AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, July 7, 1997
Volume 33—Number 27
Pages 991–1023

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Electronic commerce initiative—1003
Madrid Summit sendoff by veterans—1018
Maryland, Public Service Campaign for Educational Excellence in Baltimore—1010
Massachusetts
  Departure for Boston—992
  New England Presidential luncheon in Boston—995
New York City
  Democratic National Committee dinner—1000
  St. James Theatre—1000
Radio address—991
Tax cut proposal—992

Communications to Congress

Russia, most-favored-nation status, letter transmitting report—1000

Communications to Federal Agencies

Electronic commerce, memorandum—1006

Executive Orders

Adding Members to and Extending the President's Council on Sustainable Development—998
Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices—998

Interviews With the News Media

Exchange with reporters on the South Lawn—992
Interview with European television journalists—1012

Letters and Messages

Electronic commerce, message to Internet users—1010
Independence Day, message—1011

Proclamations

To Implement the World Trade Organization Ministerial Declaration on Trade in Information Technology Products and the Agreement on Distilled Spirits—999

Resignations and Retirements

State Department, Chief of Protocol—1020

Statements by the President

See also Resignations and Retirements
Death of Jimmy Stewart—1012
Electronic commerce memorandum—1006

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1023
Checklist of White House press releases—1022
Digest of other White House announcements—1021
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1023

Editor's Note: In order to meet publication and distribution deadlines during the Fourth of July holiday weekend, the cutoff time for this issue has been advanced to 5 p.m. on Thursday, July 3, 1997. Documents released after that time will appear in the next issue.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

Week Ending Friday, July 4, 1997

The President's Radio Address

June 28, 1997

Good morning. Today I'm speaking to you from the East Room of the White House, where I'm joined by hundreds of America's brightest high school students. These Presidential Scholars are here in our Nation's Capital to learn how democracy works, and we know we can make it work much, much better.

I want to talk to you this morning about steps I'm taking to open the airwaves so voters have the loudest voice in our democracy, and about responsibility of Congress to clean up the campaign finance system.

Our democracy is the oldest and most successful in the world, but we know that there is something wrong with the way we pay for elections. Our campaign finance laws were last rewritten 23 years ago. For quite a long while those laws worked well, but they have been overwhelmed by a flood of money and the changes in the way we communicate with one another and the cost of communication.

Spending in congressional campaigns has risen sixfold in the last two decades. That's more than 3 times the rate of inflation. Now both political parties are locked into an ever-escalating arms race, as they compete to raise more and more money. There's simply too much money required for campaigns, it takes too much time to raise, and it raises too many questions.

In my State of the Union Address, I challenged the Congress to act to stem the rising tide of campaign money by passing comprehensive, bipartisan campaign finance reform by July 4th, the date we celebrate the birth of our democracy. Unfortunately, Congress has made little progress toward reform since that time, and it's clear that the legislation will not pass, will not even be voted on by Independence Day. That's too bad because there has been a significant number of bipartisan support for the McCain-Feingold bill, which I have also endorsed.

But now we shouldn't wait for Congress to act, and I'm not waiting. Within my power as President, I've acted to advance key elements of reform, and I'll continue to do so. First, I have petitioned the Federal Election Commission to ban so-called soft money contributions, the large contributions from corporations, labor unions, and individuals that both parties raise. Bipartisan lawmakers led by Representatives Chris Shays and Marty Meehan have asked for the same thing. I am pleased that the FEC will begin formal proceedings on our request next month.

Second, our Justice Department will fight in the courts to uphold efforts to limit campaign spending. We know how a spending spiral can have dangerous consequences, but for two decades, court cases have made it very hard to enact tough limits. Right now, strong spending limits passed for elections in Cincinnati, and judicial elections across Ohio are being challenged. We believe spending limits are constitutional, and if we need to, we'll make that case to the highest court in the land.

And we're acting to address the single greatest reason for out-of-control costs, spending on television. In 1972, candidates spent $25 million for political ads; in 1996, $400 million. We're the only major democracy in the world that does it this way, and it doesn't have to be this way. We can make our most powerfully effective medium a powerful force for expanding democracy. Free TV time can help free our democracy from the grip of big money.

For years I have supported giving candidates free time, and in fact, Vice President Gore proposed legislation to do that a decade ago when he was in the United States Senate. Now we're working to make it happen. In March I called on the Federal Communications Commission to require broadcasters to give candidates free time as a condition of

receiving a new, lucrative license for high-tech digital TV. That's the least we can ask of broadcasters, who are given access to the public airwaves, worth billions of dollars, at no cost, with only the requirement that they meet a basic public obligation. Today I'm appointing two distinguished Americans to lead a commission that will help the FCC decide precisely how free broadcast time can be given to candidates as part of the broadcasters' public interest obligations.

Les Moonves is the president of CBS Entertainment and one of America's most prominent and creative broadcasters. And Dr. Norman Ornstein, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, is one of America's best known political scientists and a renowned expert on campaign finance reform. Their commission will explore the details of free time for candidates and other public interest obligations, such as children's broadcasting, which may need to be updated.

All these steps are important, but still they're no substitute for legislation. Again I say, Congress must act to pass comprehensive bipartisan legislation. And as I said before, Senators John McCain and Russ Feingold, joined by Representatives Shays and Meehan, have strong legislation that would limit spending, end soft money, and give candidates free time or reduced-rate TV time. I'm pleased to report that Senators McCain and Feingold have announced they will bring their bill to a vote later this summer in the Senate. This will be our first chance to see who's for real on the issue of reform.

Needed change has been filibustered to death in every Congress for a decade. In my first term, it was filibustered to death each and every year. Now the same people who filibustered reform before, whose obstruction gave us the present system, have vowed to do it again. Let's let the people be heard. Let's not let them get away with it. Every Senator must realize that a vote for a filibuster is a vote to continue undue special interests influence, soft money contributions, out-of-control spending, and continued public skepticism about the way the political process works.

When it comes to fixing our campaign finance system, let's make this summer a time not of talk but of action, not of recriminations but of results. We have a rare chance to restore the trust and earn the participation of the American people. The way we pay for elections is broken; it's time to fix it. I ask for your support. And thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6:09 p.m. on June 27 in the East Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on June 28.

Remarks on Departure for Boston, Massachusetts, and an Exchange With Reporters

June 30, 1997

Tax Cut Proposal

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, now that the two Houses of Congress have completed action on their tax plan, I would like to make some comments and offer my plan for what I think should be done with the tax portion of the balanced budget agreement.

By way of background, let me point out again, as I have said many times, I was determined to change the economic policy of the United States Government when I became President. We abandoned trickle-down and the big deficits and instead adopted an invest and grow strategy: reduce the deficit, invest in the education and skills of our people, and make sure we sold more American goods and services around the world. That has contributed, along with the ingenuity, hard work, and productivity of the American people, to the healthiest economy we've had in a generation.

I want the balanced budget we ultimately pass to continue to reinforce that strategy and our values. The agreement that we signed with the Republican and Democratic leaders of Congress reflects the invest and grow strategy. It is in balance with our values of honoring work, strengthening families, and offering opportunity. It eliminates the deficit, it invests in education, it extends health care for more of our children while securing Medicare for our parents, and it provides for an affordable tax cut for the American people.

America's families deserve a tax cut, and they deserve one that reflects their values. It is, after all, the energy and dedication of

the American people that has produced our present prosperity, that has made it possible for us to balance the budget. The American people should receive a dividend from this prosperity because they have produced the strength that has enabled us to achieve it. The dividend should be reflected in policies that help them to strengthen their families and educate their children.

Two different tax cut bills have passed the House and the Senate. The bills contain many good elements, but I do not believe they represent the best way to cut taxes, nor are they consistent with the balanced budget agreement. They are not close to the roughly $35 billion the agreement explicitly provides to help people provide for higher education costs. They do an inadequate job of opening the doors to college, therefore. They direct far too little relief to the middle class. They include time-bomb tax cuts that threaten to explode the deficit. They do not do enough to keep our economy going.

Today, as lawmakers from both Houses prepare to begin final negotiations with our administration over the details of a tax cut, I offer my plan to cut taxes. My plan reflects America's values, helping families pay for college, raise their children, buy or sell a home, pay for health care. It honors the budget agreement. It is the right plan for America.

This reflects the approach of Democratic alternatives that were offered in Congress, but it also reflects the priorities of the Republicans as well. The $85 billion tax cut I submit has five central elements.

First, the tax cut plan will focus on education, our Nation's highest priority, with $35 billion in targeted tax cuts. To offer opportunity in the new and rapidly changing economy, we must make the 13th and 14th years of education, the first 2 years of college, as universal as a high school diploma is today. To that end, my proposal will give young people a HOPE scholarship tax credit worth up to $1,500 for the first 2 years of college. It gives further tax cuts to help pay for 4 years of college. It provides tax relief to pay for training and learning throughout a lifetime. It will allow parents to save in a tax-free IRA for their children's education, and it will use tax incentives to help communities rebuild and modernize their schools. Education is how we will meet the challenges of the 21st century, and the core of our tax cut must be to help families pay for education. The tax cuts can do for our children what the GI bill did for Americans a generation ago.

Second, my plan gives families a $500 tax credit for every child under 17. This plan, unlike the tax cut proposals put forth by the congressional majority, would give working people who earn lower salaries the child tax credit as well. A rookie police officer or a starting teacher, a firefighter or a nurse who earns $22,000 deserves a child tax credit. They are some of our hardest pressed working people. They are paying taxes now, and I will fight to give them the same tax relief that other Americans would receive.

Third, to honor our commitment to bipartisanship, the plan allows taxpayers to exclude 30 percent of their capital gains from taxation. It also gives a capital gains tax cut for buying and selling a home. The capital gains cut is targeted, more prudent and less likely to explode the deficit in the years to come than the plan of the congressional majority.

Fourth, my plan provides estate tax relief to help parents who want to pass small businesses and family farms on to their children.

Fifth, the plan provides tax incentives to encourage businesses to hire people off welfare. It will also provide tax cuts to businesses that clean up urban toxic waste sites known as brownfields and convert these sites to productive use. It will create 20 more empowerment zones to attract businesses into disadvantaged neighborhoods, and it includes tax incentives to revive our Nation's capital.

The brownfields and the empowerment zones were both mentioned in the budget agreement as items that the leaders would work hard to include in the final tax bill. It is now time for all the leaders who did the agreement to work together to achieve that. Only by bringing the spark of private enterprise into our inner cities will we truly break the cycle of poverty that holds too many of our people back.

In addition, the Senate, by bipartisan agreement, departed from the budget agreement to support a 20 cents per pack tax on cigarettes. I will support this change. Unlike the Senate version, however, I believe these

revenues should be used entirely in ways that focus on the needs of children and health care.

This tax cut plan that I have just outlined embodies the best ideas offered by Democrats. It reflects many of the priorities of the Republicans, such as the capital gains cut. It is balanced. It is fair to the middle class. It will foster economic growth without hurting our vulnerable citizens. And it is consistent with the budget agreement. It is the right plan for America. And I will do my best and fight hard for it in the weeks to come.

Q. What do you say to people who think you give more to the rich than the poor in this case?

The President. Well, I would just—I would ask you to compare my plan with the Republican plan. Our plan gives the vast majority of aid to the middle class, the 60 percent in the middle, and much, much more than either the plan which passed the Senate or the plan which passed the House. The people who have more money pay more taxes, and if you have a capital gains tax cut or an estate tax cut of any kind, there will be significant benefits to people in upper income groups. But our plan targets hard the middle class as well as working people who make more modest incomes.

And Secretary Rubin and Director Raines and the others on our economic team who are here will have a distributional chart, and you can compare the two. But we committed to work with the Republicans, and this is a good-faith effort to do that, incorporating both their ideas for capital gains and some other things as well.

Q. Mr. President, could you just lay out for us what you see as the primary differences in your approach to capital gains and theirs? And also, why did you wait until now when the two Houses have finished to offer this plan; why didn't you do it earlier?

The President. Well, because up until now I was working with both the Democrats and the Republicans in the Congress to develop their plans and to negotiate with them. But we now have two plans that, in one important respect—the amount of money allocated to help middle class families pay for higher education is clearly inconsistent with the budget agreement.

If you go back and read the budget agreement, the budget agreement says that certain things will be done, and it says other things will be worked on, that there will be best efforts. There was no ambiguity here. We said we would allocate roughly $35 billion of this to help families pay for higher education. The plans aren't close to that.

Now, can we afford to do all the things that the Republicans want to do and the things that are also mentioned in the budget agreement that are important to me and important to many Democrats? The answer is, we can if we have prudence and discipline.

The principal difference in the capital gains provisions is that I would have a 30 percent exclusion; they would have a 50 percent exclusion. It's still a very large tax cut for people who can invest money. And I think you will see that it is not necessary in terms of the stock market. It's doing quite well as it is. What I'd like to see us do is to offer more incentive for people to start new businesses and to hold on to those investments for a longer period of time to build companies.

Q. Mr. President, are you worried about the deficit rising if there——

The President. I'm worried about the deficit rising with some of the less—perhaps less publicized aspects of both plans. I think that some of the individual retirement accounts, or so-called back-loaded accounts—which means they could dramatically increase in cost to the Treasury right outside the 10-year budget window. I'm worried about the indexing of capital gains. I'm worried about the weakening of the alternative minimum tax revisions to the point where people will be making a lot of money and not paying any taxes ever. And we went through that once in the early eighties; the American people were, to say the least, opposed to it. And that could also lead to a big increase in the deficit.

Q. Mr. President, is that a list of things over which you would definitely veto a tax bill? Republicans may be wanting to know that.

The President. Well, first of all—I talked to Senator Lott and Speaker Gingrich last week, and we've had good working relationships with Mr. Archer and Senator Roth and others. I don't want to get into veto now.

We knew that this, because of the unusual way in which this budget agreement was fashioned, that this would proceed, in effect, in a series of stages, the budget agreement, then the congressional committees, then we'd have final negotiations over the bill. I don't want to start talking about veto now. I want to craft an agreement consistent with the budget agreement that can be written into law and can be passed with the bipartisan majority of both sides.

We had a bipartisan majority in both Houses for the budget agreement. And I think it's important that we try to preserve that here.

Hong Kong

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned, given the letter that came from Secretary Albright to the Chinese, that the Chinese will stick to their end of the bargain on maintaining democracy in Hong Kong during this transition?

The President. Well, Secretary Albright is there, as you know, and what we have is the agreement, the 1984 agreement that the Chinese and the British asked the United States to support, and we did. And we expect that they will honor that agreement.

Q. Do you think that 4,000 troops marching in is a good sign?

The President. Well, it's a concern, I think. But we don't know yet that they intend to violate the agreement. They may be concerned about disruption, disorder. We'll just have to see what happens. But we will monitor it very closely. And everybody in the world knows what the agreement was. It's probably the most well-publicized agreement of its kind in modern history. And everybody has a pretty good feel for, not only the economic but the political system of Hong Kong.

Q. Did you watch the ceremony this morning?

The President. I did not. I was not able to do it.

Q. Well, what makes you think that the Chinese——

Mike Tyson and Evander Holyfield Fight

Q. [*Inaudible*]—Federal role should be in regulating boxing, and your personal reaction to what happened in that fight? [*Laughter*]

The President. I saw the fight, and until what happened, it was a good fight. And I was horrified by it, and I think the American people are. And I don't know what the Federal role should be; I've not given any thought to that whatever. But as a fan, I was horrified.

Q. Why were you horrified?

Hong Kong

Q. Mr. President, back on Hong Kong, is there any reason that you have to believe that the Chinese would allow what would amount to an enclave of dissent in Hong Kong?

The President. Well, the agreement says that there will be one China and two systems. And it's hard to have a system with free elections and freedom of speech and an open press without dissent. Just look around here; I mean, people just have different views of things. [*Laughter*] I can't imagine how you could have it any other way.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:55 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Remarks at the New England Presidential Luncheon in Boston

June 30, 1997

Thank you. This is a pretty rowdy group today. [*Laughter*] And if you weren't rowdy before Senator Kennedy talked, you must be now. [*Laughter*]

Let me say to the mayor, to Senator Kerry, Senator Kennedy, to all the Members of the Congress that I have been with today, the State officials, Steve Grossman, Alan Solomont, Governor Mike Dukakis and Kitty, who are here, and all of you—Joan Menard—I've probably forgotten somebody behind me; I'm testing my memory, which is deteriorating rapidly here. [*Laughter*] I'm delighted to be back in Boston, and I'm glad to have the chance to say again, thank you for being the number one State in America in the support for Bill Clinton and Al Gore in 1996. I'm very grateful to you all. Thank you.

Thank you for being here for us in 1995, when everyone said that the days of our administration were numbered, the Demo-

cratic Party was on the downhill. You know all that stuff they said. You were right, and they were wrong, and I thank you for that.

But most importantly, I thank you because you have helped us to prove that it's good for America to give opportunity to everybody who's responsible enough to work for it. You've helped us to prove that it's good for America to think about the future. You've helped us to prove that it's good for America to give everybody a chance without regard to race or gender or any other thing that divides us if we are united by our shared values and our willingness to be good citizens. You've helped us to prove that we can lead the world and be strong at home. And I think that all of you should be very proud of that.

We are trying to prepare this country for a new century in which the young people in this audience will be able to do things with their lives that most of the rest of us could not even imagine. And I believe we are well on our way to doing it. You all know how we're doing today compared to 5 years ago. What I want us to think about is how we can be doing 5, 10, 15, 20 years from now.

I'm proud of the fact that we have the lowest unemployment rate in 24 years and the lowest inflation rate in 30 years and the biggest decline in inequality among working people since the 1960's. I'm proud of all that. The biggest drop in welfare rolls in history, the biggest drop in the crime rate in 36 years, I'm proud of that. I'm proud of the fact that we have taken dramatic strides to protect our environment with safe drinking water and new clean air standards and new food standards and record numbers of toxic waste dumps cleaned up and record land set aside in preservation forever. Only the two Roosevelt administrations have set aside as much land to preserve for our country's future.

But there is a lot to do. And you have to be a part of that. Because we're going through a transition in which we're changing so fast we can never be satisfied with where we are, we have to keep worrying about where we're going. And let me just mention one or two things, if I might.

First of all, we're debating this balanced budget plan. If we pass a balanced budget that's faithful to the agreement I made, it will have the biggest increase in health care for children since Medicaid was enacted in 1965—the biggest. Thank you, Senator Kennedy, for leading that. It will have the biggest increase in Federal support for education since 1965. It will have the biggest increase in Federal support, to help everybody in this country who is willing to work go on to college, since the GI bill was passed over 50 years ago.

It is a good budget for the American people, but it is important that we be faithful to it. If we are faithful to the agreement, it will help cities like Boston to take sites that have been polluted and are therefore useless now and clean them up and use them to provide for development and new jobs and new opportunities, to make sure this economic recovery reaches people who haven't felt it yet. If we are faithful to it, we can do all these things.

The other thing that I am determined to do, that I spoke a little about in Washington before I left today, is to get a tax bill out of this committee—out of the Congress that helps all the American people. We can pay for this tax cut.

First of all, let me say this: I would not support any tax cut that will bring back the bad old days of exploding deficits. I would not do that. This tax bill, in the first 5 years, is about one-tenth of the cost of the tax bill that was adopted in 1981, when the Reagan administration came in and asked us to adopt trickle-down economics. So we're not talking about a huge bill here. What we are talking about is a bill that is basically the dividend the American people have earned for bringing this economy back. And I believe it's important to pass a bill that will give everyone a fair chance to participate in it and that will be faithful to the budget agreement, which means among other things that we have to provide substantial resources to help middle class people to raise their children and educate them and then keep on getting an education for a lifetime. We have got to make at least 2 years of college as universal in the 21st century as a high school diploma is today.

Why did Boston come back? Why is Massachusetts coming back? Just drive around this town and look at the concentration of world-class universities. Every person in this

country who gets out of high school and has at least 2 years of fine education afterward has a fair chance to get a decent job with a growing income. Everybody who doesn't is likely to get a job with declining incomes.

We must not use this tax bill to help people who don't need it too much without giving the middle class the tools they need to make higher education universal in America in the 21st century. We can do it, and we have to do it.

There are a lot of other things going on there now. We're reviewing this tobacco settlement, and again, a lot of people who have fought for the public health for years and years and years deserve a lot of credit for this. I have no final opinion on it yet, but I will say this: We cannot agree to anything which undermines the capacity of the Federal Government to protect the public health and the health of our children. If this settlement furthers it, we should be for it. If it doesn't, we should not. That ought to be the test.

In the area of crime, let me say the crime rate's going down; that's the good news. The bad news is it's still going up among people under 18 in many places but not in Boston. And the mayor heard me in San Francisco last week saying to the mayors, I am trying to pass a crime bill for juveniles in this country that will give other cities the tools that Boston has used to take us now almost 2 full years without a child under 18 being killed by a handgun. If we can do it here, it ought to be done everywhere in America, and we can do it.

And finally, let me say we've had a remarkable amount of success moving people from welfare to work. But we have to create about another million jobs in the next 4 years. I've done everything I could to mobilize the private sector, but we can do more. Many of you have helped in this regard, and for that I am grateful. In this budget agreement there are specific provisions which will make it easier for us to work with cities and the private sector to hire people to move from welfare to work.

But I would just say on that portion of the budget, everyone who ever criticized the welfare program and everyone who ever said every able-bodied person ought to work, now has a moral obligation to support laws that will make sure there are jobs there. You cannot tell people they have to go to work unless they have work. That is a big moral obligation of this balanced budget, and we dare not pass a budget that walks away from that obligation to people. We have said, ''You have to work.'' We have to give them the jobs and the chance to build dignified, successful lives for themselves and their children.

The last point I would like to make is this: In the end, the success of the United States in the new century will depend upon a remarkable partnership between our Government, our private sector, and individual citizens. I have been very moved by the things that I have seen repeatedly here in Boston in the form of citizen service: the City Year program, the Mayor's Youth Advisory Council, all the people that I've seen volunteering in various aspects of the effort to keep juveniles out of trouble and away from violence. We need more of that.

And finally, we have got to prove that we can become the world's first truly multiracial, multiethnic democracy. A couple of weeks ago, I went out to the University of California at San Diego and asked the American people to join me for at least a year, and maybe longer, in a national conversation about where we are today on the subject of our racial differences, what we have to do to make sure that we are thinking and acting right about this and what new laws and policies we need.

I just leave you with this thought: In the United States today, there is one State only, Hawaii, that has no majority race. Within 3 to 5 years, our largest State, California, will have no majority race. Today, we have 5 school districts with over 100 different racial and ethnic groups represented among the student bodies—5 school districts. Within 2 years, we'll have 12, maybe 15. And within 30 years, there will be no majority race in the United States. We had better start thinking about how we are going to make sure that what we always said, which is that America is a place of ideas and ideals, not a place where there is a dominant race, a dominant class, a dominant in-crowd—we better make sure that's true.

And so I leave you with this. The people of Boston and Massachusetts have embraced the vision that I have painted for the future, more vigorously, more consistently, more ardently than any other place in the United States. I ask you to stay with it. Because if you imagine what the future is going to be and how we would make it, it is clear that if we succeed in becoming the world's first truly multiracial, multiethnic, multireligious democracy, we will be better positioned in the 21st century, even than we are now, to lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity and to give our children a better future than any generation has ever known.

That's what I'm dedicated to. We've got 3½ more years to work for it, and your presence here today has dramatically increased the chances that we will succeed.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:18 p.m. in the Grand Ballroom at the Copley Plaza Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Thomas Menino, of Boston; Alan D. Solomont, national finance chair, and Steve Grossman, national chair, Democratic National Committee; Mike Dukakis, former Governor of Massachusetts and his wife, Kitty; and Joan Menard, Massachusetts State party chair.

Executive Order 13052—Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices

June 30, 1997

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including S. 342, an Act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices, which I signed into law on June 27, 1997, I hereby extend to the Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided by the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288 *et seq.*), and Article I of the Agreement on State and Local Taxation of Foreign Employees of Public International Organizations (T.I.A.S. 12135). This order is not intended to abridge in any respect privileges, exemptions, or immunities that the Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices may have acquired or may acquire by international agreements or by congressional action.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 30, 1997.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., July 1, 1997]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on July 2.

Executive Order 13053—Adding Members to and Extending the President's Council on Sustainable Development

June 30, 1997

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to amend Executive Order 12852 for various purposes, it is hereby ordered that Executive Order 12852, as amended, is further amended by deleting the number "29" from section 1 and inserting the number "35" in lieu thereof; by deleting from 3(d) and 4(a) the text "Department of the Interior" and inserting in lieu thereof the following text: "Department of Energy"; and by deleting from section 4(b) the text "June 29, 1997" and inserting in lieu thereof the following text: "February 28, 1999."

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 30, 1997.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:08 a.m., July 1, 1997]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on July 2.

Proclamation 7011—To Implement the World Trade Organization Ministerial Declaration on Trade in Information Technology Products and the Agreement on Distilled Spirits

June 30, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

1. On December 13, 1996, the first Ministerial Meeting of the World Trade Organization ("the WTO") issued a Declaration On Trade In Information Technology Products ("the ITA"), which established a framework for expanding world trade in information technology products and enhancing market access opportunities for such products. To implement that declaration, 42 WTO members and governments in the process of acceding to the WTO agreed to eliminate duties on information technology products. These products encompass computers and computer equipment, semiconductors and integrated circuits, computer software products, telecommunications equipment, semiconductor manufacturing equipment, and computer-based analytical instruments. The participants further agreed on the common objective of achieving, where appropriate, a common classification of such goods for tariff purposes within the existing nomenclature of the Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System (HS), and on a possible future joint suggestion to the World Customs Organization to update existing HS nomenclature or to otherwise remedy any divergence in classification of such goods or in interpretation of the HS nomenclature.

2. The United States and the European Union, on behalf of its 15 member states, also reached agreement at the WTO Ministerial Meeting on the elimination of duties on certain distilled spirits.

3. Section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) (19 U.S.C. 5321(b)) authorizes the President to proclaim the modification of any duty or staged rate reduction of any duty set forth in Schedule XX for products in tariff categories that were the subject of reciprocal duty elimination or harmonization negotiations during the Uruguay Round, if the United States agrees to such action in a multilateral negotiation under the auspices of the WTO and after compliance with the requirements of section 115 of the URAA (19 U.S.C. 3524). The products covered by the ITA and the Agreement on Distilled Spirits were the subject of reciprocal duty elimination negotiations during the Uruguay Round.

4. Accordingly, pursuant to section 111(b) of the URAA, I have determined to proclaim modifications in the tariff categories and rates of duty set forth in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule ("the HTS"), as set forth in the Annexes to this proclamation.

5. Proclamation 6763 of December 23, 1994, implemented the tariff and other customs treatment resulting from the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations, as set forth in Schedule XX, with respect to the United States. Proclamation 6641 of December 15, 1993, implemented the North American Free Trade Agreement ("the NAFTA") with respect to the United States and incorporated in the HTS the tariff modifications and rules of origin necessary or appropriate to carry out or apply the NAFTA. Certain tariff provisions established by these proclamations, including staged reductions in rates of duty, and certain NAFTA rules of origin must be modified in light of the implementation of the ITA, to ensure that the previously proclaimed tariff and other customs treatment will be continued, and to take into account the tariff treatment provided for in the ITA. Accordingly, I have determined to modify the HTS in order to continue or provide such tariff and other customs treatment.

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

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including but not limited

to section 111(b) of the URAA and section 604 of the 1974 Act, do hereby proclaim:

(1) In order to provide for the immediate or staged elimination of duties on the information technology products covered by the ITA and on certain distilled spirits, and to make conforming changes in other provisions, the HTS is modified as set forth in the Annexes to this proclamation.

(2) The modifications to the HTS made by this proclamation shall be effective with respect to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the dates specified in the Annexes to this proclamation.

(3) All provisions of previous proclamations and Executive orders that are inconsistent with the actions taken in this proclamation are superseded to the extent of such inconsistency.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:07 a.m., July 1, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on July 2.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Most-Favored-Nation Status for Russia

June 30, 1997

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

On September 21, 1994, I determined and reported to the Congress that the Russian Federation 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 Russia 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 the Russian Federation. You will find that the report indicates continued Russian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the area of emigration.

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 the St. James Theatre in New York City

June 30, 1997

I deserve that for that Macarena stunt. [*Laughter*] Thank you, Whoopi. Thank you, cast. Thank you, Maestro. Thank you, orchestra.

You know, the theater is normally dark on Monday night. I think we can certify that this was most certainly not dark tonight, and we thank you from the bottom of our hearts. I thank all those who are here with our Democratic Party. And thank you all for coming tonight.

Someone told me that the last time anything like this was done on Broadway was for President Eisenhower in 1955. All I can say is, the others don't know what they missed. You have brightened all of our days. And I think you have pretty much made it a certainty that tomorrow will not be a tragedy.

Thank you. God bless you all. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:53 p.m. following a performance of the play "A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum." In his remarks, he referred to comedienne Whoopi Goldberg, who starred in the play. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in New York City

June 30, 1997

Thank you very much. Well, you heard Lauren say that Al Gore is the most influential Vice President in history—I let him have all the jokes. [*Laughter*]

I do want to thank my good friend Peter Duchin and his orchestra for being here to-

night. And I want to thank Mr. Billy Porter for that wonderful song he sang. And thank you, Denise Rich, for writing the song, it was wonderful—and the group, you were all great. Thank you. You're going to hear a lot more from that young fellow, I predict. If I could sing like that, I'd be in a different line of work. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Wynton Marsalis, who has always been there for us repeatedly. We were having a discussion around the dinner table tonight about Wynton Marsalis, a man I admire enormously. And I said, I believe that he is the only musician in the world who is the best at what he does in both classical and jazz music. And then someone pointed out that Yo Yo Ma, with the ''Appalachian Suite,'' had come pretty close. And he's helped us, too. So I don't care; you can take your choice. [*Laughter*] But he's a magnificent man. And thank you, Lauren Bacall, for being who you are and for being there for us for all these years. Thank you.

Thanks for being here. You know, one of my immutable laws of politics is that no one should ever have to listen to a speech after 11 o'clock at night. And I'm not running again, anyway; therefore, I will let you out by midnight. [*Laughter*] I'll be very brief.

I want you to remember the last thing the Vice President said. You have helped bring your country to this point through your support, and you are helping us to continue to take it in the direction that it is now headed, which is very different from 5 years ago.

I am so grateful to have had the chance to serve as President. I'm grateful, especially, to the people of New York who gave us right at 60 percent of the vote in the last election and a huge plurality of well over 1.7 million votes, about 25 percent of our total—just under 25 percent of our total national plurality came from the generosity of the people of New York State, and I will never forget that. Judith Hope, our State democratic chair, told me that we carried President Roosevelt's home county, which is apparently something that never happened when he was here. [*Laughter*] That's just because they didn't know me as well, and I thank them for that. [*Laughter*]

Let me say to you, when you go home tonight and you get up tomorrow and you think about why you do all this, I think the most useful question you can ask yourself is, what would you like your country to look like in 30 years? What would you like your country to look like when your children or your grandchildren are your age? That's a question I try to force myself to ask and answer every single day I do this job.

And it may sound trite now because I've said it so many times, but I don't have any better definition of that answer than I did when I started more than 6 years ago now. I want my country to be a place where the American dream is alive for everybody who is responsible enough to work for it. I want our country to be a community that's coming together and celebrating the differences among us, not being driven apart by them. And I want us to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity well into the next century.

We're a lot closer to that today than we were 5 years ago because of the condition of the economy; because we are ending the structural deficit in the Government; because we have developed a serious approach to move people from welfare to work, not to punish them or their children; because we developed a serious approach to reduce the crime rate and make people safer on their streets, not just talk tough about it; because we've made a good beginning in education and the environment and done a lot of things around the world.

But we still have a lot to do. It really matters not only that we balance this budget but how we do it and whether we really empower people who need to be helped by this budget. If the budget we want passes, it will have—for people that tell you there's nothing very significant in it, you decide. It will have the biggest increase in children's health coverage since the passage of Medicaid in 1965. It will have the biggest increase in Federal support for education since 1965. It will have the biggest increase in Federal support to help all kinds of people who need it go to college since the GI bill was passed 52 years ago. I think it's a budget worth fighting for. It's a budget I'm very proud of.

We still have a lot to do in other areas. We've got a lot to do in the area of the environment. We took a tough decision last week

on clean air rules, and we're going to work with our cities and our businesses to meet those clean air rules, but it matters whether the air is clean. There are too many children with asthma in this country; there are too many problems. It matters.

We're going to have to make some other tough decisions. The United States has 4 percent of the world's population; we produce 20 percent of the greenhouse gases that are warming our planet. It's led to the most disruptive weather patterns anybody can remember over the last 4 or 5 years. We owe it to our children not to take a stable universe away from them. It's not very complicated. And can we find a way to grow our economy and do that? Of course we can. We're smart. We can do that. But we have to do it.

We still have to find a way to honor the intergenerational compact that is the test of any great society. We do well by the elderly, and we don't do very well by the poor—the children in this country. Twenty percent of them are living below the poverty line, and it's hard for them to get the chances they need in life. And I am determined that before I leave office we will balance the intergenerational equities and take care of our children better, because we have to for our future.

Finally, just let me say this. I knew something—I thought I knew something about people who couldn't get along with one another because of their differences, because I grew up in the segregated South. I thought I knew something about that. And then I became President, and I saw what happened in Bosnia and Rwanda and Burundi. And I saw what happened when my kinfolks in Ireland still insist on shooting each other over 600-year-old fights that children can barely explain. And I thought after we signed that first peace agreement in the Middle East we would have an irreversible process because people would see it just did not make any sense to hold on to old hatreds. But they die hard.

And I don't care what anybody says—you know, yes, there is an entitlements issue that we have to face on Social Security, but my generation is not going to bankrupt our children and grandchildren. Fundamentally, that's an accounting problem; it'll get fixed. The biggest problem is whether we can muster the wisdom and strength of spirit to treat each other with respect and not just abide each other's differences of all kinds but to actually relish them and be glad that we have all this diversity in our country. Because if we can do that and then be united as one America by shared values, then we're way the best positioned democracy in the world for the next century. But this is a very important thing that you have to understand.

So as you leave here tonight, I want you to think about that. We've still got a lot of work to do before the new century comes in. There are 5 school districts in America with more than 100 different racial and ethnic groups among the students in them. Within 2 years, there will be 12. Before you know it, there will be 20. There's only one State in the country that has no majority race, Hawaii. Within 3 to 5 years, California won't. Within 30 years, the United States won't. We always say we're bound together by our shared values. We're about to find out. [*Laughter*] Hold on, we're about to find out.

And every one of us who can be in this room tonight because of our financial or political position or whatever, we have a special responsibility to the people who will follow behind us. The United States has got an incredible opportunity here. And I'm going to keep trying to make peace in the Middle East and Northern Ireland and do what I can to help Africa. I'm going to do everything I can in this term to try to resolve the differences between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus. I'm going to support what's now going on, finally, where the Indians and Pakistanis are talking. I'm going to do all that. But just remember, all those people live in America.

And we have other differences as well. Sometimes I think that we couldn't live if we couldn't look down on somebody who is different from us. Sometimes I wonder if it's just sort of endemic to human nature, you know. Every one of you has done this, I know—at least I have. I'll plead guilty. Haven't you had a bad day when you just were really down on yourself and you said, "Well, no matter how bad I am, at least I'm not him or her"? I mean, it's almost like endemic, and we have to fight that because we are the most richly blessed country in the

world. Here we are, going into this global society, and everybody's right here.

And if we have the discipline to give excellence in education, if we have the discipline to preserve the environment while we grow the economy, if we have the discipline to eliminate the intergenerational imbalance and give children health care just like we give it to senior citizens, if we have the discipline to do these things and to continue to fulfill our responsibilities in the world, the best days of this country are still ahead of us, and the people in this room will not live to see them. And that's good. That's good. That's our responsibility. And that's what this administration is all about, and that's what your presence here is helping to further. And for that, we are profoundly grateful.

God bless you, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:25 in the Ballroom at the Plaza Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to actress Lauren Bacall and musicians Peter Duchin, Billy Porter, Denise Rich, Wynton Marsalis, and Yo Yo Ma.

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, Macadara 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, every-

where in the world. Not only will industry leaders such as IBM be able to tap in to new markets, but the smallest start-up 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; and Macadara MacColl, managing director, Parent Soup.

Statement on Electronic Commerce

July 1, 1997

As I unveil our electronic commerce initiative, I am also pleased to announce that I signed a memorandum [1] 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.

Memorandum on Electronic Commerce

July 1, 1997

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

[1] White House correction.

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 regulations 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 ex-

cellence 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 at 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 Cal Ripken, Orioles third baseman. 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 Jimmy 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 se-

curity 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 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 call off their march——

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 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 I call, a quote, ''the arrogance of the U.S. superpower which wants to rule the world politically and economically,'' and 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 they 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 per-

centage 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.

European-American Relations

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 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.

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.

The Balkans

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.

Palma de Mallorca

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 President Jacques Chirac of France; Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany; President Jose Maria Aznar of Spain; and Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom. A portion of this interview could not be vertified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks at a Madrid 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 Goldberg 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 Office 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, the 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.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

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

June 28

The President announced his intention to appoint Norman J. Ornstein and Leslie Moonves as Cochairs of the Advisory Committee on Public Interest Obligations of Digital Television Broadcasters.

June 29

In the evening, the President and Hillary Clinton returned to the White House from a weekend stay at Camp David, MD.

June 30

In the morning, the President traveled to Boston, MA. He traveled to New York City in the afternoon, and returned to Washington, DC, after midnight.

The President announced the nomination of Wendy Ruth Sherman to be Counselor of the Department of State with the rank of Ambassador.

The President announced his nomination of Maura Harty to be Ambassador to Paraguay.

The President announced his nomination of Curtis Warren Kamman to be Ambassador to Colombia.

The President announced his nomination of Anne Marie Sigmund to be Ambassador to the Kyrgyz Republic.

The President announced his nomination of Daniel V. Speckhard to be Ambassador to Belarus.

July 1

The White House announced that the President promoted J. Terry Edmonds to the position of Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy Director of Speechwriting.

The White House announced that the President promoted Stephanie S. Streett to the position of Assistant to the President and Director of Presidential Scheduling.

The White House announced that the President promoted Michael Waldman to be Assistant to the President and Director of Speechwriting.

The White House announced that the President appointed Paul Begala as Assistant to the President and Counselor to the President, a role he will assume in August.

The White House announced that the President named Sidney Blumenthal as Assistant to the President as part of the communications team, which he will join in August.

The White House announced that the President will meet with President Eduard Shevardnadze of Georgia at the White House on July 18.

The White House announced that the President will meet with President Heydar Aliyev of Azerbaijan at the White House on August 1.

July 2

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Baltimore, MD, where he met with Baltimore Orioles and Philadelphia Phillies players at Oriole Park at Camden Yards before attending the game. Following the game, the President returned to Washington, DC.

The White House announced that the President and Hillary Clinton will depart for

Spain on the evening of July 4, and that they will have a private visit with King Juan Carlos and Queen Sofia of Spain in Palma de Mallorca on July 7. They then will travel to Madrid, where the President will participate in the NATO Summit, July 8–9.

The President announced the nomination of Gordon D. Giffin to be Ambassador to Canada.

The President announced the nomination of James F. Mack to be Ambassador to Guyana.

July 3

The President announced his intention to nominate Hershel Gober to be Secretary of the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

The President announced his intention to nominate Rita D. Hayes as Deputy U.S. Trade Representative in Geneva.

The White House announced that the President has accepted the invitation of Queen Margrethe II of Denmark to stay at her summer palace, following his arrival in Denmark on July 11. He will meet with the Prime Minister and address the people of Denmark on July 12.

The White House announced that on July 17, the President will address the 88th annual convention of the NAACP in Pittsburgh, PA, and the national convention of the National Association of Black Journalists in Chicago, IL.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

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

Released June 30

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, National Economic Adviser Gene Sperling, Office of Management and Budget Director Franklin Raines, and Council of Economic Advisers Chair Janet Yellen on the President's tax cut proposal

Released July 1

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the upcoming visit of President Eduard Shevardnadze of Georgia

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the upcoming visit of President Heydar Aliyev of Azerbaijan

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the appointment of Assistant to the President and Director of Presidential Scheduling

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the appointment of Assistant to the President and Counselor to the President

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the appointment of Assistant to the President, Communications Team

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the appointment of Assistant to the President and Director of Speechwriting

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the appointment of Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy Director of Speechwriting

Announcement of actions to promote electronic commerce around the world

Released July 2

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Adviser Samuel Berger, Secretary of Defense William Cohen, and Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott on the upcoming NATO Summit in Madrid, Spain

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's upcoming visit to Spain for the NATO Summit

Released July 3

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's upcoming visit to Denmark

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President will address the conventions of the NAACP and the National Association of Black Journalists on July 17

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

Acts Approved by the President

Approved July 3

H.R. 363 / Public Law 105–23
To amend section 2118 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to extend the Electric and Magnetic Fields Research and Public Information Dissemination program

H.R. 1306 / Public Law 105–24
Riegle-Neal Amendments Act of 1997

H.R. 1553 / Public Law 105–25
To amend the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 to extend the authorization of the Assassination Records Review Board until September 30, 1998

H.R. 1902 / Public Law 105–26
Charitable Donation Antitrust Immunity Act of 1997