664
Tavakoli, Vivian—1664
Taylor, James—1738, 1739
Taylor, LeBaron—1160
Tejeda, Frank—1176
Telson, Michael L.—1832, 1848
Tenet, George J.—1169, 1274
Tenet, Stephanie—1169
Terkel, Studs—1266, 1836
Terrill, Cathy Ficker—1844
Thernstrom, Abigail—1696, 1703, 1804
Thernstrom, Stephan A.—1804
Thomas, Buzz—1103
Thomas, Cherryl T.—1843
Thomas, Dave—1613
Thomas, Eric—978
Thomas, Harry L., Sr.—1136
Thomas, Helen—1041
Thomas, Jefferson—1261
Thomas, Peter—1618
Thomas, Robert—1272
Thomas, Scott E.—1833, 1848
Thomasson, Patsy—1760
Thompson, Fred—1308, 1309, 1524
Thompson, Joseph—1837, 1852
Thompson, Joseph F.—1840
Thompson, Kathryn G.—1830
Thompson, Mozelle W.—1841, 1843, 1856
Thompson, Sally—1832, 1848
Thompson, Toby—1100
Thompson, Tommy G.—1016
Thornton, Michael B.—1853
Thornton, Tracey—1161
Thurm, Kevin—1553
Thurman, Sandra—1516, 1684
Tiahrt, Todd—1592
Titus, Constance—1259
Titus, Myer L.—1259
Tobe, Amy Weiss—1838
Tobias, Andy—1684
Tobias, Robert M.—1338
Tomsheck, Jim—1655
Torricelli, Robert G.—1320, 1406, 1482, 1483, 1485, 1686, 1687
Townsend, Kathleen Kennedy—1133
Trachtenberg, Stephen J.—1533, 1537
Tramontano, Karen—1162, 1516
Treanor, Kathleen—1100
Trickey, Minnijean Brown—1261
Trie, Charles Yah Lin—1524
Trimble, David—1837, 1838
Tristani, Gloria—1175, 1835, 1850
Troncoso, Jose Gerardo—1851
Trumka, Richard—1219
Tsakapoulous, Angelo—1580
Tsakapoulous, Eleni—1580
Tsakapoulous, Sophia—1580
Tuchmann, Tom—1003
Tucker, Mark Reid—1850
Tufo, Peter F.—1836, 1851
Tung Chee-hwa—1835
Turner, Ted—1208
Turner, Tina—1756
Twaddell, William H.—1836, 1852
Tyson, Laura D.—1475, 1720, 1840

Udall, Norma—1553, 1555
Udovenko, Hennadiy—1205, 1214, 1731
Ulmanis, Guntis—1842
Umberg, Thomas J.—1832, 1848
Underwood, Cecil H.—1018
Unger, Laura S.—1835, 1851
Upton, Fred—1555
Upton, John—1005

Valenti, Jack—1430
Vallace, Paul—1440
Van Note, Dave—1003
Vance, Cyrus R.—1627
Varmus, Harold E.—1106, 1770
Varney, Christine A.—897, 960
Varotta, Conrado Franco—1399
Velázquez, Nydia M.—1368
Veltroni, Walter—1430
Venegas, Arturo, Jr.—1537
Verani, Pablo—1399
Vershbow, Alexander R.—1834, 1849
Villaraigosa, Antonio R.—1536
Villareal, Jose H.—1830
Villella, Edward—1263, 1725, 1727, 1836
Vitaliano, Eric—1482
Vladeck, Bruce C.—1720
Voinovich, George V.—1013, 1016
Vos, Joris Michael—1841
Votano, Carmen—1175

Wagner, Gerd—1192
Wagner, Jeanette Sarkisian—1843
Waldin, Michelle—1627
Waldman, Michael A.—1829
Walesa, Lech—1830
Walker, Ann F.—1161
Walker, Bill—1259
Walker, Edward S., Jr.—1836, 1851
Walker, John—1578
Walker, Robert M.—1833, 1850
Wang Yeping—1444, 1456
Ware, James S.—1855
Warshaw, Robert S.—1838, 1854
Wasserman, Lew—1589
Watanabe, Terry K.—1830
Waters, Laughlin Edward—913, 914
Waters, Maxine—1008, 1160, 1413
Watkins, Shirley Robinson—1831, 1845
Watson, Anthony—1720
Watson, Doc—1264, 1836
Watson, Robert—1297
Watts, J.C., Jr.—1808
Waxman, Henry A.—1082, 1099
Waxman, Seth P.—960, 1835, 1851
Weatherspoon, Teresa—1120

Webb, Wellington E.—1702
Webb, Wilma J.—1631, 1633
Wei Jingsheng—1653, 1843
Weisberg, Lois—1439
Weizman, Ezer—1306, 1309, 1320, 1837
Welch, David—935
Weld, William F.—988, 1018, 1069, 1141, 1157, 1158, 1168, 1770, 1831, 1846, 1851
West, Audrey—1310
West, Gail—1688
West, Mary Beth—1839
West, Togo D., Jr.—1237, 1688, 1817
Westendorp, Carlos—949
Westfall, George (Buzz)—1596
Wheeler, Douglas P.—1578
Whelan, Katie—1546
White, Arthur H.—1844
White, Bill—1248
White, Edward H., II—1792
White, Edward H., III—1792
White, Jesse C., Jr.—1440
White, Jesse L., Jr.—1516
White, Lois Jean—960, 1839
White, Michael R.—1094
Whitehead, John—1827
Whitman, Christine Todd—1484
Widnall, Sheila E.—1027, 1190
Wiesel, Sam W.—1079
Wilcox, David W.—1836, 1851
Wilder, L. Douglas—1293
Wilhelm, Charles E.—1747
Wilhelm, David—1707, 1709
Wilhelm, Deegee—1709
Wilhite, Donald—1297
Wilkes, Sybil—1239
Williams, Cassandra—1568
Williams, John Eddie—1248
Williams, Lee—1830
Williams, Vanessa—973
Willis, Carroll—1259, 1760
Willis, Joyce—1760
Willrich, Mason—1299
Wilson, Carolyn—1255
Wilson, Pete—1004
Wilson, Roger—1596
Wilson, Steve N.—982
Winston, Judith A.—966, 972, 975, 1069, 1106, 1136, 1162, 1274, 1679, 1693, 1830
Winter, William F.—1020, 1272, 1273, 1694
Witt, James Lee—1297, 1760, 1835
Witt, Lea Ellen—1760
Wladawsky-Berger, Irving—1840
Wofford, Harris—1106, 1436
Wold, Darryl R.—1855
Wolpe, Howard—1842
Wong, C.J.—1337
Woodriffe, Edwin R.—1303
Woods, Grant—1536
Woods, Harriett F.—1832
Woods, Henry—1254
Woolsey, Lynn C.—1413
Wooten, JoAnne Lyons—973
Woteki, Catherine—1283
Wrenn, Sue—1489
Wright, Betsy—1760
Wright, Erica—1698
Wright, Robert C.—1764
Wright, Suzanne—1764
Wykle, Kenneth R.—1837, 1853
Wynn, Steve—1013

Yang, Terry—1196
Yarrow, Peter—1486
Yazzie-King, Ela—1831, 1846
Yee, James—1839
Yellen, Janet L.—1052, 1268
Yeltsin, Boris—906, 909, 911, 931, 1198, 1213, 1481, 1503, 1543, 1632, 1640, 1655, 1788, 1842
Yilmaz, Mesut—1790, 1840, 1844
Young, Johnny—1834, 1848
Young, R.L. (Buddy)—1100
Young, Richard L.—1845
Young, Whitney—1043
Yturria, Frank D.—1839, 1854

Zealey, Sharon J.—1845
Zechman, Edwin K., Jr.—1458
Zedillo, Ernesto—920, 1386, 1557, 1560-1562, 1577, 1839, 1841
Zimmerman, Harriet—1465
Zimmerman, Jerome—1465
Zubak, Kresimir—1814, 1844

Document Categories List

Addresses and Remarks

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings; Bill Vetoes; Interviews With the News Media; Resignations and Retirements
AFL–CIO convention in Pittsburgh, PA—1219
Air Force, 50th anniversary celebration in Arlington, VA—1190
Akron, OH, community—1704
American Heritage Rivers initiative—1153
American University—1136
Argentina
  Buenos Aires
    Business leaders—1389
    State dinner—1388
    Univision townhall meeting—1378
    Wreath-laying ceremony—1376
  Nahuel Huapi National Park in San Carlos de Bariloche—1399
Arkansas State Democratic Party, reception in Little Rock, AR—1256
Asia Society—1424
Bayh, Evan, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee dinner—1686
Beyer, Donald S., Jr.
  Dinner in Arlington, VA—1289
  Rally in Alexandria, VA—1489
Block Island, RI, arrival—1111
Bosnia-Herzegovina
  Peace process—1793
  Community in Sarajevo—1814
  U.S. troops in Tuzla—1817
Brazil
  Business leaders in Sao Paulo—1367
  Reception in Brasilia—1352
  Vila Olimpica da Mangueira School in Rio de Janeiro—1372
Brennan, Justice William J., Jr., funeral service—1023
Bronx, New York City, community—1733
Business leaders—1041
Campaign finance reform legislation—1289, 1304
Canada, U.S. consulate staff in Vancouver, British Columbia—1655
Capps, Representative Walter H., memorial service—1541
Central Intelligence Agency, 50th anniversary celebration in Langley, VA—1169
Cessna employees in Wichita, KS—1592
Childhood immunization initiative—990
Children, safe and effective use of medications—1098
China, visit of President Jiang
  State dinner—1456
  Welcoming ceremony—1444

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
Christmas
  "Christmas in Washington"—1764
  National Christmas tree lighting ceremony—1718
Climate change discussions
  Kyoto protocol in New York City—1745
  Washington, DC—993
Coast Guard in Miami, FL—1747
Congressional Black Caucus Foundation, gala—1160
Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues—1403
Congressional Hispanic Caucus—1175
Congressional leaders, meeting—958
Congressional reception—1155
Congressional Space Medal of Honor, presentation ceremony—1792
Council of Jewish Federations, teleconference—1604
Democratic Business Council
  Assemblies
    Chicago, IL—1708
    St. Louis, MO—1089
    Washington, DC—1072, 1606
  Dinner—1143
Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee
  Dinners
    Boca Raton, FL—1469
    New York City—1738
    Westwood, CA—1008
  Reception—989
Democratic Governors' Association, reception—1546
Democratic Leadership Council—1433
Democratic National Committee
  Autumn retreat on Amelia Island, FL
    Arts and culture session—1477
    Education session—1473
    Globalization and trade session—1475
  Dinners
    Amelia Island, FL—1480
    Houston, TX—1248
    Las Vegas, NV—1572
    Los Angeles, CA—1588
    Miami, FL—1752, 1756
    New York City—1741
    Philadelphia, PA—1326
    San Francisco, CA—1204
    Washington, DC—1077, 1147, 1334, 1548, 1610, 1684, 1760
  Luncheons
    Denver, CO—1633
    Palm Beach, FL—1465
    Pittsburgh, PA—1226
    Sacramento, CA—1580
    San Francisco, CA—1198

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
Democratic National Committee—Continued
Receptions
Denver, CO—1637
Florham Park, NJ—1319
Democratic Party reception in Chicago, IL—1706
Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee dinners
St. Louis, MO—1598
Washington, DC—1405
Denmark, Copenhagen
Community—954
State luncheon—952
Denver, CO, arrival—1631
Diabetes initiatives—1079
Ecumenical Breakfast—1615
Education
America Reads initiative—1401
Congressional action on proposed legislation—1270
Voluntary national testing for basic skills, radio remarks—1400
Electronic commerce initiative—895
European Union leaders, meeting—1718
Fast-track trade authority
Proposed legislation—1171, 1493, 1499, 1507, 1509, 1530
Renewal, support for—1148
Federal budget
Agreement—1024
FY 1998 proposal—1675
Legislation—1037
Negotiations—986
First Lady, birthday celebration in Chicago, IL—1439
Food safety initiative—1283
Four Seasons Elementary School in Gambrills, MD—1133
Genetic screening, proposed legislation to ban discrimination—956
George Bush Presidential Library, dedication ceremony in College Station, TX—1505
Greenhouse gas emissions, international agreement—1675
Hanukkah, celebration—1821
Health care
"Consumer Bill of Rights and Responsibilities"—1618
Task Force civil case—1826
Hot Springs High School class reunion in Hot Springs, AR—1253
Human Rights Campaign, dinner—1516
Incline Village, NV
Community at Lake Tahoe—1007
Lake Tahoe Presidential forum—1002, 1005
Income and poverty report—1267
Internal Revenue Service reform—1338
Internet—960
Iraq, expulsion of U.N. weapons inspectors—1564
Israel
Meeting with President Weizman—1306
Terrorist attacks in Jerusalem—1026, 1129
Jones, Hilary, funeral service in Jasper, AR—981

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
Kennedy Center Honors, reception—1725
Kerry, Senator John F., dinner—1496
Landmines, international efforts to eliminate—1183
"Lewis and Clark" screening—1537
Lighthouse Elementary School in Jupiter, FL—1464
Little Rock, AR
Central High School, 40th anniversary celebration of desegregation—1233
Congressional Medal of Honor Society reception—1237
Candlelight vigil honoring the Little Rock Nine—1259
MacKay, Buddy, luncheon in Miami, FL—1750
Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards, presentation ceremony—1798
Man of Peace Award, presentation ceremony—1627
McGreevey, Jim
Rally in Edison, NJ—1484
Reception in West Orange, NJ—1315
Messinger, Ruth, rally in New York City—1486
Metropolitan Baptist Church in Newark, NJ—1310
Metropolitan Baptist Church in Washington, DC—1724
Mexico, meeting with President Zedillo—1557
Midwest Technology Corporation of St. Louis in St. Louis, MO—1086
Mother Teresa, death—1131
Murray, Patty
Dinner in Medina, WA—1640
Reception in Seattle, WA—1644
NAACP, national convention in Pittsburgh, PA—966
National Arts and Humanities awards
Dinner—1269
Presentation ceremony—1261
National Association of Black Journalists, question-and-answer session in Chicago, IL—973
National Association of Elementary School Principals in Arlington, VA—997
National Association of Police Organizations, "Top Cops"—1330
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards—1420
National Boy Scout Jamboree in Bowling Green, VA—1027
National Conference of Democratic Mayors, dinner—1092
National Geographic Society—1408
National Governors' Association Conference in Las Vegas, NV—1013
National Italian-American Foundation—1430
National Medals of Science and Technology, presentation ceremony—1770
National Public Radio, 10th anniversary of "Performance Today"—1491
National Urban League—1042
NCAA champions
Men's basketball, University of Arizona Wildcats—1432
Women's basketball, University of Tennessee Lady Volunteers—1432

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
Nixon, Jay, reception in St. Louis, MO—1596
NATO summit sendoff by American veterans—912
Oak Bluffs School in Oak Bluffs, MA—1122
Oklahoma City memorial—1100
Organization of American States Hemispheric Arms Trafficking Convention, signing ceremony—1560
Oscar Mayer Elementary School in Chicago, IL—1439
Poland, Warsaw
Community—939
State dinner—941
President's Advisory Board on Race, meeting—1271
Public Service Campaign for Educational Excellence in Baltimore, MD—902
Race initiative
Outreach meeting with conservatives—1802
Townhall meeting in Akron, OH—1693, 1695
Radio addresses—916, 951, 983, 1001, 1039, 1081, 1109, 1115, 1118, 1132, 1159, 1193, 1253, 1287, 1341, 1397, 1429, 1513, 1576, 1630, 1669, 1723, 1759, 1813, 1825
Religious exercise and expression in the Federal workplace—1102
Rock the Vote, reception in Beverly Hills, CA—1585
Romania, community in Bucharest—944
Roundtable discussion in San Carlos, CA, on charter schools—1194
Russia, meeting with Foreign Minister Primakov—1213
Sacramento, CA, arrival—1577
San Carlos Charter Learning Center, roundtable discussion on charter schools in San Carlos, CA—1194
San Jacinto Community College in Houston, TX—1242
Saxophone Club, receptions
Philadelphia, PA—1323
San Francisco, CA—1200
Service Employees International Union—1162
Spain
Meeting with President of the Government Aznar—919
NATO summit in Madrid
American community at the U.S. Embassy—923
Meeting with the congressional delegation and national security team—917
North Atlantic Council—922
NATO–Ukraine charter, signing ceremony—927
STARBRIGHT World On-Line Computer Network—1457
Thanksgiving turkey, presentation ceremony—1665
Tobacco, proposed legislation—1179
Townhall meetings
Akron, OH, on race—1693, 1695
Univision in Buenos Aires, Argentina—1378
Tropical Shipping Company in Palm Beach, FL—1461
United Kingdom, death of Princess Diana—1121

Addresses and Remarks—Continued
United Nations
52d session of the General Assembly in New York City—1205
Luncheon hosted by Secretary-General Annan in New York City—1214
United Parcel Service strike—1112
U.S.-China Education Foundation Board—1424
Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 50th anniversary celebration in New York City—1731
Venezuela, Caracas
Arrival—1342
Bilateral agreements, signing ceremony—1343
Citizens—1345
Veterans Day celebration ceremony in Arlington, VA—1539
Vitaliano, Eric, rally in Staten Island, NY—1482
Weather forecasters—1279
Welfare reform—1308
White House conferences
Child care—1413
Climate change—1293, 1296
Hate crimes—1533, 1535
White House Millennium Program, announcement at the National Archives and Records Administration—1105
WNBA
Champion Houston Comets, telephone remarks—1119
Second place New York Liberty, telephone remarks—1120
Women's Leadership Forum in Las Vegas, NV—1567
Yolo Basin Wetlands in Davis, CA—1578
Young Democrats Council in Philadelphia, PA—1323

Appointments and Nominations

See also Digest (Appendix A); Nominations Submitted (Appendix B); Checklist (Appendix C)
Air Force Department, Chief of Staff, statement—1032
Defense Department, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman, remarks—964
Health and Human Services Department, Surgeon General, remarks—1156
Justice Department, Acting Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, remarks—1767
National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare, members, remarks—1719
Veterans Affairs Department, Acting Secretary, remarks—1688
White House Office, Special Counselor to the President for fast-track trade legislation, statement—995

Bill Signings

Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, remarks—1612

Bill Signings—Continued
Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1604
Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997, statement—1691
Balanced Budget Act of 1997
Remarks—1051
Statement—1053
Continuing appropriations legislation
First continuing resolution, statement—1278
Second continuing resolution, statement—1419
Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1322
Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1565
Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1438
Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1666
Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998
Remarks—1553
Statement—1555
Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1437
District of Columbia appropriations legislation, statement—1614
Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1352
Federal Bureau of Investigations, Washington Field Office Memorial Building, statement—1303
Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997
Remarks—1624
Statement—1626
Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1665
Hope, Bob, legislation conferring honorary veteran status, statement—1458
Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, statement—1623
International Dolphin Conservation Program Act, statement—1109
Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1277
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, statement—1611
National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, statement—1332
Oklahoma City National Memorial Act of 1997, statement—1333
Savings Are Vital to Everyone's Retirement Act of 1997, statement—1622
Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act, statement—1099
Taxpayer Browsing Protection Act, statement—1058
Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997
Remarks—1051

Bill Signings—Continued
Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997—Continued
Statement—1052
Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1339
Veterans' Compensation Rate Amendments of 1997, statement—1614

Bill Vetoes

Line item vetoes
Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, letter—1624
Balanced Budget Act of 1997
Letter—1086
Remarks—1082
Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998
Letter—1367
Statement—1366
Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, letter—1623
Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, message—1479
Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, letter—1692
Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, message—1479
Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1998
Letter—1396
Statement—1396
Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998
Message—1303
Remarks—1301
Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997
Letter—1086
Remarks—1082
Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998
Letter—1378
Statement—1377
Line item vetoes of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998, legislation to override, message—1557
Partial birth abortion legislation, message—1340

Citations

Presidential Medal of Freedom—1276
Presidential Citizens Medal—1746

Communications to Congress

See also Bill Vetoes
Aeronautics and space activities, message transmitting report—1455
Africa, comprehensive trade and development policy, letter transmitting report—1824
Andean Trade Preference Act operations, letter transmitting report—1718
Angola, U.S. national emergency
Message—1231

Communications to Congress—Continued
Angola, U.S. national emergency—Continued
Message reporting—1232
Letter—1765
Arctic research plan, message transmitting—1025
Argentina-U.S. extradition treaty, message transmitting—1030
Australia-U.S. mutual legal assistance treaty, message transmitting—1192
Barbados
Extradition treaty with U.S., message transmitting—1035
Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S., message transmitting—1128
Brazil-U.S. peaceful nuclear cooperation agreement, message transmitting—1459
Burma, letter reporting—1729
Cambodia, civil unrest, letter—950
Canada-U.S. taxation convention protocol, message transmitting—1218
Chemical Weapons Convention, certifications required by ratification resolution, letters reporting—1812, 1828
China-U.S. fisheries agreement, message transmitting—963
Colombia, U.S. national emergency with respect to narcotics traffickers
Letter—1397
Letters reporting—1096, 1373
Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, message transmitting—1209
Cuba, telecommunications services payments, message reporting—1152
Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, title III, letter—963
Cyprus
Extradition treaty with U.S., message transmitting—1021
Negotiations, letters transmitting reports—925, 1512
Defense articles and services trade, letter transmitting report—1169
Defense exports, implementation of monitoring program, letter transmitting report—1111
District of Columbia budget request for FY 1998, message transmitting—943
Eastern Bloc, countries of the former, most-favored-nation trade status, letter transmitting report—1727
Eastern Caribbean States
Extradition treaties with U.S., message transmitting—1029
Mutual legal assistance treaties with U.S., message transmitting—1127
Export control regulations, U.S. national emergency
Letter—1100
Letter transmitting report—1812
Fast-track trade authority, message transmitting proposed legislation—1173
Federal Advisory Committees, message transmitting report—1190

Communications to Congress—Continued
Federal Government employees, pay adjustments, letter transmitting alternative plan—1117
Federal Labor Relations Authority, message transmitting report—1130
France-U.S. extradition treaty, message transmitting—938
Free trade areas, negotiations, letter transmitting report—1239
Immigration reform, message transmitting proposed legislation—996
India-U.S. extradition treaty, message transmitting—1219
Information infrastructure, message transmitting report—1022
Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters, message transmitting—1126
Iran, U.S. national emergency
Letter—1113
Letter reporting—1663
Message—1278
Message reporting—1186
Iraq
Compliance with U.N. Security Council resolutions
Letters reporting—934, 1215, 1670
Message—1033
U.S. national emergency, message—1032
Ireland-U.S. taxation convention, message transmitting—1231
Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, letter transmitting report—1557
Luxembourg
Extradition treaty with U.S., message transmitting—926
Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S., message transmitting—925
Mexico-U.S. protocol for the protection of migratory birds and game mammals, message transmitting—1168
Middle East, terrorists who threaten to disrupt the peace process, letter reporting—1059
Mongolia, most-favored-nation trade status, message—985
Narcotics producing and transit countries, letter—1529
National Endowment for the Arts, message transmitting report—943
North American Free Trade Agreement, message transmitting study—942
Nuclear proliferation, prevention, letter transmitting report—1692
Partnership For Peace, letter transmitting report—1126
Poland
Extradition treaty with U.S., message transmitting—937
Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S., message transmitting—926
Serbia and Montenegro, U.S. national emergency, letter reporting—1714

Communications to Congress—Continued
South Pacific Regional Environment Programme, message transmitting agreement—1512
Sudan, U.S. national emergency, message—1492
Trinidad and Tobago
Extradition treaty with U.S., message transmitting—1036
Mutual legal assistance treaty with U.S., message transmitting—1128
United Nations, U.S. Government activities, message transmitting report—1130
Weapons of mass destruction, U.S. national emergency, message—1542
World Intellectual Property Organization, message transmitting treaties—1022
Yugoslavia, former, troop deployment for stabilization, letter reporting—1811

Communications to Federal Agencies

See also Presidential Documents Published in the Federal Register (Appendix D)
Assault-type rifles, importation of modified semiautomatic, memorandum—1575
Combined Federal Campaign, memorandum—1021
Education, low-performing public schools, memorandum—1442
Electronic commerce, memorandum—898
Food safety initiative, memorandum—1285
Haitians in U.S., deferred enforced departure, memorandum—1823
Health care "Consumer Bill of Rights and Responsibilities," memorandum—1621
HIV prevention, integration in Federal programs serving youth, memorandum—1678
Indian country, law enforcement, memorandum—1116
Immigration, refugee admissions consultations, memorandum—1036
Religious exercise and expression in the Federal workplace, memorandum—1104
Veterans Affairs Department, John D. Dingell Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, memorandum—923

Interviews With the News Media

See also Addresses and Remarks
Exchanges with reporters
Air Force One—947, 1347
Bucharest, Romania—942, 946
College Station, TX—1504
Copenhagen, Denmark—953
Denver, CO—1631
Madrid, Spain—917, 919
Martha's Vineyard, MA—1112, 1121, 1129, 1131
New York City—1213, 1745
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada—1652, 1653
White House—958, 964, 986, 1026, 1037, 1041, 1082, 1156, 1171, 1179, 1183, 1267, 1270, 1283, 1301, 1304, 1306, 1308, 1493, 1499,

Interviews With the News Media—Continued
Exchanges with reporters—Continued
1507, 1509, 1530, 1557, 1665, 1675, 1688, 1718, 1719, 1766, 1767, 1772, 1793, 1821
Interviews
Argentine reporters—1391
Black Entertainment Television—1047
European television journalists—904
Knight-Ridder Newspapers—1679
"Meet the Press"—1519
Tom Joyner Morning Show—1239
Voice of America—910
Joint news conferences
Brazil, President Cardoso—1354
Canada, Prime Minister Chretien—1646
China, President Jiang—1445
News conferences
No. 149 (July 9)—928
No. 150 (August 6)—1061
No. 151 (October 14)—1354
No. 152 (October 29)—1445
No. 153 (November 23)—1646
No. 154 (December 16)—1772

Joint Statements

Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)
Connecting the APEC Community—1657
Vancouver framework for enhanced public-private partnerships in infrastructure development—1661
Azerbaijan-U.S. relations—1038
Brazil-U.S. partnership for education—1365
China-U.S. relations—1452
Georgia-U.S. relations—983
Kazakhstan-U.S. relations—1602
Mexico-U.S. foreign relations—1562
Venezuela-U.S. declaration of the Presidents—1344

Letters and Messages

See also Bill Vetoes; Communications to Congress; Communications to Federal Agencies
Christmas, message—1819
Electronic commerce, message to Internet users—901
Hanukkah, message—1797
Independence Day, message—903
Kwanzaa, message—1820
Labor Day, message—1116
Lawrence, M. Larry, letter to Mrs. Lawrence on former Ambassador's gravesite—1728
National Arts and Humanities Month, message—1266
National Security Council, 50th anniversary, message—1215
Ramadan, message—1827
Rosh Hashana, message—1277
Yom Kippur, message—1334

Meetings With Foreign Leaders and International Officials

See also Joint Statements

Meetings With Foreign Leaders and International Officials—Continued
Argentina, President Menem—1376, 1388, 1389, 1399, 1838
Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) leaders—1842
Association of Southeast Asian Nations leaders—1842
Azerbaijan, President Aliyev—1832
Bosnia-Herzegovina
National Government Tripartite Presidency
President Izetbegovic (Chairman)—1814, 1843
President Krajisnik—1843
President Zubak—1814, 1843
Serb Republic President Plavsic—1843
Brazil, President Cardoso—1352, 1354, 1838
Canada, Prime Minister Chretien—1646, 1842
Chile, President Frei—1842
China
President Jiang—1444, 1445, 1456, 1652, 1840
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Chief Executive Tung—1835
Denmark
Prime Minister Rasmussen—952–954
Queen Margrethe II—952
European Union
Commission President Santer—1718
Council President Juncker—1718
France, President Chirac—1829
Georgia, President Shevardnadze—1831
Germany, President Herzog—1831
Greek Orthodox Church, Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I—1839
Iceland, President Grimsson—1831
India, Prime Minister Gujral—1835
Indonesia, President Soeharto—1842
Ireland, Prime Minister Ahern—1766
Israel, President Weizman—1306, 1837
Japan, Prime Minister Hashimoto—1653
Jordan, Crown Prince Hassan—1836
Kazakhstan, President Nazarbayev—1841
Mali, President Konare—1841
Mexico, President Zedillo—1557, 1560, 1841
NATO, Secretary General Solana—922, 927, 1829
Northern Ireland, Ulster Unionist Party leader Trimble—1837
Pakistan, Prime Minister Sharif—1835
Poland
Former President Walesa—1830
President Kwasniewski—939, 941, 1830
Romania, President Constantinescu—942, 944, 1830
Russia, Foreign Minister Primakov—1213
Singapore, Prime Minister Goh—1842
South Africa, Deputy President Mbeki—1831
South Korea, President Kim—1842
Spain
King Juan Carlos I—1829, 1830
President of the Government (Prime Minister) Aznar—919, 922, 927, 1829
Turkey, Prime Minister Yilmaz—1844
Ukraine, President Kuchma—927, 1830
United Kingdom, Prime Minister Blair—1829

Meetings With Foreign Leaders and International Officials—Continued
United Nations
General Assembly President Udovenko—1205, 1214
Secretary-General Annan—1205, 1214
Venezuela, President Caldera—1342, 1343, 1345, 1838

Resignations and Retirements

See also Citations
Air Force Department, Chief of Staff, statement—1021
Defense Department, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman, remarks—1274
Justice Department, Solicitor General, statement—963
State Department, Chief of Protocol, statement—915

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings; Bill Vetoes; Joint Statements; Resignations and Retirements
Adoption legislation, congressional action—1556
Anticrime measures, effectiveness—1652
Boeing-McDonnell Douglas merger, European Union approval—993
Bosnia-Herzegovina, helicopter tragedy—1192
Campaign finance reform—1027, 1238, 1307, 1459
Cisneros, Henry G., indictment—1759
Climate change, Kyoto protocol—1746
Community Reinvestment Act, 20th anniversary—1342
Crime statistics—1287
Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, action on title III, letter—962
Deaths
Arcos Bergnes, Sebastian—1822
Canosa, Jorge Mas—1652
Capps, Walter H.—1444
Denver, John—1352
Devroy, Ann—1419
Lichtenstein, Roy—1276
Michener, James A.—1397
Mother Teresa—1131
Peterson, Esther—1820
Rockefeller, Jeanette E.—1728
Steel, Dawn—1821
Stewart, James—903
Sturdivant, John N.—1455
Dellums, Representative Ron, decision not to seek reelection—1596
Economy—1286, 1723
Education
Assistance programs, congressional action—1174
Voluntary national testing for basic skills, congressional action—1175, 1513
Egypt, terrorist attack in Luxor—1595

Statements by the President—Continued
Fast-track trade authority, proposed legislation—995, 1283, 1321, 1459, 1495
Fazio, Representative Vic, decision not to seek reelection—1596
Federal budget, congressional action on balanced budget legislation—1030
Fort Bragg, NC, helicopter tragedy—934
Haitians in U.S., deferred enforced departure—1823
Handguns
Center to Prevent Handgun Violence, study—1193
Providing child safety locks—1105
Homeless, assistance—1825
Immigration reform
Commission on Immigration Reform, report—1277
Proposed legislation—996, 1565
Information technology agreement, proclamation implementing—898
International financial services agreement—1759
Iraq, U.N. Security Council resolution—1542
Islamic star and crescent, vandalism of display on the Ellipse—1826
Japan-U.S. trade agreement on access to Japanese ports—1395
Justice Department
Attorney General's decision not to call for independent counsel—1692

Statements by the President—Continued
Justice Department—Continued
40th anniversary of the Civil Rights Division—1728
Korean Peninsula, peace process—1630
Mars Pathfinder spacecraft, landing—915
Northern Ireland
Cease-fire—985
Orange Order decision to reroute parade—956
Oklahoma City bombing trials—1822
Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Veterans' Illnesses, special report—1515
Presidential Legal Expense Trust—1827
Religious freedom promotion, report—989
Renewable fuels tax incentives—1031
Russia, ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention—1503
State Department, U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, withdrawal of nomination—1168
Tax cut legislation, congressional action—1031
Television rating system—938
Terrorist organizations, designation by State Department—1322
Tobacco advertising, R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. decision to stop using Joe Camel character—939
United Parcel Service strike—1110, 1113
White House Conference on Child Care—992