AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, July 13, 1998
Volume 34—Number 28
Pages 1311–1361

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

China, business community in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region—1312
Compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, memorandum signing—1331
Congressional Medal of Honor, presentation—1354
Florida, firefighters and relief workers in Daytona Beach—1351
Georgia
  Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee luncheon in Atlanta—1347
  National youth antidrug media campaign in Atlanta—1344
Gun safety and responsibility—1334
Medicare and the legislative agenda—1328
"Presidential Dialogue on Race" on PBS—1336
Radio address—1327

Communications to Congress

Emigration policies of certain former Eastern bloc states, letter transmitting report—1354
Libya, continuation of national emergency, letter reporting—1330

Communications to Federal Agencies

Compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, memorandum—1333
Joint Institute for Food Safety Research, memorandum—1326
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, memorandum—1344

Interviews With the News Media

Exchange with reporters in the Rose Garden—1328
News conference in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China, July 3 (No. 162)—1317

Joint Statements

Joint Statement on South Asia—1311
Joint Statement on U.S.-Polish Relations—1356

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

China, President Jiang—1311
Poland, Prime Minister Buzek—1356

Statements by the President

Death of M.K.O. Abiola of Nigeria—1334
Senate action
  Higher education reauthorization legislation—1356
  India-Pakistan sanctions legislation—1354
  Internal Revenue Service reform legislation—1354

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1361
Checklist of White House press releases—1360
Digest of other White House announcements—1358
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1359

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

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

Joint Statement on South Asia

June 27, 1998

Introduction

Recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan, and the resulting increase in tension between them, are a source of deep and lasting concern to both of us. Our shared interests in a peaceful and stable South Asia and in a strong global nonproliferation regime have been put at risk by these tests, which we have joined in condemning. We have agreed to continue to work closely together, within the P–5, the Security Council and with others, to prevent an accelerating nuclear and missile arms race in South Asia, strengthen international nonproliferation efforts, and promote reconciliation and the peaceful resolution of differences between India and Pakistan.

Preventing a Nuclear and Missile Race in South Asia

The P–5 Joint Communique of June 4, which was endorsed by UN Security Council Resolution 1172, sets out clear and comprehensive objectives and a plan for action to address the threat of South Asian nuclear and missile arms race. We pledge our full support for the steps outlined in the Joint Communique, and again call on India and Pakistan to stop all further nuclear tests and adhere immediately and unconditionally to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), to refrain from weaponization or deployment of nuclear weapons and from the testing or deployment of missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons, and to enter into firm commitments not to weaponize or deploy nuclear weapons or missiles capable of delivering them.

Strengthening Global Nonproliferation Cooperation

The United States and China remain firmly committed to strong and effective international cooperation on nuclear nonproliferation, with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as its cornerstone. We will continue to bolster global nuclear nonproliferation efforts, and reiterate that our goal is adherence of all countries, including India and Pakistan, to the NPT as it stands, without any modification. States that do not adhere to the Treaty cannot expect to be accorded the same benefits and international standing as are accorded to NPT parties. Notwithstanding their recent nuclear tests, India and Pakistan do not have the status of nuclear weapons states in accordance with the NPT.

We reaffirm our determination to fulfill our commitments relating to nuclear disarmament under Article VI of the NPT. To this end, both countries have signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and do not intend to resume nuclear testing.

We call for the prompt initiation and conclusion of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, on the basis of the 1995 agreed mandate, for a multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. We urge India and Pakistan to participate, in a positive spirit, in such negotiations with other states in the Conference on Disarmament with a view to reaching early agreement.

We both actively support the Strengthened Safeguards System now being implemented by the IAEA, and will promptly take steps to implement it in our countries.

Reducing Tensions and Encouraging the Peaceful Resolution of Differences Between India and Pakistan

We are committed to assist where possible India and Pakistan to resolve peacefully the difficult and long-standing differences between them, including the issue of Kashmir. We welcome the resumption of dialogue between the two countries and encourage them

to continue such dialogue, and we stand ready to assist in the implementation of confidence-building measures between them, and encourage the consideration of additional measures of this type.

Responsibilities of the United States and China

The United States and China have long sought friendly relations with both India and Pakistan. We reaffirm this goal and our hope that we can jointly and individually contribute to the achievement of a peaceful, prosperous, and secure South Asia. As P–5 members, and as states with important relationships with the countries of the region, we recognize our responsibility to contribute actively to the maintenance of peace, stability and security in the region, and to do all we can to address the root causes of tension.

We reaffirm that our respective policies are to prevent the export of equipment, materials or technology that could in any way assist programs in India or Pakistan for nuclear weapons or for ballistic missiles capable of delivering such weapons, and that to this end, we will strengthen our national export control systems.

Next Steps

Close coordination between the United States and China is essential to building strong international support behind the goals to which we are committed in response to nuclear testing by India and Pakistan. We will stay closely in touch on this issue, and will work with other members of the P–5 and the Security Council, with other Asian and Pacific countries, and with the broader international community to forestall further instability in South Asia, achieve a peaceful and mutually acceptable resolution of differences between India and Pakistan, and strengthen the global nonproliferation regime.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks to the Business Community in Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China

July 3, 1998

Thank you very much. To Jeff Muir, and Victor Fong, thank you both for your fine remarks and for hosting me. I thank all the members of the Hong Kong Trade Development Council and the American Chamber of Commerce for making this forum available, and so many of you for coming out on this morning for what will be my last public speech, except for my press conference, which the members of the press won't permit to become a speech, before I go home.

It has been a remarkable trip for my wife and family and for the Senate delegation and members of our Cabinet and White House. And we are pleased to be ending it here.

I want to say a special word of appreciation to Secretary Albright and Secretary Daley, to Senator Rockefeller, Senator Baucus, Senator Akaka, Congressman Dingell, Congressman Hamilton, Congressman Markey, and the other members of the administration and citizens who have accompanied me on this very long and sometimes exhausting but ultimately, I believe, very productive trip for the people of the United States and the people of China.

I'm glad to be back in Hong Kong. As I told Chief Executive Tung and the members of the dinner party last night, I actually—I may be the first sitting President to come to Hong Kong, but this is my fourth trip here. I was able to come three times before, once with Hillary, in the period which we now refer to as back when we had a life—[*laughter*]—before I became President. And I look forward to coming again in the future.

I think it's quite appropriate for our trip to end in Hong Kong, because, for us Americans, Hong Kong is China's window on the world. I have seen remarkable changes taking place in China, and since the possibilities of its future—much of which clearly is and for some time has been visible here in Hong Kong, with its free and open markets and its vibrant entrepreneurial atmosphere.

Devoid of natural resources, Hong Kong always has had to fall back on the most important resource of all, its people. The entrepreneurs, the artists, the visionaries, the hardworking, everyday people have accomplished things that have made the whole world marvel. Hong Kong people have dreamed, designed, and built some of the world's tallest buildings and longest bridges. When Hong Kong ran out of land, the people simply went to the sea and got more. To the average person from a landlocked place, that seems quite stunning.

I thank you for giving me a chance to come here today to talk about the relationship between the United States and all of Asia. I have had a great deal of time to emphasize the importance of our future ties with China, and I would like to reiterate them today and mention some of the points that the two previous speakers made. But I would like to put it in the context of the entire region. And after all, it is the entire region that has been critical to the success of Hong Kong.

We have a fundamental interest in promoting stability and prosperity in Asia. Our future is tied to Asia's. A large and growing percentage of our exports, our imports, and our investments involve Asian nations. As President, besides this trip to China, I have been to Japan, Korea, Indonesia, the Philippines, Australia, and Thailand, with more to come. I have worked with the region's leaders on economic, political, and security issues. The recent events in South Asia, in Indonesia, in financial markets all across the region remind the American people just how very closely our future is tied to Asia's.

Over the course of two centuries, the United States and Asian nations have built a vast, rich, complex, dynamic relationship—forged in the beginning by trade, strained on occasion by misunderstanding, tempered by three wars in living memory, enriched by the free flow of ideas, ideals, and culture. Now, clearly, at the dawn of the 21st century, our futures are inextricably bound together—bound by a mutual interest in seeking to free future generations from the specter of war. As I said, Americans can remember three wars we have fought in Asia. We must make it our mission to avoid another.

The cornerstone of our security in Asia remains our relationship of longstanding with five key democratic allies: Japan, South Korea, Australia, Thailand, the Philippines. Our military presence in Asia is essential to that stability, in no small measure because everyone knows we have no territorial ambitions of any kind.

Nowhere is this more evident than on the Korean Peninsula, where still every day, after 40 years, 40,000 American troops patrol a border that has known war and could know war again. We clearly have an interest in trying to get a peace on the Korean Peninsula. We will continue to work with China to advance our efforts in the four-party talks, to encourage direct and open dialog between North and South Korea, to faithfully implement the agreement with North Korea to end their nuclear weapons program, and to insist that North Korea do the same.

I am encouraged by the openness and the energy of South Korea's new leader, Kim Dae-jung. Last month, in an address to our Congress, he said, "It is easier to get a passerby to take off his coat with sunshine than with a strong wind."

Of course, our security is also enormously enhanced by a positive partnership with a prosperous, stable, increasingly open China, working with us, as we are, on the challenges of South Asian nuclear issues, the financial crisis in the region, the Korean peace effort, and others.

Our oldest ties to Asia are those of trade and commerce, and now they've evolved into some of our strongest. The fur pelts and cottons our first traders bought here more than 200 years ago have given way to software and medical instruments. Hong Kong is now America's top consumer for cell phones. Today, roughly a third of our exports and 4 million jobs depend on our trade to Asia. As was earlier said, over 1,000 American companies have operations in Hong Kong alone. And as we've seen in recent months, when markets tremble in Tokyo or Hong Kong, they cause tremors around the world.

That is why I have not only sought to ease the Asian economic difficulties but to institutionalize a regional economic partnership through the Asian Pacific Economic Council

leaders meetings that we started in Seattle, Washington, in 1993, and which in every year since has advanced the cause of economic integration and growth in the region. That is why I'm also working to broaden and deepen our economic partnership with China and China's integration into the world economic framework.

It clearly is evident to anyone who knows about our relationship that the United States supports China's economic growth through trade. We, after all, purchase 30 percent of the exports of China, far more than any other country in the world, far more than our percentage of the world's GDP.

We very much want China to be a member of the World Trade Organization. We understand the enormous challenges that the Chinese Government faces in privatizing the state industries and doing so at a rate and in a way which will permit people who lose their jobs in the state industries to be reintegrated into a changing economy and have jobs and be able to educate their children, find a place to live, and succeed in a stable society.

So the real question with this WTO accession is not whether the United States wants China in the WTO. Of course, we do. And the real question, in fairness to China, is not whether China is willing to be a responsible international partner in the international financial system. I believe they are. The question is, how do you resolve the tension between the openness requirements for investment and for trade through market access of the WTO with the strains that are going to be imposed on China anyway as it undertakes to speed up the economic transition and the change of employment base within its own country?

We are trying to work these things out. We believe that there must be an end agreement that contains strong terms that are commercially reasonable. We understand that China has to have some transitional consideration because of the challenges at home. I think we'll work this out. But I want you to understand that we in the United States very much want China to be a member of the WTO. We would like it to happen sooner, rather than later, but we understand that we have not only American but global interests to consider in making sure that when the whole process is over that the terms are fair and open and further the objectives of more open trade and investment across the world.

I also would say in that connection, I am strongly supporting the extension of normal trading status, or MFN, to China. I was encouraged by the vote in the House Ways and Means Committee shortly before we left. I hope we will be successful there. I think anything any of you can do to support the integrity of the existing obligations that all of us have including and especially in the area of intellectual property, will be very helpful in that regard in helping us to move forward.

In addition to trade and security ties, the United States and Asia are bound by family ties, perhaps our most vital ones. Seven million Americans today trace their roots to Asia, and the percentage of our citizens who are Asian-Americans is growing quite rapidly. These roots are roots they are eager to renew or rebuild or to keep. Just last year 3.4 million Americans traveled to Asia; 7.8 million Asians traveled to the United States. Thousands of young people are crossing the Pacific to study, and in so doing, building friendships that will form the foundations of cooperation and peace for the 21st century. All across the region we see evidence that the values of freedom and democracy are also burning in the hearts of the people in the East as well as the West. From Japan to the Philippines, South Korea to Mongolia, democracy has found a permanent home in Asia.

As the world becomes smaller, the ties between Asia and the United States—the political ties, the family ties, the trade ties, the security ties—they will only become stronger. Consider this one little statistic: In 1975 there were 33 million minutes of telephone traffic between the U.S. and Asia; in 1996 there were 4.2 billion minutes of such traffic, a 127-fold increase. That doesn't count the Internet growth that is about to occur that will be truly staggering.

Now, the result of all this is that you and I in our time have been given a remarkable opportunity to expand and share the storehouse of human knowledge, to share the building of wealth, to share the fights against disease and poverty, to share efforts to protect the environment, and bridge age-old

gaps of history and culture that have caused too much friction and misunderstanding.

This may be the greatest moment of actual possibility in human history. At the same time, the greater openness, the pace of change, the nature of the global economy, all these things have brought with them disruption. They create the risk of greater gaps between rich and poor, between those equipped for the information age and those who aren't. It means that problems, whether they are economic problems or environmental problems, that begin in one country can quickly spread beyond that country's borders. It means that we're all more vulnerable in a more open atmosphere to security threats that cross national borders, to terrorism, to drug smuggling, to organized crime, to people who would use weapons of mass destruction.

Now, how are we going to deepen this relationship between the U.S. and Asia, since all of us recognize that it is in our interest and it will further our values? I believe there are three basic lessons that we can learn from the immediate past that should guide our path to the future.

First, building economies and people, not weapons of mass destruction, is every nation's best path to greatness. The vast majority of nations are moving away from not toward nuclear weapons, and away from the notion that their influence in the future will be defined by the size of their military rather than the size of their GDP and the percentage of their citizens who know a great deal about the world.

India and Pakistan's recent nuclear test, therefore, buck the tide of history. This is all the more regrettable because of the enormous potential of both countries. The United States has been deeply enriched by citizens from both India and Pakistan who have done so very well in America. They and their relatives could be doing very well at home, and therefore, could be advancing their nations' cause around the world. Both these countries could achieve real, different, fundamental greatness in the 21st century, but it will never happen if they divert precious resources from their people to develop nuclear and huge military arsenals.

We have worked hard with China and other leading nations to forge an international consensus to prevent an intensifying arms race on the Indian subcontinent. We don't seek to isolate India and Pakistan, but we do seek to divert them from a self-defeating, dangerous, and costly course. We encourage both nations to stop testing, to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, to settle their differences through peaceful dialog.

The second lesson that we should take into the future is that nations will only enjoy true and lasting prosperity when governments are open, honest, and fair in their practices, and when they regulate and supervise financial markets rather than direct them.

Too many booming economies, too many new skyscrapers now vacant and in default were built on shaky foundations of cronyism, corruption, and overextended credit, undermining the confidence of investors with sudden, swift, and severe consequences. The financial crisis, as all of you know far better than I, has touched nearly all the nations and households of Asia. Restoring economic stability and growth will not be easy. The steps required will be politically unpopular and will take courage. But the United States will do all we can to help any Asian government willing to work itself back to financial health. We have a big interest in the restoration of growth, starting the flows of investment back into Asia.

There is a very limited time period in which we can absorb all the exports to try to do our part to keep the Asian economy going. And while we may enjoy a brief period of surging extra investment, over the long run, stable growth everywhere in the world is the best prescription for stable growth in America.

We are seeing some positive steps. Yesterday Japan announced the details of its new and potentially quite significant banking reform proposals. We welcome them. Thailand and Korea are taking decisive action to implement the IMF-supported economic reform programs of their countries. Indonesia has a fresh opportunity to deepen democratic roots and to address the economic challenges before it. Thanks to the leadership of President Jiang and Premier Zhu, China has followed a disciplined, wise policy of resisting

competitive devaluations that could threaten the Chinese economy, the region's, and the world's.

Even as your own economy, so closely tied to those of Asia, inevitably feels the impact of these times, Hong Kong continues to serve as a force for stability. With strong policies to address the crisis, a healthy respect for the rule of law, a strong system of financial regulation and supervision, a commitment to working with all nations, Hong Kong can help to lead Asia out of turbulent times as it contributes to China's astonishing transformation by providing investment capital and expertise in privatizing state enterprises and sharing legal and regulatory experience.

The final lesson I believe is this: Political freedom, respect for human rights, and support for representative governments are both morally right and ultimately the best guarantors of stability in the world of the 21st century. This spring the whole world looked on with deep interest as courageous citizens in Indonesia raised their voices in protest against corruption and government practices that have brought their nation's economy to its knees. They demonstrated for change, for the right to elect leaders fully accountable to them. And in just 2 weeks the universal longing for democratic, responsive, accountable government succeeded in altering their political future.

America will stand by the people of Indonesia and others as they strive to become part of the rising tide of freedom around the world. Some worry that widespread political participation and loud voices of dissent can pull a nation apart. Some nations have a right to worry about instability because of the pain of their own past. But nonetheless, I fundamentally disagree, especially given the dynamics of the 21st century global society.

Why? Democracy is rooted in the propositions that all people are entitled to equal treatment and an equal voice in choosing their leaders and that no individual or group is so wise or so all-knowing to make all the decisions that involve unfettered power over other people. The information age has brought us yet another argument for democracy. It has given us a global economy that is based on, more than anything else, ideas. A torrent of new ideas are generating untold growth and opportunity, not only for individuals and firms, but for nations. As I saw again in Shanghai when I met with a dozen incredibly impressive Chinese entrepreneurs, ideas are creating wealth in this economy.

Now, it seems to me, therefore, inevitable that societies with the freest flow of ideas are most likely to be both successful and stable in the new century. When difficulties come, as they do to every country and in all ages—there is never a time that is free of difficulties—it seems to me that open debate and unconventional views are most likely to help countries most quickly overcome the difficulties of unforeseen developments.

Let me ask you this: A year ago, when you celebrated the turnover from Great Britain to China of Hong Kong, what was everybody buzzing about after the speeches were over? Will this really work? Will this two-system thing work? Will we be able to keep elections? Will this work? How many people were off in a corner saying, you know, this is a pretty tough time to be doing this, because a year from now the whole Asian economy is going to be in collapse, and how in the world will we deal with this? When you cannot foresee the future and when problems coming on you have to bring forth totally new thinking, the more open the environment, the quicker countries will respond. I believe this is profoundly important.

I also believe that by providing a constructive outlet for the discontent that will always exist in every society—because there is no perfect place, and because people have different views and experience reality differently—and by finding a way to give everybody some sense of empowerment and role in a society, that freedom breeds the responsibility without which the open, highly changing societies of the 21st century simply cannot succeed.

For all these reasons, I think the forces of history will move all visionary people, including Asians, with their legendary assets of hard work, intelligence, and education, toward freer, more democratic societies and ways of ordering their affairs.

For me, these lessons we must carry forward into the new century. And in this time of transition and change, as we deepen America's partnership with Asia, success will

come to those who invest in the positive potential of their people, not weapons to destroy others. Open governments and the rule of law are essential to lasting prosperity. Freedom and democracy are the birthrights of all people and the best guarantors of national stability and progress.

Now, as I said, a little over a year ago, no one could have predicted what you would have to endure today in the form of this crisis. But I am confident Hong Kong will get through this and will help to lead the region out of it, because of the lessons that I have just mentioned, and because they have been a part of the fabric of your life here for a very long time.

For years, Hong Kong people have enjoyed the right to organize public demonstrations, due process under law, 43 newspapers and 700 periodicals, giving life to the principle of government accountability, debate, free and open. All this must continue. The world was impressed by the record turnout for your May elections. The results were a mandate for more democracy, not less, and faster, not slower strides toward political freedom. I look forward to the day when all of the people of Hong Kong realize the rights and responsibilities of full democracy.

I think we should all pledge, each in our own way, to build that kind of future, a future where we build people up, not tear our neighbors down; a future where we order our affairs in a legal, predictable, open way; a future where we try to tap the potential and recognize the authority of each individual.

I'm told that this magnificent convention center was built in the shape of a soaring bird on a patch of land reclaimed from the sea. It's an inspiring symbol of the possibilities of Hong Kong, of all of Asia, and of our relationship with Asia. Just a couple of days ago, Hong Kong celebrated its first anniversary of reversion to China. I am going home for America's 222d anniversary tomorrow.

May the future of this special place, of China, of the relationship between the United States and China and Asia, soar like the bird that gave life to this building.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:42 a.m. in the Hong Kong Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Jeff Muir, chairman, American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong; Victor Fong, chairman, Hong Kong Trade Development Council; Chief Executive C.H. Tung of Hong Kong; and President Jiang Zemin and Premier Zhu Rongji of China.

The President's News Conference in Hong Kong

July 3, 1998

The President. Good afternoon. I know most of the American journalists here are looking forward, as I am, to returning home for the Fourth of July. But I didn't want to leave China without first reflecting on the trip and giving you a chance to ask some questions.

Let me begin, however, by thanking the people who came with me, who worked so hard on this trip: Secretary Albright, Secretary Rubin, Charlene Barshefsky, Secretary Daley, Secretary Glickman, Janet Yellen, Mark Gearan. I'd like to say a special word of thanks to all the members of the White House staff who worked so hard to prepare me for this trip, along with the Cabinet Secretaries. I want to thank the congressional delegation: Senator Akaka, Senator Rockefeller, Senator Baucus, Congressman Hamilton, Congressman Dingell, and Congressman Markey, and also the staff of the Embassy and the consulates.

Over the past week, we have seen the glory of China's past in Xi'an, the vibrancy of its present in Beijing, the promise of its future in Shanghai and Hong Kong. I don't think anyone who was on this trip could fail to appreciate the remarkable transformation that is underway in China as well as the distance still to be traveled.

I visited a village that chooses its own leaders in free elections. I saw cell phones and computers carrying ideas, information, and images around the world. I had the opportunity to talk directly to the Chinese people through national television about why we value human rights and individual freedom so highly. I joined more than 2,000 people in worship in a Beijing church. I spoke to the next generation of China's leaders at Beijing University, to people working for change in law, academia, business, and the arts, to

average Chinese during a radio call-in show. I saw the explosion of skyscrapers and one of the world's most modern stock exchanges in Shanghai. I met with environmentalists in Guilin to talk about the challenge China faces in developing its economy while improving its environment. And here in Hong Kong we end the trip where I hope China's future begins, a place where free expression and free markets flourish under the rule of law.

Clearly, China is changing, but there remain powerful forces resisting change, as evidenced by continuing governmental restrictions on free speech, assembly, and freedom of worship. One of the questions I have tried to frame on this trip for the future is how do we deal with these issues in a way most likely to promote progress? The answer I think is clear: dealing directly, forcefully, but respectfully with the Chinese about our values.

Over the past week, I have engaged not only the leadership but the Chinese people about our experience and about the fact that democracy is a universal aspiration, about my conviction that in the 21st century democracy also will be the right course practically as well as morally, yielding more stability and more progress.

At the same time, expanding our areas of cooperation with China advances our interests: stability in Asia, nonproliferation, the rule of law, science and technology, fighting international crime and drugs, and protecting the environment. The relationship between our two countries is terribly important. The hard work we've accomplished has put that relationship on a much more positive and productive footing. That is good for America, good for China, good for Asia, good for the world.

Now I look forward to returning home and pressing for progress on a number of fronts: passing a balanced budget that makes the investments in education and research we need for the 21st century; expanding health care and providing a Patients' Bill of Rights; pursuing campaign finance reform; protecting our children from the dangers of tobacco.

Now I'd be happy to take your questions, and I'd like to begin with Mr. Bazinet. [Kenneth Bazinet, United Press International]

President's Trip to China

Q. Mr. President, from your staff to President Jiang Zemin, this trip has been hailed as a success. But we are leaving here with one symbolic agreement. I wonder if you could explain to us what exactly or how exactly you will show your critics back in Congress that you did meet your expectations on this trip. Thank you.

The President. Well, on the substance, I think we have reinforced our common commitment to regional security, which is terribly important given the progress I believe can be made in the next several months, in the next couple of years in Korea, and the job we have to do in South Asia with India and Pakistan. We made substantial progress in nonproliferation, not only in detargeting but in other areas as well. We got a significant commitment from the Chinese to take another step toward full participation in the Missile Technology Control Regime. We had an agreement on the rule of law which I believe practically—these rule of law issues I think will practically do an enormous amount to change the lives of ordinary Chinese citizens, not only in regularizing commercial dealings but in helping them with other daily problems that impinge on freedom if they're not fairly and fully resolved.

I'm pleased by the science and technology initiative that we signed, which has already produced significant benefits for both our people. I'm very pleased that we now have a Peace Corps agreement with China. And I think we have really broken some ground in cooperation on the environment. And again I say that I think China and the United States will both have heavy responsibilities to our own people and to the rest of the world in this area.

I believe that the fact that we debated openly these matters at the press conference of our disagreements is quite important, as well. And I might say that a lot of the democracy activists from Hong Kong said that they felt that in some ways the fact that we had this public discussion, the President of China and I, in the press conference might have a bigger impact over the long run on the human rights picture than anything else that happened here.

I have acknowledged in candor that we have not made as much progress on some of the trade issues as I had hoped, but I also now have a much clearer understanding of the Chinese perspective. I think they want to be in the WTO; I think they want to assume the responsibilities of opening their markets and taking down barriers and allowing more investment. But I think, understandably, since they are also committed to privatizing state-owned industries, they have big chunks of unemployment for which they have to create big chunks of employment. And they want to have a timing for WTO membership that will permit them to continue to absorb into the workforce people that are displaced from the state industries.

So I have an idea now about how we may be able to go back home, put our heads together, and come up with another proposal or two that will enable us to push forward our trade agenda with the Chinese. So in all those areas, I think that we made substantial, substantive progress.

Mr. Hunt. [Terence Hunt, Associated Press]

Strategic Partnership With China

Q. Mr. President, have you and President Jiang Zemin achieved the constructive strategic partnership that you've talked about? What do you mean by that term, and how can you have that kind of a relationship with a country that you say unfairly restricts American businesses?

The President. For one thing, I don't think it's the only country in the world where we don't have complete fair access to the markets. We still have trade differences with Japan, which is a very close ally of ours, and a number of other countries. So we don't have—we can have a strategic partnership with a country with whom we do not have a perfect relationship.

I think that—first of all, let me remind you about what our interests are. We have profound interest in a stable Asia that is progressing. We have a profound interest in a partnership with the world's largest country in areas where we can't solve problems without than kind of partnership, and I cite Korea, the Indian subcontinent, the Asian financial crisis, and the environmental challenges we face as examples of that. So I think that our interests are clear, and I think we're well on the way toward expanding areas of cooperation and defining and honestly and openly dealing with areas of differences that are the essential elements of that kind of partnership.

Mr. McQuillan. [Larry McQuillan, Reuters]

1996 Campaign Fundraising and China

Q. Mr. President, during your news conference with President Jiang, he mentioned that you raised campaign fundraising with him. And I wonder if you could share with us just what ideas you expressed to him. And also, since he said that the Chinese conducted an investigation and that they found the charges were totally absurd, did you suggest that he might want to cooperate with Justice Department and also congressional investigations?

The President. Let me say, he is interested in a very—in what I might call a narrow question here, but a very important one, and in my mind, the most important one of all. The question here—the question that was raised that was most troubling was whether people at high levels in the Government of China had either sanctioned or participated in the channeling of funds in violation of American law not only into the Presidential campaign but into a number of congressional campaigns. That charge has been made. He said they looked into that, and he was, obviously, certain, and I do believe him, that he had not ordered or authorized or approved such a thing, and that he could find no evidence that anybody in governmental authority had done that.

He said that he could not speak to whether any people pursuing their own business interests had done that. He didn't say that it happened or he knew that it happened. I want to make it clear. He just said that his concern was on the governmental side.

And I told him that that was the thing that we had to have an answer to, and that I appreciated that, and that if he were—if the Government of China were contacted by any people doing their appropriate work, I would appreciate their telling them whatever they could tell them to help them to resolve that

to their satisfaction, because I do think that is the really important issue.

Mr. Pelley. [Scott Pelley, CBS News]

Human Rights and Democracy in China

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. Many democracy advocates were encouraged by your trip to China and, in fact, Bao Tong granted an interview to test the limits of Chinese tolerance. But sir, why did you find it impossible to meet with the democracy advocates in Beijing, where it would have had the most impact? And would you feel compelled to intervene personally if Bao Tong is arrested after you leave?

The President. Well, I have continued—first, let me answer the second question first. I have continued to raise individual cases and will continue to do so with the Chinese Government and with the President. I would very much like to see China reassess its position on categories of arrestees as well. And let me just mention, for example, they're probably 150 people who are still incarcerated as a result of the events in Tiananmen Square who were convicted of nonviolent offenses. There are also several people still incarcerated for a crime that is no longer a crime, that the Chinese themselves have said, ''We no longer want to, in effect, pursue people who have committed certain offenses against the state under—which were basically a rubric for political dissidents.'' I suggested that they look at that. So in all that, I will continue to be active.

On your first question, I did my best to meet with people who represented all elements of Chinese society and to do whatever I could to encourage democratic change. The decisions I made on this trip—as I remind you, the first trip by an American President in a decade—about with whom to meet and how to handle it were basically designed—were based on my best judgment about what would be most effective in expanding human rights. And we'll have to—I think, at this moment, it looks like the decisions I made were correct, and we'll have to see over the course of time whether that is accurate or not.

Mr. Blitzer. [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network]

Forced Abortions in China

Q. Mr. President, in the days leading up to your visit there was very dramatic testimony in the U.S. Congress about forced abortions—allegations, reports that there were forced abortions still continuing in China. Did you specifically raise the issue of forced abortions with President Jiang Zemin? And if you did, what did he say to you about this allegation?

The President. Well, they all say the same thing. They say that is not Chinese policy, that it violates Chinese policy. My view is that if these reports are accurate, there may be insufficient monitoring of what's being done beyond the Capital and beyond the place where the orders are being handed out to the place where the policy is being implemented.

And so I hope by our presence here and our concern about this, which, I might add was—this issue was first raised most forcefully, a couple of years ago by the First Lady when she came to Beijing to speak at the Women's Conference. I'm very hopeful that we will see some progress on this and that those who are making such reports will be able to tell us over the coming weeks and months that there has been some real progress.

Q. But did you raise it with President Jiang?

The President. We talked about it briefly. But they all say the same thing, Mr. Blitzer. They all say that this is not policy, that they've tried to make it clear. And I have tried to make it clear that it's something that we feel very, very strongly about. But as I said, I believe that if, in fact, the policy is being implemented in a way that is different from what is the stated policy in Beijing, we may get some reports of improvements in the weeks and months ahead, and I hope we will.

Mr. Donaldson. [Sam Donaldson, ABC News]

Kosovo

Q. Mr. President, while you've been in China, the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo appears to be continuing. You and the Secretary of State have both talked very firmly to President Milosevic about stopping, and it is not stopping. Is there a point at which you're

going to move, or is, in fact, this a bluff which he's successfully calling?

The President. No, I don't think that's accurate. But the situation—let me say, first of all, I still believe the situation is serious. I still believe, as a practical matter, the only way it will ultimately be resolved is if the parties get together and resolve it through some negotiation and dialog. I think that the Serb—excuse me, the—I think that Belgrade is primarily responsible here. But I think that others, when they're having a good day or a good week on the military front, may also be reluctant to actually engage in dialog. So I think this is something that all parties are going to have to deal with.

Now, I have, since I have been on this trip, checked in almost daily on the Kosovo situation and continue to support strongly with our allies continuing NATO planning and a clear and unambiguous statement that we have not, nor should we, rule out any options. And I hope that is still the position of our European allies.

Q. While NATO is planning, people are dying every day.

The President. They are, Mr. Donaldson, but there is—the conflict is going on; both sides are involved in it. There is some uncertainty about who is willing and who is not willing to even negotiate about it. And we're working on it as best we can.

Mr. Bloom. [David Bloom, NBC News]

Human Rights and Democracy in China

Q. Mr. President, if this trip is followed in the days or weeks to come by the piecemeal release of a few Chinese dissidents, would you consider that a success? And why not set a deadline for China to release all of its political prisoners? And, if I may, sir, you spoke a minute ago about the powerful forces resisting change in China. Do you believe there could ever be democracy here?

The President. Oh, yes. The answer to the second question is yes. I believe there can be, and I believe there will be. And what I would like to see is the present Government, headed by this President and this Premier, who are clearly committed to reform, ride the wave of change and take China fully into the 21st century and basically dismantle the resistance to it. I believe there—not only do I believe there can be, I believe there will be.

Now, I believe that, again—on your first question, I think I have to do what I think is most effective. And obviously, I hope there will be further releases. As I said, I would like to see not only targeted, selected high-profile individual releases, which are very important, but I think that the next big step would be for China to look at whether there could be some expedited process to review the sentences of whole categories of people, because that would tend to show a change in policy rather than just the product of negotiation with the Americans.

In all fairness, while I very much value the role that I and our country have been able to play here, the best thing for China will be when no outside country is needed to advance the cause of human rights and democracy.

Go ahead, Mr.—[*inaudible*].

Taiwan and President's Previous Views on China

Q. Mr. President, the U.S. policy pushed for a negotiated reconciliation between the People's Republic and Taiwan. But some in Taiwan believe that by endorsing the ''three no's,'' your administration has taken away some of the bargaining power that they would need in a negotiation. Did that concern you? And can you tell us why you thought it was important to publicly articulate the ''three no's'' policy, when people in Taiwan were saying this would make it more difficult?

And also, if you'll forgive me, just a quick two-parter—as you look back at the ups and downs of your China policy over the past 6 years, have you ever had occasion to regret the very tough and sometimes personal words you had on the subject for George Bush in 1992?

The President. Let me answer the Taiwan question first. First, I think there may be difference of opinion in Taiwan. Yesterday the Taiwanese leader, Mr. Li, said that the United States had kept its commitments not to damage Taiwan or its interests in any way here. I publicly stated that, because I was asked questions in public about Taiwan, and I thought it was an appropriate thing to do

under the circumstances. But I did not announce any change in policy. In fact, the question of independence for Taiwan, for example, has been American policy for a very long time and has been a policy that has been embraced by the Government in Taiwan, itself.

So I believe that I did the right thing there to simply clarify to both sides that there had been no change in our policy. The substance of the policy is obviously something that the Chinese Government agrees with. I think what the Taiwan Government wants to hear is that we favor the cross-strait dialog, and we think it has to be done peacefully and in orderly fashion. That is, I believe, still the intention and the commitment of the Chinese Government.

So I didn't intend, and I don't believe I did, change the substance of our position in any way by anything that I said. I certainly didn't try to do that.

Mr. Maer. [Peter Maer, NBC Mutual Radio]

Q. And about what you said——

The President. Oh, I'm sorry, I forgot. Well, let me go back and try to retrace the steps there. I think that at the time—you may have a better record of exactly what was said and what wasn't—I felt very strongly that the United States should be clear and unambiguous in our condemnation about what happened 9 years ago, at the time. And that then we needed to have a clear road going forward which would attempt to—not to isolate the Chinese but would attempt to be very strong about how we felt about what happened and would, in essence, broaden the nature of our policy.

What I felt was that in a genuine concern to maintain a constructive relationship with China, for security reasons and for economic reasons, that we didn't have high enough visibility for the human rights issue. I believed that then; I still believe that. I think any President would say that once you've served in this job you understand a little bit more the nuances of all policies than you did before you get it. But I believe, on balance, that we have a stronger human rights component to our engagement strategy than was the case before, and I think that is quite important.

Mr. Maer.

Human Rights in China

Q. Mr. President, during your trip, at least in the first cities you visited, we saw a sort of "catch and release" program of human rights dissidents. And of course, thousands of others are still in prison in labor camps. Since you did not meet with them, sir, what would your message be to those who wanted to meet with you? And to follow up on your response to an earlier question, why is it that you feel that it would not help their cause to have sat down and met with some of them?

The President. Because I believe over the long run what you want is a change in the policy and the attitude of the Chinese Government on whole, not just on this, that, or the other specific imprisoned dissident or threatened dissident, although those things are very important. I don't want to minimize that. I'm glad Wei Jingsheng is out of jail. I'm glad the bishop is out of jail. I'm glad Wang Dan is out of jail. I think these things are important.

But what I am trying to do is to argue to the Chinese Government that not because we're pressuring them publicly, but because it is the right thing to do—the right thing to do—that the whole policy should be changed. And after all, our relationships have been characterized, I think, by significant misunderstanding, including the misunderstanding of the Chinese of our motive in raising these issues.

And so I felt that by going directly to engage the Chinese, starting with the President, and especially taking advantage of the opportunity to have this free and open debate before all the Chinese people, I could be more in the short and in the long run to advance the cause of human rights.

Q. The other part of the question is, is there some message to these individuals that you'd like to send them?

The President. My message is that the United States is on your side, and we did our best. We're on the side of free speech. We're on the side of not putting people who dissent in prison. We're on the side of letting people who only dissented and exercised their free speech out of prison, and that we

believe that this new, heretofore unprecedented open debate about this matter will lead to advances. We think that it's going to take a lot of discipline and a lot of effort, but we believe that this strategy is the one most likely to advance the cause of free speech and free association and free expression of religious conviction, as well.

Northern Ireland Peace Process

Q. A question from the Irish Times. I understand, Mr. President, that you have been following events in Northern Ireland very closely during your trip and that you telephoned party leaders from Air Force One yesterday, and you spoke to them about the prospect of serious violence this weekend—[*inaudible*]. Could I ask you, what would you say to those on the opposite side of the dispute at this time, and also about the burning of 10 Catholic churches in Northern Ireland? And could I ask you, too, is there any prospect of you visiting Ireland this year, now that the Northern Ireland elections are behind us?

The President. Well, yes, I did call Mr. Trimble and Mr. Hume to congratulate them on the respective performances of their parties, and the leadership position that—this was right before the elections—I mean, the election for leadership—but that we had assumed Mr. Trimble would be elected and that either Mr. Hume or the nominee of his party, which turned out to be Mr. Mallon, would be selected as the First Deputy. And I wanted to talk to them about what the United States could do to continue to support this process and, in particular, whether there was anything that could be done to diffuse the tension surrounding the marching season and, especially, the Drumcree march.

And we had very good, long talks. They said they needed to get the leadership elections out of the way. They wanted to consult with Prime Minister Blair, who's been up there, and with Prime Minister Ahern, and that we would agree to be in, more or less, daily contact in the days running up to the marching date in the hope that that could be done.

I think it's very important that the people of Ireland give this new Assembly a chance to work—people of Northern Ireland. And I think it would be tragic indeed if either side felt so aggrieved by the ultimate resolution of the marching issue, that they lost the bigger picture in the moment. I think that is something that must not happen.

Obviously, I feel personally horrible about what has happened to the churches. In our country we had this round of church burnings in the last few years. And during the civil rights days, we had a number of bombings of black churches, which really reflected the darkest impulses of some of our people at their worst moments. And I would just plead to whoever was responsible for this for whatever reason, you need to take the churches off the list, and you need to take violence off the list.

Japanese Economy

Q. Mr. President, this morning you mentioned the new package of Japanese banking reforms and said you welcomed them. Do you believe that those reforms and other domestic financial measures will be sufficient to stem the slide of the yen and prevent the Japanese economy from going deeper into recession, perhaps spreading fear in China and elsewhere in the region and to the United States?

The President. Well, the Japanese economy has been at a period of slow to no growth for a period of years now. And if you look at the dislocation here in Hong Kong, for example, you see what regional ramifications that has as Japan slows down; then you have the problems in Indonesia and Korea and Thailand and elsewhere.

I will reiterate: I think that the Chinese have done a good thing by maintaining the stability of their currency and not engaging in competitive devaluations. I hope they will continue to do that. But I don't think anyone seriously believes that the financial situation in Asia can get better and that, therefore, we can resume global growth in a way that won't have a destructive impact on the United States and other countries unless Japan can grow again. We all have a vested interest in that, as well as our best wishes for the people of Japan.

Now, I'm encouraged by the fact that the Prime Minister announced this program and announced it several days before he had

originally intended to. And I think what the markets are waiting for now is some action and a sense that if it turns out that the implementation of this program is not enough, that more will be done.

It is not rational, in my view, to believe that the Japanese economy is meant to contract further. This is an enormously powerful, free country, full of brilliant people and successful businesses and staggering potential. And this is almost like a historical anomaly. Now, we know generally what the elements of the program are. But what I hope very much is that as soon as these elections are over, there will be a strong sense of determination and confidence not only on the part of the Japanese Government but the Japanese people, and that the rest of us will do whatever it is we have to do to support their doing whatever they have to do to get this turned around. But we have a huge stake in getting Japanese growth going, and I think that it can be done because of the fundamental strengths of the Japanese people and their economy. But I think that it's going to take some real concerted action. And if the first steps don't work, then you just have to keep doing more. You just have to keep working through this until it's turned around.

It's not a situation like the Depression in the United States in the thirties, which took, literally, years and years and years to work out of, because we had fallen so much below anything that they're facing now. And we didn't have anything like the sophisticated understanding or the sophisticated economy or capacity in the thirties that they have now.

So I think we can get through this in a reasonable amount of time, but the rest of us, including the United States and China, need to have both good wishes and determination for Japan and just understand that, however, there's a limit to what we can do until they do the things that they have to do. But I think after this election, you may see a little more moment there.

Mr. Walsh. [Ken Walsh, U.S. News & World Report]

President Jiang Zemin of China

Q. Mr. President, you spent considerable time with President Jiang Zemin this week both in public and in private. I wonder if you could give us your assessment of him not only as a strategic partner but as a leader and as an agent for change in China.

The President. Well, first of all, I have a very high regard for his abilities. I remember not so many years ago, there was a—the conventional wisdom was that he might be a transitional figure. And after I met with him the first time, I felt very strongly that his chances of becoming the leader of China for a sustained period were quite good, because he's a man of extraordinary intellect, very high energy, a lot of vigor for his age or indeed for any age. And I think he has a quality that is profoundly important at this moment in our history when there's so much change going on. He has a good imagination. He has vision; he can visualize; he can imagine a future that is different from the present.

And he has, I think, a very able partner in Premier Zhu Rongji, who has enormous technical competence and almost legendary distaste for stalling and bureaucracy and just staying in the same path the way—even if it's not working. So my view is that the potential we have for a strategic partnership is quite strong.

However, I think that like everyone else, he has constituencies with which he must work. And I hope that more of them are now more convinced that we can build a good, positive partnership as a result of this trip. I hope more of them understand that America wishes China well, that we are not bent on containing China, and that our human rights policy is not an excuse for some larger strategic motive. It's what we really believe. We believe it's morally right, and we believe it's best for them, as a practical matter, over the long run.

So I believe that there's a very good chance that China has the right leadership at the right time, and that they understand the daunting, massive nature of the challenges they face. They want us to understand that there is much more personal freedom now, in a practical sense, for most Chinese than there was when President Nixon came here or 10 years ago. But I think they understand that this is an unfolding process, and they have to keep going. And I hope that we can be a positive force there.

Yes, go ahead.

Q. Following up on that, do you consider that the three televised appearances were in part a personal expression of gratitude from President Jiang to you?

The President. I don't know about that. I think that it might have been—I think it was a personal expression of confidence in the good will that we have established to build the right kind of relationship. But more importantly, I think it was a personal expression of confidence that he could stand there and answer questions before the people of China that might come not only from Chinese press but from ours as well.

So I wouldn't say gratitude; I think confidence is the right answer. But I can tell you, every place I went after that—you know, when I came down to Shanghai or when I flew over to Hong Kong, lots and lots of people I met with mentioned it to me, that it really meant something, that it changed the whole texture of what had happened. And I think that we did the right thing. And I'm certain that he did the right thing.

Go ahead.

Democracy in China

Q. Ambassador Sasser said earlier this week that he believe that communism in China will end. You just said now that democracy will come to China. What is the time frame for that? Will it happen in your lifetime?

The President. I certainly hope so. [*Laughter*] That's like saying—I don't mean to trivialize the question, but let me give you—do I believe a woman will be elected President of the United States? I do. Do I think it will be a good thing? I do. Do I know when it will happen? I don't. Who will make the decision? The American people.

As I said, I believe that leaders of vision and imagination and courage will find a way to put China on the right side of history and keep it there. And I believe that even as—when people are going through changes, they may not believe that this is as morally right as we do. But I think they will also be able to see that it is in their interest to do this, that their country will be stronger, that when people have—if you look at just the last 50 years of history in China, and if you look at the swings back and forth, when Mao Tse-tung was alive and you were letting a thousand flowers bloom, and all of a sudden there was a reaction—you know—and there was the Cultural Revolution and then there was the reaction, and we liked the reaction of that. Then there was Tiananmen Square.

If you want to avoid these wild swings where society is like a pressure cooker that blows the top off, then there has to be some institutional way in which people who have honest grievances—even if they're not right—not all the critics will always be right all the time, just like the government, the officials won't always be right all the time—but if there is a normalized way in which people can express their dissent, that gives you a process that then has the integrity to carry you on more of a straight line to the future, instead of swinging back and forth all the time. It is—the very ability to speak your mind, even if you think you can't prevail, is in itself empowering.

And so, one of the things that I hope is that—the Chinese leaders, I've always been impressed, have an enormous sense of history, and they're always looking for parallels and for differences. It's a wise thing. Our people need to understand more of our own history and how it may or may not relate to the moment and to the future. And if you think about—one of the things that, if I were trying to manage this huge transition—and I'll just give you, parenthetically, one thing,—the Mayor of Shanghai told me that in just the last couple of years 1.2 million people had been displaced from state industries in Shanghai, and over one million had already found other jobs. That's just in one area of the country. If you're trying to manage that sort of transition, one of the things that I would be looking for is how I could keep this thing going down the track in the right direction and not have wild swings and not be confronted with a situation which would then be unmanageable.

So that's what I hope has happened and where I hope we'll go.

Mr. Knoller [Mark Knoller, CBS Radio], I'll take your question and then I'll go. You guys may want to shop some more. [*Laughter*]

Policy of Constructive Engagement

Q. Mr. President, if constructive engagement is the right policy in your view for dealing with China, why isn't it an appropriate policy for dealing with other countries, say, Cuba?

The President. That's not the question I thought you were going to ask—[*laughter*]—I mean, the example I thought you were going to give. I think each of these has to be taken on its own facts. In the case of Cuba, we actually have tried—I would remind you—we have tried in good faith on more than one occasion to engage Cuba in a way that would develop the kind of reciprocal movement that we see in China.

Under the Cuban Democracy Act, which was passed by the Congress in 1992 and signed by President Bush, but which I strongly supported during the election season, we were given a clear roadmap of balanced actions that we could take and that Cuba could take. And we were, I thought, making progress with that map until the—people, including American citizens, were unlawfully shot out of the sky and killed. That led to the passage of the Helms-Burton law.

And even after that, after the Pope went to Cuba, I took some further actions, just about everything I'm empowered to take under the Helms-Burton law, to again increase people-to-people contacts in Cuba, to empower the church more with our support as an instrument of civil society, and to send a signal that I did not want the United States to be estranged from the people of Cuba forever.

I do believe that we have some more options, and I think Cuba is a case where, because it's close to home and because of the position we occupy in the region, our policy has a greater chance of success. But even there, you see, whatever policy you pursue, you have to be prepared to have a little patience and work with it and hope that it will work out in the long run.

But nothing would please me more than to get some clear signal that Cuba was willing to be more open and more free and more democratic and work toward a common future and join the whole rest of the hemisphere. You know, in our hemisphere every country but Cuba is a democracy, and I would like the see—nothing would please me more than to see some rapprochement between the people of our two countries, especially because of the strong Cuban-American population in our Nation.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 162d news conference began at 5:23 p.m. in the Grand Ballroom of the Grand Hyatt Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Premier Zhu Rongji of China; President Li Teng-hui of Taiwan; freed Chinese dissidents Wei Jingsheng, Bishop Zeng Jingmu, and Wang Dan; David Trimble of the Ulster Unionist Party and John Hume and Seamus Mallon of the Social Democratic and Labor Party of Ireland; Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom; Prime Minister Bertie Ahern of Ireland; Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan; and Mayor Xu Kuangdi of Shanghai, China.

Memorandum on the Joint Institute for Food Safety Research

July 3, 1998

Memorandum for the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Agriculture

Subject: Joint Institute for Food Safety Research

Americans enjoy the most bountiful and safe food supply in the world. My Administration has made substantial improvements in the food safety system, from modernizing meat, seafood, and poultry inspections to creating a high-tech early warning system to detect and control outbreaks of foodborne illness.

Our success has been built on two guiding principles: (1) engaging all concerned parties including consumers, farmers, industry, and academia, in an open and far-ranging dialogue about improving food safety; and (2) grounding our efforts in the best science available. We have made progress, but more can be done to prevent the many foodborne illnesses that still occur in our country.

As we look to the future of food safety, science and technology will play an increasingly central role. An expanded food safety research agenda is essential to continued improvements in the safety of America's food. We need new tools to detect more quickly

dangerous pathogens, like E. coli O157:H7 and campylobacter, and we need better interventions that reduce the risk of contamination during food production.

Food safety research is a critical piece of my Fiscal Year 1999 food safety initiative; and I have urged the Congress to revise the appropriations bills it currently is considering to provide full funding for this initiative. I also have urged the Congress to pass two critical pieces of legislation to bring our food safety system into the 21st century: (1) legislation ensuring that the Food and Drug Administration halts imports of fruits, vegetables, and other food products that come from countries that do not meet U.S. food safety requirements or that do not provide the same level of protection as is required for U.S. products; and (2) legislation giving the Department of Agriculture the authority to impose civil penalties for violations of meat and poultry regulations and to issue mandatory recalls to remove unsafe meat and poultry from the marketplace.

At the same time, we need to make every effort to maximize our current resources and authorities. One very important way to achieve this objective is to improve and coordinate food safety research activities across the Federal Government, with State and local governments, and the private sector. Solid research can and will help us to identify foodborne hazards more rapidly and accurately, and to develop more effective intervention mechanisms to prevent food contamination.

I therefore direct you to report back to me within 90 days on the creation of a Joint Institute for Food Safety Research that will: (1) develop a strategic plan for conducting food safety research activities consistent with my Food Safety Initiative; and (2) efficiently coordinate all Federal food safety research, including with the private sector and academia. This Institute, which will operate under your joint leadership, should cooperate and consult with all interested parties, including other Federal agencies and offices—particularly, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Partnership for Reinventing Government, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy—State and local agencies focusing on research and public health, and on consumers, producers, industry, and academia. The Institute should make special efforts to build on efforts of the private sector, through the use of public-private partnerships or other appropriate mechanisms.

These steps, taken together and in coordination with our pending legislation, will ensure to the fullest extent possible the safety of food for all of America's families.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 3 but was embargoed for release until 10:06 a.m., July 4.

The President's Radio Address

July 4, 1998

Good morning, I've just returned from my trip to China, a great and ancient nation that is undergoing historic change—change I could see in new private businesses that are helping China's economy to grow, in people free for the first time to work in jobs of their own choosing, and in Chinese villages in the first free elections of local leaders.

I was able to speak directly, not only to President Jiang and the leaders of the Chinese Government but to the Chinese people themselves about the partnership we hope to build with China for peace and prosperity and about the importance of freedom and what it means to us in America. At this particular moment in history, when for the first time a majority of the world's people live under governments of their own choosing, and when in China the positive impacts of greater openness and personal liberties are already apparent, I'm especially glad to be home for Independence Day—the day we celebrate the freedom our Founders declared 222 years ago this Fourth of July.

And this Fourth of July, even as we celebrate, we should be not only grateful for the freedom we enjoy; we should rededicate ourselves to the work of responsible citizenship. For example, on the Fourth of July, families and friends come together all over America at backyard barbecues and parks for picnics. As they enjoy their meals, I want to report to you about what I'm doing to make sure

the food and drinks we serve our families this Independence Day and every day are safe.

Our food supply is the most bountiful and the safest in the world, but we know we can do better. For nearly 6 years I've worked hard to put in place a modern food safety system for the 21st century. I signed into law legislation to keep harmful pesticides off our fruits and vegetables. We put in place strong protections to ensure that seafood is safe, and we're modernizing our meat and poultry safety system.

Last year we launched a nationwide early warning system to catch outbreaks of foodborne illnesses sooner and prevent them from happening in the first place. But as much as we've done, we know we have to do more to keep our families safe and strong. We know older people and children are especially vulnerable to contaminated food. That lesson was driven home tragically last year, when apple juice contaminated with a deadly strain of *E. coli* caused the death of a 16-month-old child in Washington State and led to the hospitalization of more than a dozen other children.

Today we're taking two important steps to ensure that our food supply is as safe as we can make it. First, I am pleased to announce a new rule that requires warning labels on all packaged juice that has not been pasteurized or processed to kill harmful bacteria. These warnings will help families make better decisions about the juice they buy, and they will help us to prevent thousands of Americans from becoming ill every year.

Second, I'm directing the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture to report back to me within 90 days with a plan to create a new national institute for food safety research. This institute will join the resources of the public and private sectors and bring together the talents of the most esteemed scientists in the government, in universities, and in businesses to develop cutting edge techniques to keep our food safe.

I'm doing what I can to protect our families from contaminated food. Congress must also do its part to ensure the safety of America's food supply. First and most important, it should fully fund my comprehensive $101 million food safety initiative. Among other important programs, this initiative will pay for 225 new food and drug administrators, inspectors, and employees—people who can keep unsafe food away from our borders, out of our stores, and off our dining room tables.

Congress should also give the FDA greater authority to halt imports of fruits, vegetables, and other food products that are produced under safety conditions that simply do not match our own strict standards. It should give the U.S. Department of Agriculture new authority to impose tough fines on businesses who violate those standards and to issue mandatory recalls of unsafe meat and poultry before they reach our table; and it should confirm a respected, experienced scientist, Dr. Jane Henney, to lead our food safety efforts as Commissioner of FDA.

Food can never be made entirely safe; therefore, every parent also has a responsibility—a responsibility to handle food carefully, especially during the summer. Meanwhile, we must do everything we can to protect the food Americans eat and to give our families the peace of mind they deserve. That's one important way on this Fourth of July we can resolve to keep our Nation strong as we move into the 21st century.

Happy Independence Day, Americans, and thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 7:18 a.m. on July 3 in the Grand Hyatt Hotel Hong Kong SAR, China for broadcast at 10:06 a.m., e.d.t., on July 4. This transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 3 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast. In his address, the President referred to President Jiang Zemin of China, and Jane E. Henney, Food and Drug Administration Commissioner-designate.

Remarks on Medicare and the Legislative Agenda and an Exchange With Reporters

July 6, 1998

Good morning. I'm delighted to be here with Secretary Shalala, Mr. Apfel, and Ron Pollack to make an announcement today. Let me first, by way of introduction, say, as all of you know, the First Lady and I just returned this weekend from our trip to China.

It was a trip that advanced America's interests and values in a secure, stable, and increasingly open China by achieving solid progress in a number of areas and an honest, unprecedentedly open discussion with both Chinese leaders and the Chinese people.

We've come back to America at a critical time. We're exactly halfway through the Major League Baseball season, but we're already in the ninth inning of this congressional session. We have to use wisely the remaining 38 working days to make a season of progress.

With an economy the strongest in a generation and our social fabric strengthening, it is, as I have said repeatedly, extremely tempting for all of us to kick back and soak in the good times. But that would be wrong. There are still enormous challenges and opportunities facing the United States on the edge of the 21st century. We must make this a moment of opportunity, not missed opportunity.

First, we have to advance the economic strategy that has brought so much opportunity to so many Americans. In the coming weeks, I will insist that the House join me and the Senate in reserving the surplus until we save Social Security first. We should fulfill our obligation to American's children, with smaller class sizes, modernized schools, higher standards, more Head Start opportunities, more reading help for third graders, more access to college.

We should strengthen the International Monetary Fund because our prosperity depends upon the stability of our trading partners in Asia and around the world. We should press forward with our reform of Government by passing IRS reform to guard against abuses and extend taxpayers' rights, and through bipartisan campaign finance reform.

And we must further strengthen families and communities across our country with a juvenile crime bill that uses prosecutors and probation officers to crack down on gangs, guns, and drugs, and bars violent juveniles from buying guns for life; with comprehensive tobacco legislation; and with the Patients' Bill of Rights that says critical medical decisions can only be made by doctors, not insurance company accountants.

There is much to do in these remaining 38 days. Congress has a choice to make in writing this chapter of our history. It can choose partisanship, or it can choose progress. Congress must decide.

I stand ready to work with lawmakers of good faith in both parties, as I have for 5½ years, to move our Nation forward. And I have a continuing obligation to act, to use the authority of the presidency and the persuasive power of the podium to advance America's interest at home and abroad. Nowhere is that need greater than our mission to provide quality health care for every American, especially the elderly.

Last year's bipartisan balanced budget agreement gave seniors and people with disabilities new help to pay their Medicare premiums. This was the right thing to do. Yet a new study released today by Mr. Pollack's Families USA shows that over 3 million of the hardest-pressed Medicare beneficiaries still do not receive the help to which they are due.

I want to thank Ron Pollack for his continuing excellent work for accessible and quality care for all Americans, and for continuing to point out the problems in achieving that goal.

Today I am launching a national effort to educate every single Medicare recipient about this opportunity, using the mail, Medicare and Social Security notices, case workers, field offices, working with State governments, and using the Internet. Through this effort, hundreds of thousands of older and disabled low-income Americans will receive more affordable health care without any new congressional action. This is a duty we owe our parents and our fellow citizens, and we should honor it. It's the right thing to do.

I want to thank Secretary Shalala and Mr. Apfel for working out the details of this outreach. We look forward to signing up people and getting them on the Medicare rolls as quickly as possible.

This is a moment of opportunity. We have to use it decisively. We can do so, and if we do we will strengthen our Nation. Again I say, we have to choose progress over partisanship.

Thank you.

Fast-Track Trading Authority

Q. Speaker Gingrich said that he may bring up fast-track legislation again this fall. Are you planning an aggressive push for fast track this year?

The President. Well, I don't know that anything has changed in terms of the votes. I would like to see the Africa trade bill, which did pass the House, and the Caribbean Basin Initiative, which I understand has been modified in the Senate, so it may pass, pass. You know I'm strongly for fast track, but if there is no reason to believe we can pass it, it would be a mistake to keep the other initiatives from passing which would do a great deal of good for the United States and for the countries in our neighborhood and in Africa.

Health Maintenance Organizations

Q. Mr. President, in 12 States big HMO's have dropped Medicaid coverage altogether. In at least 12 states, major HMO's have dropped Medicaid——

President Clinton. Yes, I read that story in the morning paper, and I was very concerned about it. And before I came out here, I talked to Secretary Shalala about it. She says that in some States, there is contrary evidence, so I have asked her to look at all 50 States, get all the facts, report back to me as soon as possible, and then we'll let you know what we find out as quickly as we can. It was a very disturbing story, but we want to get all the facts, and then we'll make them available to you.

Thank you.

Death of Roy Rogers

Q. Your thoughts on Roy Rogers?

President Clinton. I would like to say something about Roy Rogers because he was, as you know, most prominent in my childhood. I think it was from the midforties to the midfifties when he was the number one Western star. And like most people my age, I grew up on Roy Rogers, Dale Evans, and Trigger, and Gabby Hayes. I really appreciate what he stood for, the movies he made, and the kind of values they embodied, and the good-natured spirit that he exhibited all the way up until his last interviews, not so very long ago.

And my thoughts are with his family and his many friends, but today there will be a lot of sad and grateful Americans, especially of my generation, because of his career.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Ronald F. Pollack, vice president and executive director, Families USA; Roy Rogers' wife, actress Dale Evans; and actor George (Gabby) Hayes.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the National Emergency With Respect to Libya

July 6, 1998

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

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of January 13, 1998, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 12543 of January 7, 1986. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa–9(c).

1. On January 2, 1998, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Libya pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extended the current comprehensive financial and trade embargo against Libya in effect since 1986. Under these sanctions, virtually all trade with Libya is prohibited, and all assets owned or controlled by the Libyan government in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked.

2. There have been no amendments to the Libyan Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 550 (the "Regulations"), administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) of the Department of the Treasury, since my last report of January 13, 1998.

3. During the reporting period, OFAC reviewed numerous applications for licenses to authorize transactions under the Regulations. Consistent with OFAC's ongoing scrutiny of

banking transactions, the largest category of license approvals (34) concerned requests by non-Libyan persons or entities to unblock certain interdicted funds transfers. Three licenses authorized receipt of payment for the provision of legal services to the Government of Libya in connection with actions in U.S. courts in which the Government of Libya was named as defendant and for other legal services. One license authorizing certain travel transactions was issued. A total of 38 licenses were issued during the reporting period.

4. During the current 6-month period, OFAC continued to emphasize to the international banking community in the United States the importance of identifying and blocking payments made by or on behalf of Libya. OFAC worked closely with the banks to assure the effectiveness of interdiction software systems used to identify such payments. During the reporting period, more than 140 transactions potentially involving Libya, totaling more than $8.9 million, were interdicted.

5. Since my last report, OFAC has collected 15 civil monetary penalties totaling nearly $280,000 for violations of the U.S. sanctions against Libya. Fourteen of the violations involved the failure of banks and U.S. corporations to block payments or letters of credit transactions relating to Libyan-owned or -controlled financial institutions. One U.S. individual paid an OFAC penalty for commercial exports to Libya.

Various enforcement actions carried over from previous reporting periods have continued to be pursued aggressively. Numerous investigations are ongoing and new reports of violations are being scrutinized.

6. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from January 7 through July 6, 1998, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the Libyan national emergency are estimated at approximately $960,000. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, and the Department of Commerce.

7. The policies and actions of the Government of Libya continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. In adopting UNSCR 883 in November 1993, the United Nations Security Council determined that the continued failure of the Government of Libya to demonstrate by concrete actions its renunciation of terrorism, and in particular its continued failure to respond fully and effectively to the requests and decisions of the Security Council in Resolutions 731 and 748, concerning the bombing of the Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 flights, constituted a threat to international peace and security. The United States will continue to coordinate its comprehensive sanctions enforcement efforts with those of other U.N. member states. We remain determined to ensure that the perpetrators of the terrorist acts against Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 are brought to justice. The families of the victims in the murderous Lockerbie bombing and other acts of Libyan terrorism deserve nothing less. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against Libya fully and effectively, so long as those measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments as required by law.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 7.

Remarks on Signing the Memorandum on Ensuring Compliance With the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act

July 7, 1998

Thank you. Mr. Pomeroy, we're delighted to have you here, along with your colleagues, and we appreciate the work you do every day. I want to thank all of those who are here with me on this platform who are responsible for the action we're taking today and the

work we've done on health care. And, like the Vice President, I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to Senator Kennedy.

I honestly believe that when the history of the United States Congress in the 20th century is written, there will be very few people who have exercised as much positive influence to benefit the American people, whether they were in the majority or the minority, as Senator Kennedy. And this is one of the crowning achievements of his career, and I'm very grateful to him for what he's done.

I have done everything I knew to do to help our country move forward to expand health care access and improve health care quality. Yesterday I announced an important initiative to help more than 3 million senior citizens get assistance in paying their Medicare bills. I have called upon Congress to rise above partisanship and join me in ensuring that the well-being of the patient will always be our health care system's bottom line, whether or not the patient is in a managed care plan or in traditional fee-for-service medicine. And in a few moments, I intend to take action to strengthen the vital health care protections of the Kennedy-Kassebaum law.

It was nearly 2 years ago that I stood with many of the people in this room on the South Lawn to proudly sign that bill into law. It was a remarkable achievement, the product of extraordinary dedication by Senators Kassebaum Baker and Senator Kennedy and others. It's given millions of Americans the chance to change jobs without losing health insurance even if they or someone in their family has a so-called pre-existing condition.

Unfortunately, reports have shown that some health plans are paying no more than lip service to the requirements of the law, delaying or denying coverage to eligible Americans. That is unacceptable. It is wrong.

I will sign an Executive order at the conclusion of this event to give new teeth to the Kassebaum-Kennedy law and new peace of mind to Americans with pre-existing conditions. As the single largest buyer of private health insurance, the Federal Government speaks with a very loud voice. With that voice, we now put health plans on notice. This administration has zero tolerance for actions that undermine these vital health care protections. If you violate the letter or the spirit of the Kassebaum-Kennedy law, we will, if necessary, terminate your contract to provide health insurance to Federal employees. If you say no to people with pre-existing conditions, the Federal Government will say no to you.

I am very pleased that the National Association of Insurance Commissioners will join the Department of Health and Human Services and the Office of Personnel Management in these efforts. As the primary enforcers of the Kassebaum-Kennedy law, the State commissioners play a crucial role, and I thank them for their help.

Now it's Congress' turn also to get involved. We must work together in the same spirit of bipartisanship that produced the Kassebaum-Kennedy law to enact an enforceable Patients' Bill of Rights. All Americans deserve to know that the medical decisions they depend upon are being made by medical doctors and not insurance company accountants. All Americans have the right to know all their medical options and not just the cheapest. All Americans should have the right to choose the specialists they want for the care they need. All Americans should have the right to emergency room care whenever and wherever they need it. Traditional care or managed care, all Americans deserve quality care.

In February I took executive action to extend this Patients' Bill of Rights to all the 85 million Americans who get their health insurance through the Federal Government. Now Congress must do so for every American.

Today there are only 37 working days left in this session of Congress, but that's no excuse for failing to act, and millions of Americans are looking to us for the right kind of action. They want us to pass a strong, bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights. They want us to put progress over partisanship. They want us to leave our country stronger for the century just ahead. I believe this action today helps to achieve that goal, and I thank all of you for your role in it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:20 p.m. in the Grand Foyer at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Glenn Pomeroy, president, National Association of Insurance Commissioners. The President also referred to Public Law 104–191, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, approved Aug. 21, 1996.

Memorandum on Ensuring Compliance With the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act

July 7, 1998

Memorandum for the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management

Subject: Ensuring Compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996

Earlier this year, my Administration received a number of troubling reports that health insurers were circumventing insurance protections under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) by giving financial incentives to agents to avoid enrolling Americans with preexisting conditions. In addition, we learned that some agents were delaying the processing of applications submitted by qualified individuals in order to ensure that the applicant had a sufficient break in coverage to lose eligibility for HIPAA protections. Such actions clearly were and are inconsistent with the letter and spirit of HIPAA.

In February, I directed the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to take appropriate actions to encourage health insurers and their agents to stop all such harmful practices. The Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) responded by immediately releasing a strong guidance bulletin on March 18 to every insurance commissioner in the Nation, advising them of our strong commitment to ensure compliance with HIPAA.

Today, I am taking additional actions to ensure that health plans comply with this law. I direct the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to use its contractual relationship with health plans to improve HIPAA compliance. The OPM oversees the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program (FEHBP), the Nation's largest employer-sponsored health benefits program with 9 million enrollees and 350 participating health plans.

Specifically, I direct the OPM to take all appropriate action—up to and including termination of a participating health plan from the FEHBP—if the OPM determines, consistent with HIPAA and implementing regulations, that a plan is engaging in insurance practices that are inconsistent with the letter and spirit of HIPAA. In order to be eligible to participate in the FEHBP, carriers subject to HIPAA will have to certify to the OPM that they are providing access to health insurance in compliance with HIPAA. Such action by the OPM will provide another enforcement tool to the Federal Government without in any way altering or hindering any other enforcement action by the HCFA or State insurance commissioners.

To help ensure that the OPM can take these important enforcement actions, I direct the HCFA to immediately send to the OPM reports of violations by insurers or their representatives that preclude or inhibit access to the insurance protections provided under HIPAA. Any such referral to the OPM would not alter the responsibility of States or the HCFA to utilize any and all enforcement tools at their disposal to ensure HIPAA compliance.

Finally, I direct that the HHS and the Department of Labor report to me, through the Vice President, within 6 months on the successes and shortcomings of HIPAA. This report should be produced after consultation with the States and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners and should include specific legislative or regulatory recommendations to further strengthen this law.

My Administration has zero tolerance for any actions that hinder vulnerable Americans from accessing insurance, consistent with HIPAA's protections. This directive is intended to ensure that health plans come into compliance with this important statute so that Americans are assured these insurance protections.

William J. Clinton

Statement on the Death of M.K.O. Abiola of Nigeria

July 7, 1998

I was deeply saddened to learn of the sudden and untimely death of M.K.O. Abiola, a distinguished citizen and patriot of Nigeria. I extend my heartfelt condolences to his family and to all of the people of Nigeria.

Members of a U.S. delegation, led by Under Secretary of State Thomas Pickering, and Nigerian officials were with Chief Abiola when he fell ill. They accompanied him to the hospital with a physician and Government officials and witnessed physicians at the State House clinic work to try to save Chief Abiola.

I have been encouraged by the efforts of the new head of state, General Abdulsalam Abubakar, to restore public confidence in the Government of Nigeria and to take crucial initial steps to embark on a credible transition to civilian democratic rule. I urge the Government of Nigeria to continue and to expedite this transition and call upon all the people of Nigeria to contribute peacefully and constructively to build a brighter future for their country.

In this time of tragedy, I wish to reaffirm the longstanding friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Nigeria.

Remarks on Efforts to Promote Gun Safety and Responsibility

July 8, 1998

I would like to begin by thanking Suzann Wilson for making the long trip up here from Arkansas with her sister to be with us today, so soon after that terrible tragedy. Most people wouldn't feel like going out of the house, much less coming all the way to Washington, and I think it is a real credit to her and to her devotion to her daughter that she is here today.

I want to thank Colonel Mitchell and Lieutenant Governor Kathleen Kennedy Townsend and, in his absence, Governor Glendening, for the pathbreaking work being done in Maryland on this important issue. I thank Secretary Rubin and Mr. Johnson and Mr. Magaw for being here and the work the Treasury Department is doing. Thank you, Secretary Riley, for the work you've done to have zero tolerance for guns in schools. Thank you, Attorney General Reno, for the steady work now we have done for 6 years to try to bring this issue to the American people.

I thank Senator Durbin, Senator Chafee, and Senator Kohl, and a special word of thanks to Representative Carolyn McCarthy. And to all the advocates out here, I welcome you here, and I thank you, and especially to the law enforcement officers.

I think that this recent series of killings in our schools has seared the heart of America about as much as anything I can remember in a long, long time. I will always personally remember receiving the news from Jonesboro because it's a town I know well. I know the local officials; I know the school officials. I've spent large numbers of days there. I've been in all the schools and answered the children's questions. And once you know a place like that, you can't possibly imagine something like this occurring.

But it's happened all over the country. I was in Springfield, Oregon, as you know, in the last couple of weeks, meeting with the families there. I think every American has sent out prayers to Suzann and the other parents and the other spouses and people who were so wounded by this. But in a fundamental way, our entire Nation has been wounded by these troubled children with their guns.

As has already been said, these events have been even more difficult for us to understand because they're occurring at a time when we've had the lowest crime rate in America in 25 years and for the first time in a decade, a steady drop in the juvenile crime rate. So we struggle for answers. We say, "Well, does the popular culture have anything to do with this? Does good parenting have anything to do with this?" And we know that probably everything we consider has something to do with this. But no matter how you analyze this, it is clear that the combination of children and firearms is deadly. As parents, public officials, citizens, we simply cannot allow easy access to weapons that kill.

For 5 years now, our administration has worked to protect our children, and we are making progress, as has been said. A great

deal of the credit goes to farsighted leaders at the city level and at the State level, people like Lieutenant Governor Kathleen Kennedy Townsend and Superintendent Mitchell and Governor Glendening.

We're well on our way toward putting 100,000 police on the street. About a quarter of a million people have not been able to buy guns in the first place because of the Brady law, because of their criminal background or their mental health history. We have banned several types of assault weapons and have struggled to preserve the integrity of that law against a commercial assault from importers.

School security is tighter; antigang prevention is better; penalties are stronger. We promoted discipline in schools with antitruancy and curfew and school uniform policies, and in various ways, they have worked marvelously in many communities. And we have a national policy now in all our schools of zero tolerance for guns in schools. Over 6,000 students with guns were disarmed and sent home last year, doubtless preventing even more terrible acts of violence.

But it is not enough if children have access to guns. In Springfield, Oregon, the young man in custody was sent home the day before because he had a gun in the school.

So, yes, our laws must be strong, our enforcement resolute. At home, parents must teach their children the difference between right and wrong and lead them away from violence. But recent events remind us that even if all this is done, it is still too easy for deadly weapons to wind up in the hands of children—by intent or by accident—and then to lead to tragedy by intent or by accident.

We can't shrug our shoulders and say, ''Well, accidents will happen,'' or ''Some kids are just beyond hope.'' That is a copout. Instead, every one of us must step up to our responsibility. That certainly includes gun owners, gun purchasers, and gun dealers. Today we say to them, protecting children is your responsibility too, and there are penalties for the failure to fulfill it.

In response to the directive I issued to Secretary Rubin in June of last year, all Federal gun dealers will now be required to issue written warnings and post signs like that one over there. The sign makes it plain for all to see in simple, direct language, that it's illegal to sell, deliver, or transfer a handgun to a minor, period. From now on, no customer or employee can avoid personal responsibility by pleading ignorance of the law.

Responsibility at gun shops, of course, must be matched by responsibility at home. Suzanne talked movingly about that. Guns are kept in the home for many purposes, from hunting to self-defense. That is every family's right, and as she said more eloquently than I, that is not in question. The real question is every parent's responsibility, every adult's responsibility to make sure that unsupervised children cannot get a hold of the guns. When guns are stored carelessly, children can find them, pick them up, court danger. Most will put them back where they found them. Others, as we know now from hard experience, will touch the trigger by accident. A troubled few will take guns to school with violence in mind.

Too many guns wielded in rage by troubled adolescents can be traced back to an irresponsible adult. As has been previously said, in Maryland now, and now in 14 other States, parents have a legal responsibility to keep guns locked and out of reach of young hands. That should be the law in all 50 States. There are 35 more that ought to follow Maryland's lead. It should be the practice in every home.

There is also a proper Federal role in preventing children's access to firearms, and Congress should pass a tough, targeted child access prevention law with new penalties to punish the most egregious offenders.

I applaud Senators Chafee and Durbin for their legislation starting us down the road toward making this the law of the land. I thank Senator Kohl and Representative McCarthy for their strong support. They are doing the right thing. And during the last days of this legislative session, this is how we should move forward, again I say, with progress, not partisanship.

There is much we must do in public life to fulfill our obligation to our children. More than a year ago, we directed all Federal law enforcement agencies to issue child safety locks to Federal officers so that their guns could not be misused. A majority of our gun

manufacturers have joined us voluntarily in this effort, and that has been successful. I hope all other gun manufacturers will follow suit.

The real work, of course, must still be done in our homes, beyond law and policy to the most basic values of respect, right and wrong, conscience and community, and violence rejected in favor of nonviolence and communication. Only parents can remedy what ails children in their heart of hearts. But the rest of us must do our part to help and must do our part to contain the potential for destructive violence when things fail at home.

So I say again, this is an issue that has wounded every American in one way or the other. Of the four women standing to my right, three have lost members of their immediate family because of gun violence. All of us have grieved with them. We can do better. This is one big first step.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:03 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Suzann Wilson, mother of Britthney Varner who was killed in the Westside Middle School shooting in Jonesboro, AR; Maryland Superintendent of Police Col. David B. Mitchell; and Lt. Gov. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend and Gov. Parris N. Glendening of Maryland.

Remarks in the "Presidential Dialogue on Race" on PBS

July 8, 1998

Moderator Jim Lehrer. Good evening. I'm Jim Lehrer. Welcome to an hour of conversation with President Clinton about race in America.

And welcome to you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you, Jim.

Mr. Lehrer. The President's conversation will be with eight Americans—four NewsHour regulars: essayist Richard Rodriguez of the Pacific News Service, Roger Rosenblatt and Clarence Page of the Chicago Tribune, and regional commentator Cynthia Tucker of the Atlanta Constitution; plus, four others: Roberto Suro of The Washington Post, author of a recent book on Hispanic Americans; Kay James, dean of Regent University's School of Government; Elaine Chao, former head of United Way of America, now at the Heritage Foundation; and Sherman Alexie, novelist, poet, and screenwriter.

Keep in mind, please, that whatever their affiliation and most importantly, their race, each is here as an individual speaking only for him or herself.

Richard Rodriguez, what do you think is the single most important thing the President could do to improve race relations in this country?

[*Mr. Rodriguez asserted his belief that race issues in the country have become more complicated and that the national discussion initiated under "One America: The President's Initiative on Race" and its Chair, John Hope Franklin, has not kept pace with that complexity.*]

The President. Well, I basically agree with you about that. As a Southerner, like Dr. Franklin, I think that there are unique and still unresolved issues between black and white Americans, and there are some conditions in America which disproportionately involve African-Americans. Some of them are not old. Today there was just this Journal of American Medical Association story saying that African-Americans metabolize nicotine in a different way than other races, as far as we know, and therefore, even though blacks smoke fewer cigarettes, they're more likely to get lung cancer—interesting thing.

But to get back to your main point, I have tried to emphasize that America is becoming a multiracial, multiethnic, multireligious society, and therefore it would be more important both to understand the differences and to identify the common values that hold us together as a country.

And I often cite, since we're in northern Virginia where this program is being filmed, I often cite the Fairfax County School District, which is now the most diverse school district in the country, with people from over 100 different racial and ethnic groups with over 100 different languages, actually, in this school district. And I think that's a pattern of where we're going. I've got a friend who is a Southern Baptist minister here; he used to be a minister in Arkansas. He's got a Korean ministry in his church. That's just one

tiny example of the kind of things you're going to see more and more of in the country.

Mr. Lehrer. Cynthia, is the unfinished business still black and white?

[*Ms. Tucker suggested that what many think are racial differences are actually class differences, that disproportionately poor blacks resent whites, and that working class whites with stagnant or declining incomes blame blacks and immigrants. She blamed the wealth gap, in part, for the continuing racial problems.*]

The President. There's no doubt about that. And I think that whenever possible, if you think that there is a class-related or income-related element in the difficulties we have with race, we ought to have income-based solutions to it.

A lot of things that I've asked the Congress to do over the last 5½ years, a lot of things that are in this budget now are designed to address that, with grater incentives for people to invest in inner cities and Native American reservations and other poor areas; tax systems, which would disproportionately benefit working people on the lower income of the scale. I think those things are very important because—and there is, by the way, some evidence that in the last couple of years, the income inequality has begun to abate some.

But I think it's very important not to confuse the two. I mean, I believe the primary reason for income inequality—increasing inequality in America is that we have changed the nature of the economy. That is, if you go back to 100 years ago, and you see when we moved from an agricultural to an industrial economy, we also had a big influx of immigrants. There was a hug increase in inequality, not so much because of the immigrants, but because the way people made money changed. The whole basis of wealth changed. That's what's happened in this computer-based information economy, and the premium on education these days is so much greater than it's ever been, that there's a lot of stagnant incomes out there from people who have worked hard all of their lives but aren't part of the modern economy. And I think that we need strategies to identify the people that aren't winning and turn them into winners. And at the very least, turn their children into winners.

Mr. Lehrer. Kay James, class or race?

[*Ms. James answered that no matter how middle class a person becomes, if that person is black, he or she will still experience discrimination. She suggested that issues of poverty and class are worthy topics, but they should not take precedence over discussion of racism in America.*]

The President. Well, obviously, I agree with that, or I wouldn't have set up this initiative. I think that the point I wanted to make is to whatever extent you can have an economic approach that embraces people of all races, if it elevates disproportionately—racial groups that have been disproportionately depressed, you'll help to deal with the race problem.

But there is—no one could look around the world—if you forget about America, just look at the rest of the world—no one could doubt the absence of a deep, inbred, predisposition of people to fear, look down on, separate themselves from, and when possible, discriminate against people who are of different racial and ethnic groups than themselves. I mean, this is the primary factor in the world's politics today at the end of the cold war.

Mr. Lehrer. Sherman, does a poor Native American starting out face more hurdles than a poor white American starting out?

Mr. Alexie. A poor Native American faces more hurdles than a poor anybody.

Mr. Lehrer. Anybody?

[*Mr. Alexie described conditions in Native American reservations and noted the lack of role models.*]

The President. Let me ask you something. I'd like to start, because I think this will help us to get to the race issue you talked about. Let's just talk about the Native American population. When I was running for President in 1992, I didn't know much about the American Indian condition, except that we had a significant but very small population of Indians in my home State and that my grandmother was one-quarter Cherokee; that's all I knew. And I spent a lot of time going around to the reservations and to meet

with leaders and to learn about the sort of nation-to-nation legal relationship that's supposed to exist between the U.S. Government and the Native American tribes.

I concluded that the American Indians had gotten the worst of both worlds, that they had not been given enough empowerment or responsibility or tools to make the most of their own lives, and the sort of paternalistic relationship the U.S. Government had kept them in was pathetic and inadequate. So they literally got the worst of both worlds. They weren't given enough help, and they certainly didn't have enough responsibility and power in my view to build the future.

So what do you think the most important thing is for Americans to know about American Indians? And what do you think the most important thing American Indians should be doing for themselves or should ask us to do to change the future?

[*Mr. Alexie answered that people should understand that Native Americans are separate, as sovereign nations, politically and economically. He suggested that Native Americans themselves have to recognize the value of education.*]

Mr. Lehrer. Elaine Chao, where do the Asian-Americans—what kinds of obstacles do they start out with compared to white Americans or Native Americans or black Americans, whatever?

[*Ms. Chao noted the increased strain in relations between races due to feelings of unequal treatment and the Asian-American community's underrepresentation in the minority figures.*]

The President. Give us an example.

[*Ms. Chao related the story of an Asian-American single mother in San Francisco whose son was denied admission into a school, despite high test scores, because it already had "too many Chinese-Americans."*]

The President. Let's go back to what Kay said. What do you think the roots of racism are?

[*Ms. James suggested the root of racism is a character and integrity problem and asserted that it would only be overcome once people interact and dispel preconceived notions, prejudices, and stereotypes.*]

The President. Do you think young people—and you're a dean of a school of government—do you think young people are less racially prejudiced than their parents on the whole?

[*Ms. James related her own experience as a youth and part of a group that integrated schools in the South and how over time, relationships were established that broke the barrier of race and friendships flourished.*]

Mr. Lehrer. Roger Rosenblatt, how would you answer the President's question? Where do we get our attitudes about race? Where do they come from?

[*Mr. Rosenblatt suggested that racial attitudes stem from fear, ignorance, and a sense of "otherness," a perceived difference that causes hatred in some and a "shy retreat" in others. He noted that the focus is too often placed on blame rather than solutions and suggested reaffirming the goal of integration.*]

The President. What about what Elaine said, though? Let me give you a little background, although I don't know about the facts of this case. California, I give them a lot of credit—California is trying to have within the public school system a much higher performing school by, among other things, going to charter schools, which are—which seek to have the benefits of public education with the strengths of private, standard-spaced education. And San Francisco has a number of schools—this is probably a part of their school choice program—where they basically create schools. They get out from under the rules and regulations of central administration, and they hold the kids to high standards.

But apparently, they've made a decision also that they think they ought to have some diversity within their student body. And so, is it fair for a Chinese student who may be the fifth best Chinese student, but also the fifth best overall student who has to get in a class, to be deprived of the chance to get in the class? And if it's not fair, if this child was unfairly treated, what do you do with the kids who didn't do very well, and what

school should they go to, and how can you guarantee them the same standards?

Mr. Lehrer. How would you answer that, Roberto?

[*Mr. Suro remarked on the expansion of the racism problem from the long-established black/white paradigm and the lack of language and mechanisms to deal with the increasing diversity of racism. He asked the President how he applied his own experiences to a more complicated Nation.*]

The President. Well, the short answer is that I try to do now what I tried to do when I was a kid, when I realized what was going on, because I had an unusual background for a lower middle-class white guy in the South because I had grandparents who believed in integration, and my grandfather ran a little store and most of his customers were black. So I had an atypical background. But I was sort of hungering for contact with people who were different from me. And my theory, going back to what Kay said, is that basically if you would ask me, what's the most important thing we could do, I think it is the more people work, and learn, and worship, if they have faith, and serve together, the more likely you are to strike the right balance between celebrating our differences instead of being afraid of them and still identifying common values.

Now, you still have—you have a separate problem for Native Americans, who literally, many of whom still live on reservations. But there has to be a way—you cannot overcome what you do not know. And if I could just say one other thing. One of the complicating—believe me, there are lots of hard questions. I don't think—one of the hard questions is the education question, whether it's affirmative action in college admissions or what Elaine said, for the simple reason that I believe there is an independent value to having young people have—learn in an environment where they're with people of many different racial and ethnic backgrounds. And the question is, how can you balance that with our devotion to merit and then not discriminating against people because of their race, in effect, when they would otherwise, on grounds of academic merit, get a certain situation? That's one of the hardest questions we face.

But I still think the more we are together—I was quite impressed, for example, when our daughter was trying to select a college. And one of the things that she did, she went around and actually got the composition and makeup of every school to which she applied, because she wanted—and then she actually went there to see whether those people were actually—[*laughter*]—not just admitted but actually really getting—relating to each other.

But a lot of the young people in her generation that I spend time talking to understand that this is something they need to do. I mean, they figured out that their life is going to be real different from ours, and they better figure out how to live together.

Mr. Lehrer. Clarence, does that make sense to you?

[*Mr. Page explained that people need to realize if they want diversity, they will have to accept sacrifice. He noted that establishing diversity and maintaining it necessitates curbing equal opportunity to some extent, and achieving dialog and desegregation requires work.*]

Mr. Lehrer. Somebody has to get hurt in order for other people to be helped?

[*Mr. Page noted the difficulties of affirmative action, and suggested the President was reluctant to deal with that issue, a subject Mr. Page described as the most divisive in race relations. He posed the question of defining, as a nation, affirmative action and suggested that until it is dealt with effectively, it will continue to be a political tool.*]

The President. See, I believe—I frankly—I believe that the real reason it's a problem—it's more a problem in education now than in economics because the unemployment rate is so low and because the jobs are opening up, so most gifted people feel that if they're willing to work hard, they can find a job. We don't have the anxiety about affirmative action we used to have when the police departments and the fire departments were being integrated and promotions were being given. Every now and then you hear something about that, but most of the controversy

now is about education. Why? Because people know education is really important and if parents and children make a decision about where they want to go to school—in the case of Elaine, a public school—that they believe is good, or a college, they're afraid if they don't get in where they want to get in, they'll get a substandard education.

I have a different view. The reason I've supported affirmative action, as long as you don't just let people in who are blatantly unqualified to anything, is that I think, number one, test scores and all these so-called objective measures are somewhat ambiguous and they're not perfect measures of people's capacity to grow. But secondly and even more importantly, I think our society has a vested interest in having people from diverse backgrounds.

When I went to college in the ''Dark Ages,'' one of the reasons I applied to Georgetown was they had foreign students there, and they had a policy of having a kid from every State there. Maybe I got in because there weren't so many people from Arkansas who applied, for all I know. I think that there are independent educational virtues to a diverse student body, and young people learn different things in different ways. And I don't think objective measurements are perfect. So I don't have a problem with it.

But I think the most important thing is that we have to understand that this is one of the hard questions. And it is best worked out, in my view, by people sitting around a table trying to work out the specifics, like in San Francisco. And when people feel like they have no voice, then they feel robbed. But there will never be a perfect resolution of this.

Mr. Lehrer. Richard, do you agree? No perfect resolutions to this?

[*Mr. Rodriguez agreed and related his experiences with affirmative action in college and the job market and how he was offered opportunities solely because of his Hispanic heritage rather than personal merit. He suggested race discussions will be troubled if basic understandings do not exist.*]

The President. Let me ask you—let me ask everybody—first of all, I'm glad you said that, because we're in the business of defining stereotypes tonight, so that's good. I think all of us who have worked hard to get where we are are sort of proud of that. I mean, when I was a young man, I was the only person on my law school faculty that voted against our tenure policy because I never wanted anybody to guarantee me a job. I told them they could tell me to leave tomorrow, and I'd go. I mean, I really identify with what you've done. I'm proud of that.

But suppose you're the president of the university. Would you like, other things being equal, to have a faculty that were not—that were reasonably racially diverse? And even more importantly, would you like, other things being equal, to have a student body that reflected the America these young people are going to live in once they've graduated? And if you believe that, and you didn't want to infuriate people like you've been infuriated and make them feel like you've felt, how would you go about achieving that?

I think this is tough stuff. I don't pretend that my position is easy or totally defensible. How would you do it?

[*Mr. Rodriguez answered that matters should be addressed early on, in the first grade as opposed to graduate school. Mr. Rosenblatt agreed and suggested that goals are better than quotas.*]

The President. Let's go back to this. I want to ask you, too, to come in, because I want you to go in here. [*Laughter*] What exactly was it did you resent? Did you resent the fact they were going to guarantee you a job whether you were any good or not? Or did you resent the fact that they were looking for Hispanic faculty members?

[*Mr. Rodriguez said he resented being entitled to an opportunity because he was a needed minority in a quota system and getting opportunity because his skin was darker than another's. Mr. Suro related his experiences, recalling that there were times when he consciously did not want to be regarded as a ''Hispanic journalist.'' He remarked on the diversity of groups that do not share common histories, yet they are lumped together in one group.*]

Mr. Lehrer. Cynthia, the differences—in other words, dealing with people differently.

[*Ms. Tucker stated that the black experience in America is distinct. She recounted her own experience living under Jim Crow laws in southern Alabama, and she said she believes affirmative action is useful and that it is not synonymous with unqualified. Ms. Chao stated that the history of race relations in America has been very tragic, that it is still not a perfect world, but it is incumbent on people to remember that the ideal of equal opportunity for everyone be maintained. She stressed the importance of equal standards for all.*]

Mr. Page. Well, how do you define merit? Does—should there be an equal opportunity to get into Berkeley and UCLA? But how do you define merit? Is it SAT's or ACT's or other criteria?

Ms. Chao. No, I think clearly, merit.

Mr. Lehrer. Let me ask Sherman, where do Native Americans fit into the affirmative action debate?

[*Mr. Alexie asserted the illusionary nature of the debate over affirmative action and stated that national policy is being made based on isolated and anecdotal examples. Ms. Chao remarked on the reality of differential standards for different groups.*]

The President. Do you want to answer Clarence?

[*Ms. Chao stressed the importance of education and suggested that the real goal for the country is eliminating crime and creating economic opportunity for all.*]

The President. What are you going to say about this?

Ms. James. I was just going to say, Mr. President, I think the operative phrase was, in your question, ''all things being equal,'' wouldn't we like a diverse community, particularly in the academic arena?'' And I was looking around the table and thinking, gee whiz, I bet I'm the only one here at the table that has to make admissions decisions.

The President. You've got to make these decisions. [*Laughter*]

[*Ms. James stated that most Americans have a high esteem for the idea of diversity, but they feel there is unfair preferential treatment bestowed on some to achieve it. She suggested focusing on the income-based programs and preferential treatment for various reasons as opposed to solely based on race.*]

The President. Let me go back to something Clarence said at the beginning. You pointed out—we talked about prejudice, discrimination, then we started talking about diversity and all that. I think you need—if I could go back to the very first thing that all of you started talking about—we need a vocabulary that embraces America's future, and we need a vocabulary that embraces America's present and past on this race issue. And we need to know when we're making distinctions. And then we need to fess up to the fact at least when it comes to Native Americans that if we don't do something fairly dramatic, the future is going to be like the past for too many people.

For example, I think most Americans, whether they're conservatives or liberals or Republicans or Democrats, would support, for example, my budget proposal to give more resources to the EEOC to get rid of the backlog. Because all of the surveys show that 85 percent of the American people, or 90 percent, or something, believe that actual discrimination against an individual person in the workplace is wrong, based on race.

Now, the real problem is that affirmative action, I think now, since there are a lot of middle-class blacks, middle-class Hispanics, that it's almost—people are not so sure in the workplace and the schoolplace whether it is furthering the goal of getting rid of the lingering effects of discrimination, which is Cynthia's experience, and mine as a Southerner—ours—you know, or whether it is now being used to create a more diverse environment which people feel is a good thing, but not a good thing if it is sticking it to this hard-working Chinese mother in San Francisco and her children, who is raising her kids under adverse circumstances.

And I guess one of the things that bothers me is that a lot—we need to make these kinds of discussions practical and institution- or community-based, because, I'll say again, I think that we want our children to grow up to learn to live in the world that they will in fact live in. Therefore, if you forget about

discrimination for a minute—you can't ever do that, but let's just assume there is no discrimination—America has a wonderful system of higher education. There are hundreds of schools I think you can get a world-class undergraduate education in. And I believe that, therefore, it's worth having some policy to try to diversify the student body.

It's interesting to see what Texas did when the *Hopwood* decision came down. They said, "Well, we don't want to have a totally segregated set of colleges and universities in Texas, so we'll just say the top 10 percent of every high school can automatically go to any Texas institution of higher education." That looks like a merit-based decision, but, of course, it's not any more merit-based than the other decision, because there are segregated high schools, and there are differences in test scores, and all that.

So we need to kind of—we need 10 hours to discuss this, and I'd like to listen to you. But the only thing I want to point out is, the American people have got to decide. Do they want a housing project in Chicago—in this case, only the people from Chicago have to decide—that's integrated? If so, the people who don't get in there, do they have reasonable alternatives? That's one realistic thing. If a child doesn't get into a good school that he or she wants to get into, do they have an equivalent alternative? If they don't, you maybe have hurt them for life. Is it worth it to get—the discrimination?

Or in the case—look at Kay's problem. She runs a government department, makes these admission decisions in a school that has a certain religious and value-based approach to life. So if a child gets deprived of going into there, even if the kid goes to Harvard, it may not be the cultural environment——

Ms. James. They couldn't get near the education they get at Regent. [*Laughter*]

The President. But let's assume it's equivalent. The child may lose something noneducational. So all these things are—I just want the American people to start talking about this in a way that's real here.

[*Mr. Rodriguez remarked on the increasing numbers of young people who do not want to be defined as belonging to a particular race. He recalled an encounter with a woman in San Francisco whose father was African-American and mother was Mexican. The woman described herself as a "Blaxican." Mr. Rodriguez said youth will redefine the look of America.*]

The President. That's good.

Mr. Lehrer. Cynthia, and then to Roger—on this question that the President raised, the new dialog, and to Richard, what are the new words we use? What do we talk about in this new world?

[*Ms. Tucker suggested the importance of acknowledging how much the world has changed and the need for a stronger sense of history. Mr. Rosenblatt questioned the similarity of racism today and when he was growing up. He questioned the importance of affirmative action as an issue for debate.*]

Mr. Lehrer. Roberto, how would you define the new vocabulary?

Mr. Suro. We've talked a lot about how trying to describe the population and how it's changed. Roger touches on an important point. We have to have a new vocabulary to describe our attitudes. Discrimination is a different thing in this country than it was 20 years ago.

Mr. Lehrer. In what way?

[*Mr. Suro explained that discrimination is based on more factors than solely race, and more complicated remedies and vocabulary are required to describe attitudes. Mr. Page noted, even in suburban neighborhoods, some groups tend to be as widely discriminated against as their counterparts in inner-city neighborhoods.*]

Mr. Lehrer. What do you tell your son? What do you tell your son about why this is happening?

[*Mr. Page responded that he answers any questions his son might pose and that the child is aware of racial difference but does not consider any race better than others. He noted that there is still segregation. Mr. Rodriguez recalled being stopped by black police officers while jogging before dawn and remarked that this society is a very complicated one.*]

Mr. Page. Who said blacks couldn't be prejudiced? Of course.

The President. I agree with that. You know, I'm very sympathetic with what you

say. And I want it to be as you say. And I agreed that we have all kinds of overlapping stereotypes that we haven't even talked about. One of the things that came up after Los Angeles riots, you know, the attitudes of the African-Americans to the Korean grocers and the Arab grocers and the Hispanic customers and all of that—it's a lot more complicated than it used to be.

But as a factual matter, if you just look at the prison population—you wanted to bring that up—if you look at all the unemployment rate among young, single African-American males without an education, if you look at the physical isolation of people in these inner-city neighborhoods—we have the lowest unemployment rate in 28 years; there are still New York City neighborhoods where the unemployment rate is 15 percent—if you look at these things, if I could just come back to sort of what I think is practical here, I think it is imperative that we somehow develop a bipartisan consensus in this country that we will do those things which we know will stop another generation of these kids from getting in that kind of trouble.

My best model now, I guess, is what they're trying to do in Chicago in the school system and what they've done in Boston with the juvenile justice system. In Boston, they went for 2 years without one kid under 18 being killed with a gun. Unheard of in a city that size. And if you look at what they did in Houston, we need to at least adopt those strategies that will invest money in keeping these kids out of trouble in the first place and try to keep them out of jail and give them the chance to have a good life. And if there's disproportionate manifestation of race, then so be it. Then we ought to have an affirmative action program, if you will, that invests in those kids' futures and gives them a chance to stay out of trouble.

To me, it's the kids that are being lost altogether and the disproportionate presence of racial minorities among those kids that is still the most disturbing thing in the world. Because if you get these kids up there, 18 or 19, heck, they'll figure out things. Our kids will figure out things we weren't smart enough to figure out. That's how society goes on. That's what progress is all about. But I think we have to recognize that's still a big race problem in this country, especially for African-Americans.

Mr. Lehrer. Clarence raised the point, Sherman, about race talk in his family, and the President—Mr. President, you have said you had trouble getting people to talk bluntly and honestly about race.

The President. Yes. We're all too polite about it.

Mr. Lehrer. How do you get people to talk about race?

[*Mr. Alexie remarked that people are always talking about race, though the language may be coded.*]

Mr. Lehrer. But do Indians talk about race?

Mr. Alexie. Oh, yeah, we're actually probably a lot more conservative and racist than any other single group of people. We're much more reactionary. It's funny—politically, we give our money to Democrats, but we vote for Republicans. [*Laughter*]

I'm going to leave that one alone. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Lehrer. How do you get honest talk? Do you think there is honest talk about race?

[*Ms. James suggested that people are very willing to talk about race by relating personal experiences.*]

Ms. Chao. I think the bottom line is, I think there has to be not allocation of programs based on preferential treatment—but that there is equal opportunity. And going back to Clarence's issue about merit——

Mr. Lehrer. We talking about talking bluntly about race.

Ms. Chao. Right. I think this is part of it. And I think the President wanted me to answer Clarence's comments. Clarence's question about merit.

Mr. Lehrer. Okay, but we have to—I have to interrupt you all now to say, thank you, Mr. President, and thanks to all the rest of——

The President. We're just getting warmed up.

Mr. Lehrer. I know, I know, I know.

Ms. Chao. It's got to be the same standards for everybody, however merit is defined.

Mr. Lehrer. Okay. But from Washington this has been a conversation with President

Clinton about race. I'm Jim Lehrer. Thank you, and good night. And as you see, may the conversation continue.

NOTE: The program was recorded at 2 p.m. in the WETA–TV PBS studios in Arlington, VA, for broadcast at 8 p.m., July 9, on PBS.

Memorandum on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998

July 8, 1998

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense

Subject: Delegation of Authority Under Section 1406(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998

By the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code, I hereby delegate to the Secretary of Defense the functions conferred upon the President by section 1406(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85).

The authority delegated by this memorandum may be redelegated not lower than the Under Secretary level.

You are authorized and directed to publish this memorandum in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

Remarks on Launching the National Youth Antidrug Media Campaign in Atlanta, Georgia

July 9, 1998

Thank you very much. Thank you. First of all, let's begin by giving Kim and James another hand. Didn't they do a good job? [*Applause*] They spoke well for you.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Miller, Mr. Mayor, General McCaffrey, General Reno, Secretary Shalala, I thank you all for your superb efforts in this endeavor. I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to Jim Burke, the president of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. He's not as well-known to most American children as the President or the Speaker or the Governor, but no American has done more to save the children of this country from the horror of drug abuse than Jim Burke. And we all owe him a very great debt of gratitude. Thank you.

I'd also like to thank the Ad Council, the Community Anti-Drug Coalition, the athletic teams and sports figures that are represented here today, the business groups, the Georgia attorney general and agriculture commissioner, and the other State and municipal and county officials. And Congressman Peter Deutsch from Florida is here with us today. I thank all of them for being here. And there are many others who aren't here who are supporting what we are doing together as Americans.

I was interested when we just watched the ads to see what the young people's reaction was to the various ads. I was wondering to myself whether the ads that were most effective with me were also the ones that were most effective to you, or whether they were different. I say that to make the point that the Speaker made so eloquently. In the end, this is about you, what touches you, what you believe, what your convictions are.

We know from the stories that we just heard from James and from Kim, we know from all the available scientific research, that what Governor Miller said is right: Attitudes drive actions. There are lots of other factors. There are some places where kids are subject to more temptation than others; there are some blocks where there are more drug dealers than others. All of us have to deal with that. But we know that the more young people fear drugs, the more they disapprove of them, the less likely they are to use them. Therefore, kicking America's drug habit requires a dramatic change in attitudes, accompanied and reinforced by a dramatic increase in personal responsibility by all Americans.

Parents have the greatest power. That's what one of the ads showed us. The ads we saw today are not meant to replace parents' voices but to reinforce them. Ultimately, the best drug enforcement program, the best drug prevention program is an effective, caring, loving parent sitting down with a child and talking seriously about drugs early.

Parents have already told us that these ads help to break the ice with their children. So I ask the parents of America today, don't wait

until your children are using drugs to talk to them about drugs. Watch the ads together and discuss them, beginning tonight.

Every one of the rest of us can, and must, help parents to teach their children to turn away from drugs. The entertainment industry can shape attitudes, as anyone who has a teenager can tell you. The media should never glamorize drugs. I'm pleased that across the entertainment industry, a real effort is now being made to help, with the antidrug messages on the Wonderful World of Disney, antidrug chat groups on America OnLine, even training sessions about youth drug use for screenwriters and producers at Fox—something I hope we will see for all people who prepare television programs on all networks.

Professional athletes can shape attitudes. I thank Major League Soccer, the Florida Marlins, the New York Mets, Atlanta's own Braves for agreeing to air the ads during their home games. And while one of government's primary responsibilities is to enforce the law—and we should—we can also support this change in attitudes.

As General McCaffrey said, with the help of the Speaker and people from across the political spectrum, we have aggressively pursued a comprehensive antidrug strategy. We've put more police on our streets. We've strengthened our border patrols. We've toughened penalties. We do more drug testing of prisoners and parolees to break the link between crime and drugs. We work more with countries where drugs are grown and processed to try to stop the drugs from coming into the United States in the first place.

But with this ad campaign, in which the public's investment is matched dollar for dollar by private partners, America is mounting a new and sweeping effort to change the attitude of an entire generation of young people.

Already, we've seen an impact in the 12 cities where the ads have run as a pilot project. Calls—listen to this—in just those 12 cities, calls to local antidrug coalition hotlines have increased by up to 500 percent. Calls to our national antidrug helpline have nearly tripled. Young people here in Atlanta say that the ads make them realize the serious consequences of using drugs. In Denver, middle school students think the ads could "scare kids out of using drugs," to quote one of them. In Washington, DC, young people say, to quote one, "the ads make them stop and think about what illegal drugs can do."

Tonight, when these ads run on every national television network, they will reach more than 40 million Americans, including millions and millions of children. That is just the beginning. Over the next 5 years, we'll help to make sure that when young people turn on the television, listen to the radio, read the newspaper, or surf the Web, they get the powerful message that drugs are wrong, illegal, and can kill.

I'm proud to say, as has already been said by General McCaffrey, that this national media campaign was a part of the historic bipartisan balanced budget agreement reached last year with Speaker Gingrich and the other leaders of Congress. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for including this in our budget agreement. It shows what we can accomplish when we put progress ahead of partisanship. I will work with the Congress to fund other important programs in our drug control strategy.

All of us—parents, the media, athletes, business, government—have an opportunity and an obligation to make a real difference in the fight against drugs. But nothing we do will succeed, as the Speaker said, unless young people also take responsibility for themselves.

We've heard some personal stories; I'd like to close with two: one from my family and one from the job the American people have so generously given me these 6 years. Let me begin with the job.

I spent a lot of time haranguing, cajoling, trying to persuade, sometimes putting brutal pressure on countries where drugs are grown or processed, or through which drugs pass, trying to get people to stop doing things that send drugs to us. And we've had some success. We supported remarkable efforts by the Coast Guard, for example, to cut off drugs before they get to this country. But we can never cut off the whole flow. And every time I'd do this, some leader of a country where drugs are grown will say, "You know, Mr. President, you're right. We have a lot of poor farmers in our country, and I wish they'd

grow something else. But America has 4 percent of the world's people, and you're buying almost 50 percent of the world's drugs. Nobody is making you buy those drugs. So you can say whatever you want to us. If you just said tomorrow—everybody in America said, we're not going to buy any more drugs, all our farmers would immediately start to grow something legal and good.'' And that's true.

Now, that doesn't let them off the hook; it doesn't excuse the inexcusable behavior of the Colombian drug cartels or any other groups in any part of the world. But it is true. It is true. It doesn't mean we should stop trying to kill the drugs at the border and stop the imports and break the drug gangs. But it's true. If every American young person tomorrow said, ''No, thank you,'' they would grow something else. The laboratories would make other chemicals that are legal and not harmful.

I'll tell you another story that's fairly well-known, but I want you to think about what it means for families. This young man was brave enough to say that his mother used drugs and talk about what—the pain it caused the family. My brother nearly died from a cocaine habit. And I've asked myself a thousand times, what kind of fool was I that I did not know this was going on? You know, I got myself elected President; I'm supposed to know what people are thinking, what's going on in their minds. How did this happen that I didn't see this coming and didn't stop it?

And when it all happened he said—I said, ''When did this start?'' He said, ''Well, in high school; I started using marijuana and drinking beer.'' I said, ''How often?'' He said, ''Everyday.'' And I thought to myself, what kind of family member was I?

And these things make you do really bad things. They make you abuse other people. Most of the people selling drugs on the street are out there supporting their own habits. So you take other people, people who are basically good people, and you turn them into animals, because they don't care what they do to anybody else because they've got to get the money if they have to destroy somebody else, so they can keep feeding their own habits. They destroy families. Mothers who love their sons wind up neglecting them, abusing them, walking away, weakening the family. Everybody gets hurt. Nobody in America is free of this. Not the President; not any community, any school, any church, any neighborhood.

So the hardest thing in the world to do is to get people to change their habits, especially if what you're doing feels good in the moment. But it's very important. Nothing is so important—not the laws, not the investments, not anything. Nothing is so important as what the American people get up and do every day just because they think it's the right thing to do. Nothing comes close to it.

So we're here today because we took a little bit of the money the American people gave the National Government—a billion dollars over the next 5 years—put it with at least that much and maybe more coming from private sources, to send a message to all these kids. I look at all these little girls out here in their Girl Scouts or their Brownie uniforms; the message seems simple today. When they're 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18, and life gets more complicated, it's real important that they carry with them the message that they have today deep in their heart.

I look at all these kids with these American's Pride T-shirts on, and what I want them to do is to go back and somehow reach all those kids that are in their schools that don't wear those T-shirts. There's somebody like my brother back at your school who is a good kid, just a little lost. Somebody told him something is all right that wasn't. And the family members were just a little out of it and couldn't believe it was going on. You can save them. That's what these ads are all about.

These ads are designed to knock America upside the head and get America's attention and to empower all of you who are trying to do the right thing. Please do it.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m. in the Sidney Marcus Auditorium in the Georgia World Congress Center. In his remarks, he referred to student antidrug organization leaders Kim Willis of Erie, PA, and James Miller III, of Portland, OR; Gov. Zell Miller, Attorney General Thurbert E. Baker, and Agriculture Commissioner Tommy

Irvin of Georgia; James E. Burke, chairman, Partnership for a Drug-Free America; and Mayor Bill Campbell of Atlanta.

Remarks at a Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Luncheon in Atlanta

July 9, 1998

Thank you very much, and welcome. Michael, I would say, with family like this and support like this, you have an excellent chance to win.

I want to thank all of you for coming today in support of Michael Coles and his wonderful family. I want to especially thank the mayor and the Governor and all of the State and local officials who are here, and my good friends, the mayor's predecessors, Maynard Jackson and Andrew Young, for coming.

I feel a great deal of gratitude to Georgia for many things. In 1992, when I started running for President, Zell Miller was about the only person besides my mother and my wife who thought I could win. [*Laughter*] And then, I didn't win in New Hampshire, where I had one or two minor obstacles—[*laughter*]—and an opponent who lived 5 miles from the State line, and they said, ''You know, if Bill Clinton doesn't get 40 percent in Georgia, he'll have to withdraw; he's toast; he's history.'' And I said, ''Now, Zell, I don't want to put any pressure on you.'' [*Laughter*] So we got 57 percent in the Georgia primary in 1992. And there have been a lot of wonderful experiences since, and I am very grateful for this State.

I'm grateful for people like Maynard and Andy, who have been friends of mine and my wife's for many, many years. I'm grateful for Bill Campbell's leadership. I can honestly say that I know quite a bit about being a Governor. I was a Governor for 12 years. One of the great honors of my life was when my colleagues once voted me the most effective Governor in the country. I'm saying that not to brag on myself but to establish my bona fide for what I am about to say.

In my experience, I believe that what Zell Miller has done as Governor of Georgia has affected more people more personally, positively, than the work of any other Governor with whom I have worked in the last 20 years.

I also want to say, when I'm a very old man, if the Lord lets me live that long, and I'm thinking about—over the high points of my wonderful career for which I'm very grateful, in the late of the night, one of the things I will always remember is Zell Miller's voice at the New York convention in 1992. I can give that speech about the house his mama built better than he can. [*Laughter*] But it captured the heart of America and the heart of what we're all about.

When we were sitting here at lunch, I went around the table before I came up, and I said, ''Can you folks—how are we going to win this race? What do you want me to say? How is this going to work?'' And they all gave me their ideas. And I don't know if I can add anything to what's already been said. Very often, since I became President, I always get to speak last. That's a great honor. But very often, it's that sort of situation where everything that needs to be said has already been said, but not everyone said it.

I think maybe there is something I can say. What do you need to win a race like this? To convince voters in what is clearly an American battleground State for the future, where Atlanta now is home to more foreign companies than any other city in America, where you have in this city really everything that you can imagine the future being about in America, but where in the State the parties are pretty evenly divided and the philosophies are pretty evenly divided, and the races have a way of being agonizingly close, as I have found in my joy and disappointment. What can I say?

Well, you have a good candidate who has demonstrated his character. Through overcoming adversity, he's demonstrated that he understands the American economic system through triumphing in it. He has built a great family, which is the most important thing for anyone to have in life. He has the guts to challenge incumbents who are going to have tons of money, which is evidence of courage in public life.

But what I would like to say to you is that we have to convince moderate Republicans and independent voters that what happened

in America in the last 6 years and what happened in Georgia in Zell Miller's tenure was not an accident and was directly related—not that I am responsible for every good thing that's happened in this country or not that he's responsible for every good thing that's happened in Georgia—but there is a connection between the ideas that leaders have and the policies that are pursued and the consequences in the lives of people.

It's not just that Zell Miller is a good man with a lot of energy and a lot of courage, and he was brave in the Marine Corps, and he gives a great speech; the HOPE scholarship was, in fact, the right thing to do. It was the right thing to do. And what I can tell you from my experience is, I was a Southern Governor; I listened to the Republicans bad-mouth the Democratic Party from can till can't, from dawn until dark, year-in and year-out, forever and a day. And that time I ran for President, I had ump-de-dump people in Arkansas who had voted for me repeatedly for Governor who never thought they would vote for a Democrat for President. Some of them didn't vote for a Democrat even when it was me—[*laughter*]—after voting for me repeatedly, because Republicans had done a great job of sort of doing reverse plastic surgery on the Democrats. You know, they'd say, ''You can't vote for them; they can't handle the budget; they can't handle this; they're weak on foreign policy.'' You know that whole litany. ''They want to take your money and give it to people on welfare; don't believe in work.'' I can give that speech better than they can give it, too. I've heard it so many times. [*Laughter*]

And they still milk that old cow every chance they get. And when 1992—I wanted to take the Democratic Party in a new direction based on its oldest values. I believed that we could unite the country and move it forward, that we could build that bridge to the 21st century based on opportunity and responsibility and a sense of community. And we set about doing things that really were different. We had new ideas on the economy. We said we believe it's possible to cut the deficit and balance the budget and still have money to invest in education and in science and technology and building the future. We believe it's possible to expand American trade and still care about preserving the environment and the standards of our working people.

We believe it's possible to be tough on crime but to be smart, too, and to find ways to keep more kids out of trouble in the first place. We believe it is possible to move people from welfare to work but not to ask them to hurt their children; to empower people to move from welfare to work by saying, ''Yes, if you're able-bodied, you have to do it. But by the way, there's got to be a job there and there ought to be child care and you ought not to have to neglect your role as a parent to do your role as a worker in this society.''

We believed that America could be a force for good in the world and still help the economic interests of our country. We believed we could have a smaller Government that was more effective, that worked on empowering people to make the most of their own lives. And we believed that we could build one America, across all the lines that divide us, because what unites us is more important than what divides us. And if we could ever learn to appreciate our differences instead of be afraid of them, we would be a very great country, indeed.

Now, that's what we believe. Now, after 6 years—and again, I say I do not believe that I, my party, or Washington, DC, is responsible for every good thing that's happened in America; most of the good things that happen in a free country happen by the billions and billions and billions of decisions that ordinary people make every day on their own. But what the President does and the policies that are pursued are not unrelated to what happens in the country. They have an impact.

And I am profoundly grateful that you gave me the chance to do this job, and I am very grateful that after 6 years, we have the lowest crime rate in 25 years, the lowest unemployment rate in 28 years, the lowest inflation rate in 29 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 29 years, the first balanced budget and surplus in 29 years, and the highest rate of homeownership in the history of the country. I'm proud of that, and you should be, too.

Now, that's not a reason to let Michael Coles—and I can't run for reelection. And if I could, it wouldn't be a reason to reelect

me. I remember once I was about to run for reelection after I had been in 10 years, and I asked a guy at the State Fair once—we were having Governor's Day—and this guy came up in overalls and said, ''Are you going to run for reelection?'' And I said, ''Yes, I might. Will you vote for me if I do?'' He said, ''I will; I always have.'' And I said, ''Well, aren't you sick of me after 10 years?'' He said, ''No, but most of my friends are.'' [*Laughter*] And I said, ''Well,'' I said, ''Don't they think I've done a good job?'' He said, ''Yes, but you drew a check every two weeks, didn't you?'' [*Laughter*] He said, ''That's what we hired you to do.''

So what's that got to do with this race, where we are now? I'll tell you what it's got to do with it. Number one, it's some indication that, if the ideas we had in the past were right, that the ideas we're advocating for the future may be right as well, and what we are trying to do in education with smaller classes and modernized schools and computers in all the schools and higher standards, that these things are important. Because no one in the world believes we have the best system of public education in the world. And everyone knows we have the best system of college education in the world. And we will never be what we ought to be for every American child until our elementary and secondary education system is also the best in the world.

You take health care. We're having this big debate over the Patients' Bill of Rights. I pleaded with the Congress to pass it, and I thought for sure they would. Now, the health insurance companies, a lot of them are against it—but not all of them, I might add. Most people are in managed care plans today. I have never been one of those that attacked managed care.

When I became President, health care costs were inflating at 3 times the rate of inflation. It was unsustainable. It was going to break every business in the country that tried to provide health insurance for their kids. It was going to consume the whole economy. We had to do something to slow down the rate of inflation. On the other hand, any system taken to extremes is subject to abuse. I don't care what system it is.

The genius of the American Constitution is the limits it places on all of us in power. And whenever we forget that, we do so at our peril. That is the problem with managed care today. People still ought to be able to get an emergency room when they need to go. They need to be able to see a specialist when they need to see a specialist. They need to be able to appeal these decisions when they need to be able to appeal them. And that's what the Patients' Bill of Rights is all about. So that's an important issue.

We have all these exciting ideas about how we can grow the economy while doing a better job at preserving the environment. Look at these wildfires that your neighbor down in Florida has been suffering. I'm going down to Daytona when I leave you to thank the firefighters down there. Florida had the wettest few months in history in the fall and winter; then they had the driest few months they had ever had; then June was the hottest month they had ever had; hotter than any July or August they had ever had.

The 5 hottest years on record since 1400 have all occurred in the 1990's. And 1998 is going to be the hottest of all if trends continue. Now, we have two choices. We can do what my—as my leaders of the other party do in Washington, which is to deny that this climate change is going on, deny this is a problem, and say we're going to go right on and do everything just like we've been doing it. If it rips the sheet, we're going to do it, and everybody else is just, you know, like Chicken Little. Or, we can face the evidence and say: Do we have to give up economic growth to change our energy use patterns, try to cool the climate, try to be more responsible? And when you look at the evidence, the evidence is plainly, no, you can grow the economy at least as rapidly as we've been growing with a different energy strategy and without having the heavy hand of government regulation do it if you just give business and citizens the incentive to do what is plainly there before them to do.

These are huge decisions. What I want to tell you is, if you like those statistics I just read off, the ideas we've had in the past are an indication that the ideas we have in the future may be right.

The third point I want to make is this: I do not expect this man, if he gets elected to Senate, to vote with me on every issue. I want him to only do so when it is consistent with his conscience and when he believes it's the right thing for the people of Georgia. But I believe he thinks enough, like all of you do and like we do, to know that we will be building a future based on progress not partisanship. And that's the last point I want to make. Look at the record of the alternative.

I am grateful that the Republicans worked with me to sign the Balanced Budget Act last year. But don't you ever forget that 93 percent of that deficit was reduced—it was 93 percent gone on the day I signed the Balanced Budget Act because of a bill that every single one of them voted against in 1993 to get it started. Don't forget that.

They said we were going to wreck the economy. When we said, ''You know, it seems to me that if somebody's got a criminal record or a serious mental health history, they ought not just to be able to walk in and buy a handgun.'' Even in Arkansas, where nearly everybody's got a gun, why, they accused me of the awfulest things you ever heard. They said, ''Oh, the world was going to come to an end.'' And one of the reasons they won the Congress in 1994 is because I disagreed with the NRA over the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. And it wasn't just in the South; they took out a Congressman in New Hampshire, too. In 1996 I went back to New Hampshire where I started, and I got a bunch of those hunters together. And I said, ''Do you remember what they told you in '94?'' I said, ''Well, as of today, there have been 80,000 felons, fugitives, and stalkers who couldn't buy handguns because of the Brady law.'' I said, ''Now, if there's a single one of you who lost your hunting rifle because of what I did, I want you to vote against me for reelection. But if you didn't, then they lied to you, and you need to get even.'' [*Laughter*] And in Republican New Hampshire, they got even, and I'm grateful. [*Laughter*]

I say that because we actually view the world in different ways. You've got to understand. Somehow—I talked to Zell on the way in here—those of you who are in this room, we have to be able to reach out to the voters who don't follow politics as closely as you do, and say, look, there are consequences to these ideas. This is not just about whether the President can give a good speech or Michael Coles made a lot of money or—even though I admire him enormously, it's not even about whether he overcame all that adversity from his terrible accident. It's also about whether we're doing the right thing for America's future.

And you know, when times are good like this, most people tend to relax, and you want to say, ''Gosh, I just want to go out and sit in the Sun. I went through the seventies; I went through the eighties; I lived through all this tumult; I'm making money; the stock market's up; leave me alone; I don't want to have to think about this. [*Laughter*] I'm going to vote for the person that looks nicest on television, makes me feel good—[*laughter*]—promises me to keep taxes down and just don't bother me.'' [*Laughter*]

I had a great uncle one time, who just died at 91, who had about a fourth grade education. He said, ''All I want you to do is keep the brooks clean so I can fish and make sure there's plenty of birds in the air and animals in the woods in hunting season. And otherwise, just leave me alone.'' [*Laughter*] There's a lot of people who feel that way. But let me tell you, any person living in Atlanta knows that this is a very dynamic world. You see what they're going through in Asia now economically. You know about all the ethnic and racial and religious tensions all over the world.

If you've looked at the demographics and you know what happens when the baby boomers—and I'm the oldest of the baby boomers—when we retire, what we're going to do, the pressures we're going to put on the Social Security system and the Medicare system, we have big, long-term challenges in this country that we have to face. It is easier to take the long-term challenges on when you're doing well. We have the confidence in this country to do well. And Georgia ought to have the confidence to vote for somebody like Michael Coles for the Senate. We ought to say, look, we've got the confidence to do that.

Here's a guy who has done all these other things right in his life, and he's a doer. You

know, get out and do things, and it will be for progress, not partisanship. I think I'll take a chance and do it, because this is a time when we have the opportunity to deal with these long-term challenges.

And I want you to go out and tell people that. I'm telling you, I've been in Washington 6 years, and I only have 2½ years to go, then I can go be a real person again just like the rest of you. But what we need is progress over partisanship. What we need is people who are willing to take a chance to deal with the long-term challenges of the country. What we need is people who understand that we cannot lead the world to a better place unless we are becoming a better country at home, that we can always do better.

Our Founders left us a charge that is a permanent mission. It's never finished: to form a more perfect Union. I think that any one of the Founding Fathers, here today, could read about this man, his family, his work, his values, and say, "that's the kind of person we had in mind."

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:10 p.m. in the Marquis Ballroom at the Marriott Marquis Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Georgia Senatorial candidate Michael J. Coles; Mayor Bill Campbell and former mayors Maynard Jackson and Andrew Young of Atlanta; and Gov. Zell Miller of Georgia.

Remarks to Firefighters and Relief Workers in Daytona Beach, Florida

July 9, 1998

Thank you so much. Well, ladies and gentlemen, first of all, I'd like to thank Karen Terry and Randy Holmes for their remarks and the introduction and for giving me and all of you and all of America, thanks to the media folks who are here, one vivid picture of what these last couple of weeks have been all about.

I want to thank my good friend Governor Chiles for the work that he has done. I thank Lieutenant Governor MacKay and all the other State officials who are here. I thank Mayor Asher and Mr. Rosevear, the chair of the county council. The mayor asked me to say in front of national television what Lawton has already said, that Daytona Beach is open for tourists. People all over America are calling the White House on the comment line. They want to know, what can we do to help the people of Florida? Well, one thing you can do is, if you haven't taken your vacation yet and you were trying to decide whether to come, give these people an economic boost down here. They've got the fires under control, and they need some help and support. It would be a good thing to do.

I want to thank the Members of Congress who are here—Corrine Brown, Peter Deutsch, and Allen Boyd—for representing you well and for supporting strongly the emergency appropriations that make it possible for FEMA and the other agencies to do its work. I thank our Agriculture Secretary, Dan Glickman, and our wonderful FEMA Director, James Lee Witt, for the work they have done.

I want to thank all the firefighters who are here. I know we have people from Palm Coast Fire Department, from the National Guard, from the U.S. Forest Service, from the Division of Florida Forestry, the Florida Emergency Management Division, and a lot of State and local emergency workers; Mr. Myers, your emergency management director here; and I'm glad to see Mr. Barbera from the International Association of Fire Fighters here.

There's so many people I want to thank, but I'd like to say a special word of thanks, too, to Bill Franz for making Daytona available as a headquarters for the firefighters and for the effort here. I really appreciate that.

They had to postpone the race this year because there was a more important race going on, and you just heard them talk about it, a race that was fought house by house and family by family. There are 150,000 fans that normally show up here, and even though the race was delayed, I hope they'll show up later to show their loyalty and support not only to Daytona but to all of you for what you did here.

I'm here because I think it's important that every American knows that this summer, notwithstanding the great movies, the real American heroes are not up in space fighting asteroids, they're in Florida fighting fires. And I thank you for it.

You might be interested to know, those of you who are firefighters, that on the several occasions when I would call—and I want to thank our great Vice President, Al Gore, for coming down here on my behalf, because I was in China when much of this occurred, and I would call back and get my daily reports, and every day, people said, ''You would not believe what the firefighters are doing. The only real worry we have is, none of them will sleep; none of them will rest.''

As you know, there are almost 100 injuries and no telling how much exhaustion here. And I guess I'm cutting into your rest time now, so I've now become part of the problem. [*Laughter*] But I think it's important that America know that, too. Every single report I got on the progress of these fires, someone said, our real concern is the people who are fighting the fires will not sleep; they will not rest; they are obsessed with saving every home. And I thank you for that.

I'd also like to thank the people who came from all corners of our country and from Canada and even some came from as far away as Russia to help, showing that this was a human challenge that touched the hearts of people the world over. When I was in China, and we were in the midst of tough discussions and arguing over things that are profoundly important over the long run, my Chinese host asked me how the people of Florida were doing with the fires. You really reached the hearts of people throughout the world.

I also want to thank the people with the public works departments across the State for the work they did in cutting fire lines and clearing the fields. And I want to thank again—no telling how many of you did things that I don't know about, but I want to echo something Governor Chiles said. Maybe it shouldn't require a disaster like this, but you did show our country at its best. You showed people at its best. You showed people what the meaning of community is and why we all really do depend on each other. And as we go back to our daily lives and, I hope, a much more ordinary routine, I hope it's something we never forget, that we are all in this together; we need each other; and we're all at our best when we're giving not only to our families but to our neighbors. It's something I will never forget, and I hope all of you can help the rest of the people of Florida and the United States remember it in good times and rainy times.

There were children who gave up their Fourth of July picnics and trips to Disney World. I met a couple of them earlier—Katie and Megan Hendren—to help out and donate food and money. Hotel managers giving free rooms, churches helping people cook food for all the empty pots, laundromat owners cleaning soot and ash from uniforms, I even heard about the truckload of bananas that were mistakenly donated to Volusia County when you put out the word that bandannas were needed for the firefighters. [*Laughter*] Well, the older I get and the more muscle cramps I get doing my exercises, the more I appreciate bananas. So the firefighters may need the bananas as well as the bandannas. And I thank all the people who made them available.

Our Government has tried to be a good partner. I just met with several people who have been victimized by this fire, and I want to thank the families that took the time to talk to me. A lot of them are still hurting. Some of them don't have their children living with the parents yet; they're all spread out all over. And a lot of them are still uncertain about what their future living conditions are going to be. And a couple of them gave me some very specific suggestions about what we still might do to serve people here better. And I thank them for that.

Today I want to say that there are some new things we're going to do, and I'd like to mention them just briefly. First of all, I've directed our Agriculture Secretary, who is here with me, Dan Glickman, to declare all of our Florida counties eligible for farmers emergency loans if they've been affected by the drought, which is directly connected to this fire. Second, the Labor Department will pay for hundreds of jobs to expedite the recovery process, which is important. Third, FEMA will develop a long-term recovery plan with the State and work with our economic development administration to analyze the economic impact of the fires and see what else we can do to help. And finally, FEMA will be giving individual assistance to

29 more counties, providing temporary housing, crisis counseling, repairing homes, replacing essential items. We're going to do everything we can until the full recovery is completed.

Let me just say one other thing. You all probably know this, but this fire was made worse because you had, first, the wettest few months you'd ever had, followed by the driest few months you'd ever had, and then June was the hottest month ever recorded—even hotter than any July or August ever recorded in Florida.

No one entirely understands what is bringing about this extreme weather. But I can tell you this—and I've got it on my mind since I just got back from China, and they've been keeping weather records there for 500 years and more. Since the 1400's, the 5 hottest years ever recorded all occurred in the 1990's; 1997 was the hottest year ever recorded. If present temperature trends continue, 1998 will be warmer than 1997 was.

Now, you'll hear a lot of political debate, and the Vice President and I believe that the climate is warming and that we ought to take steps to cool it off and that we can do it without hurting economic growth. Others may disagree. The point I want to make today is, I'm going to go back to Washington determined to try to do whatever I can to make sure that you and people like you all over America can be even better prepared, because if we are going to have hotter and hotter, and drier and drier years—and even if we move aggressively to try to combat this climate change, we'll have that for a while—then when you or other people like you have to face this again, we need to learn from what you've gone through; we need your best advice.

So that's the last thing I want to ask you. I want to ask you for one last shred of citizen service. When this is all over, you need to get together with the groups of people that fought this fire; you need to put your heads together; you need to ask yourself, what specific things could have been done to provide even better preparedness? What do you do when you're fighting three fires in three places at once? What do you do when you have to make choices about what you're going to do? Is there any way to avoid making those kind of choices? What else can we do?

Because we have to believe, based on the evidence of the last decade, that if we get hotter and hotter, and we have periods of more extreme wet, followed by periods of more extreme drought, we're going to have more things like this happen. You can help America to deal with this.

And so, when you get some sleep, when you get some rest, when you're absolutely confident this crisis is past, if you've got some ideas, get them to the State, or get them to our FEMA people, because we want to build on what you've done. This has been heroic, but if we can do anything to prevent these things or to be better prepared the next time because of your experience and your knowledge, I implore you to share it with us, because we have to believe we're facing things like this in the near future.

Finally, let me say, I found, with the help of some of our people who know I'm interested in Scripture, a verse from Isaiah that I think captures what you've all been through. And I'd like to read it to you in closing. Isaiah 57:10: "You were wearied with the length of your way, but you did not say it is hopeless. You find new life for your strength."

And because you did, our country is stronger. Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:15 p.m. at Daytona International Speedway. In his remarks, he referred to Karen Terry, a Palm Coast, FL, resident whose house was saved by firefighters of the Palm Coast Fire Department, one of whom was Randy Holmes, who introduced the President; Gov. Lawton Chiles and Lt. Gov. Buddy MacKay of Florida; Mayor Baron H. Asher of Daytona Beach; R. Stanley Rosevear, chairman, Volusia County Council; Joseph F. Myers, director, Florida Division of Emergency Management; Dominick F. Barbera, vice president, 12th District, International Association of Fire Fighters; and Bill Franz, owner, Daytona International Speedway.

Statement on Senate Action on Internal Revenue Service Reform Legislation

July 9, 1998

I am pleased that the Senate has finally passed bipartisan legislation to reform the IRS and strengthen taxpayer rights. This reform will help my effort to create an IRS that respects American taxpayers and respects their values. I look forward to signing it into law.

Statement on Senate Action on India-Pakistan Sanctions Legislation

July 9, 1998

I am pleased that the Senate has passed legislation today that is consistent with my view that U.S. food exports should not become an unintended victim of an important nonproliferation law. Food should not be used as a weapon, and I will resist any action that would lead to a de facto grain embargo.

I look forward to working with Congress to make sure this legislation or separate legislation gives us the broadest possible flexibility to further our nonproliferation policy without putting American businesses and farmers at an unfair disadvantage.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Emigration Policies of Certain Former Eastern Bloc States

July 9, 1998

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

On September 21, 1994, I determined and reported to the Congress that the Russian Federation was in "full compliance" with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. On June 3, 1997, I determined and reported to the Congress that Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine were in "full compliance" with these same criteria, and I made an identical determination on December 5, 1997, with respect to Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. These actions allowed for the continuation of most-favored-nation (MFN) status for these countries 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 Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. The report indicates continued compliance of these countries with international standards concerning freedom 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 on Presenting the Congressional Medal of Honor to Hospital Corpsman Third Class Robert R. Ingram, USN

July 10, 1998

Welcome. Thank you, Admiral, for your invocation. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the White House. I thank Secretary Cohen and Secretary West, Secretary Gober, Deputy Secretary Hamre, Secretary Dalton, Secretary Caldera, Acting Air Force Secretary Peters, General Shelton, and other members of the Joint Chiefs, and general officers here present today. I thank the Members of the Congress from the Florida delegation who are here, and other Members of Congress, including Senator Thurmond, Senator Graham, Senator Mack, Senator Glenn, Senator Cleland, Representative Brown, Representative McHale, and all those in Congress whose action helped to make this day possible.

Today we present the Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest military honor, to Robert R. Ingram for extraordinary heroism above and beyond the call of duty on March 28, 1966, in Quang Ngai Province, South Vietnam.

Today, more than 30 years later, Bob Ingram is manager of a medical service practice in Jacksonville, a registered nurse, a man who loves to work on cars. His wife, Doris,

his children and his close friends are here with us today, and we welcome them.

His story spans decades and continents, but across these divides, friendship and loyalty have endured and have brought us to this moment. Mr. Ingram enlisted in the Navy in 1963 and joined the Hospital Corps. He went to Vietnam with Company C, 1st Battalion, 7th Marines, in July, 1965.

One day in February of 1966, the company came under heavy fire and Petty Officer Ingram rushed forward to treat the wounded. Enemy bullets punctured both his canteens. When the unit's machine gunner was hit, he manned the gun. And for his bravery on that day, he received the Silver Star.

On March 28, 1966, Petty Officer Ingram accompanied the point platoon of his company as it was suddenly attacked by 100 North Vietnamese in a hail of automatic rifle fire. In moments, the platoon was decimated. Oblivious to the danger, he crawled across the terrain to reach a wounded marine. While administering aid, a bullet went through his hand. After administering aid there, he heard more calls for a corpsman. Still bleeding, he edged across the fire-swept landscape, collecting ammunition from the dead and attending to the wounded, receiving two additional wounds from rifle fire.

Though severely wounded, he continued administering aid to the wounded and the dying marines while gathering ammunition and encouraging others capable of doing so to return fire. While dressing the head wound of another corpsman, he sustained his fourth wound. Enduring extreme pain from his own wounds and disregarding the probability of this own death, Petty Officer Ingram pushed, pulled, cajoled, and doctored his marines for hours more. Losing strength and almost unrecognizable from his injuries, finally he was pulled to safety, where he tried to refuse evacuation, saying that others should go first. His vital signs dropped to the point that he was tagged ''killed in action'' and placed in a dead pile.

But, as you can see, he did not die. Eleven members of Charlie Company, however, were killed that day, and 53 more were wounded. Some are alive today because of the extraordinary selflessness and bravery of Robert Ingram.

Harvey Kappeler, a corporal in the lead platoon, wrote last year, ''I observed Robert Ingram perform acts of heroism I have never seen before, during, or after my tour of Vietnam.'' Mr. Ingram later recalled, ''I was just doing my job; my job was to take care of the men.''

Three weeks after the attack, he wrote his platoon from his hospital bed: ''I've got a tube in my throat, leg elevated, arm elevated, can't move, but I wanted you all to know I'm still alive.'' After 8 months recovering, he went back to sea on another deployment.

Other members of the company were honored for their bravery on that day in March of 1966, but no one doubted that Robert Ingram deserved the highest honor. We don't know how his citation got lost all those years ago, but we do know why he is here today, because his friends never forgot what he did for them.

Jim Fulkerson commanded the 3d Platoon of Charlie Company. In 1995 he organized a reunion of members of the battalion, including Bob Ingram. They remembered the war, the endless cold soaking rains, the terrible firefights. And Ingram's friends resolved to do everything possible to ensure that America finally gave him appropriate recognition.

Charlie Company's commander, Ben Goodwyn, wrote to General Krulak, ''I saw my fair share of combat in Vietnam. Of all the men I brought with me, Doc Ingram was undoubtedly the most courageous.''

Mr. Ingram is the 22d Navy corpsman to receive the Medal of Honor, and his reward comes appropriately as we celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Navy Hospital Corps. Through all our conflicts, they have been there on ships at sea, on the front lines, performing foxhole surgery, saving thousands of lives while risking and sometimes sacrificing their own. I salute their courageous service to our Nation.

The last troops left Vietnam almost 25 years ago now. But we do not, and we must not forget their sacrifices and bravery. As Mr. Kappeler recently wrote of the firefight in Quang Ngai that day, ''As I grow old, I look back to that day and the heroism of the marines and our Navy corpsman, and I understand what is meant by the highest traditions

of service. I am extremely proud to call Robert Ingram a friend.''

On that battlefield so many years ago, Robert Ingram performed truly heroic deeds, and asked for nothing in return. At long last, it is time to honor him.

Mr. Ingram, on behalf of all Americans, we thank you for your service, for your courage, for your determination, for your loyalty to comrades and country. We are all proud to call you an American. Hillary and I are proud that you are in the White House with us today, and I am very proud to award you the Medal of Honor.

Major Everhart, read the citation.

[*At this point, Maj. Carlton Everhart, USAF, Air Force Aide to the President, read the citation, and Lt. Comdr. Wes Huey, USN, Naval Aide to the President, assisted the President in presenting the medal.*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:18 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Rear Adm. A. Byron Holderby, USN, Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Navy, who offered the invocation.

Statement on Senate Action on Higher Education Reauthorization Legislation

July 10, 1998

The bill passed last night by the Senate will help my effort to usher more Americans through the doors of higher education, doors we have opened wide since 1993. There are still serious fiscal and policy issues that need to be resolved, and I am committed to working with Congress to do that. But I am pleased that the Senate bill endorses the new, low interest rate for student loans that I proposed, to save students $11 billion; improves teacher recruitment and training provided by our colleges; takes important steps in response to my call for colleges to help children at high-poverty schools prepare for and attend college; expands access to quality distance learning technologies; and creates what would be the Government's first performance-based organization, an innovation recommended by our reinventing Government effort.

Joint Statement on United States-Polish Relations

July 10, 1998

President Bill Clinton and Prime Minister Jerzy Buzek of Poland met today at the White House to discuss Poland's anticipated entry into NATO, common efforts to advance regional cooperation in Central and Eastern Europe and steps to deepen the close bilateral relations between the United States and Poland. Vice President Gore met separately with the Prime Minister earlier today and hosted a luncheon for the Prime Minister, his delegation and members of the Polish-American community.

The President and Prime Minister Buzek stressed the paramount importance of the U.S. Senate vote on NATO enlargement. They welcomed Poland's entry into the Alliance. Prime Minister Buzek declared that this step will fulfill the aspirations of the Polish people to belong to the Transatlantic community, guaranteeing the security of a sovereign and democratic Poland. President Clinton responded that Poland's membership in the Atlantic Alliance will advance the interests of the American people in a secure, undivided Europe. Both leaders agreed that NATO is the essential foundation of transatlantic security and reaffirmed their support for NATO's ''open door'' policy for aspiring new members, as an indispensable instrument to strengthening stability and eliminating the old dividing lines in Europe.

President Clinton expressed strong support for Poland's strides in building ties with its neighbors and efforts to promote stability, democracy, and free market economics throughout Central and Eastern Europe. The two leaders discussed efforts already under way to establish trilateral economic cooperation among the United States, Poland and Ukraine, as well as Poland's efforts to establish peacekeeping battalions with Ukraine and Lithuania. They resolved that, as allies, they should expand such common efforts to strengthen democracy and regional stability.

The President applauded Poland's active role as Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and thanked Prime Minister Buzek for Poland's strong contribution to the international effort to create stability in the Former Yugoslavia. He particularly praised Poland's participation in both IFOR and SFOR in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

President Clinton praised Poland for the bold, free-market reforms it has pioneered since 1989 as proof that the legacies of communism can be overcome. Prime Minister Buzek expressed profound gratitude for the American assistance provided during the difficult early years of its free market transformation. The leaders noted that Polish effort and sacrifice combined with United States assistance has produced several important successes in the transformation of the Polish economy. They noted particularly that:

Poland's progress in banking reform enabled the 10 contributing governments to authorize release to Poland in April of the $450 million ($221 million U.S.) they had contributed to the Polish Bank Privatization Fund, set up in 1992.

The Polish-American Enterprise Fund (PAEF) has used $257 million provided by the U.S. government for capital and technical assistance to great effect in supporting the emergence of Poland's vibrant, free market economy. The two leaders discussed the future of the PAEF. They agreed that final disposition of the PAEF's assets can be achieved in ways that further enhance Polish-American relations and advance our mutual interests in building a prosperous and democratic Europe.

The remaining U.S. government assistance is now being used to help the Polish government to continue this transformation in a number of critical areas, including local government and pension reform.

Given Poland's remarkable progress and integration into the competitive global economy, both governments took note of the new phase in our economic relationship based on investment, trade and other forms of cooperation, with private sectors in the lead. Both governments pledged to take steps to help bolster mutually beneficial trade and investment, noting that the U.S. is already the leading foreign investor in Poland. The U.S. Under Secretary of State for Economic, Business and Agricultural Affairs will visit Warsaw soon to develop this bilateral consultative mechanism on economic issues in Polish-American relations.

Poland and the United States welcomed their intense and regular bilateral dialogue in other areas as well. They noted the accomplishments of our Bilateral Working Group on Defense Matters and agreed to continue to use this as a key mechanism to prepare Poland for full integration into NATO's military structures. They also agreed to hold regular consultations on regional and global issues.

Both governments will work to increase cooperation on law enforcement. As part of this effort, the United States will work with Poland to conduct cooperative prosecutor and police training in Poland and regionally to strengthen our ability to combat transnational crime. The United States applauds Poland's efforts to develop a Polish International Training Center for Specialist Police Forces which will serve an important role in regional efforts to combat crime.

The United States and Poland welcome the enlargement of the European Union as an essential step in completing construction of a Europe that is truly whole and free. The United States supports timely accession of Poland to the EU and looks forward to Poland's early and active participation in the Transatlantic Dialogues. Both governments pledge their support for the further development of transatlantic cooperation beneficial for all countries involved.

The President also recognized Poland's considerable contributions to multilateral peacekeeping efforts around the world and announced the U.S. Government's readiness to use the Enhanced International Peacekeeping Capabilities Initiative (EIPC) to further develop Poland's already strong capabilities in this area. The President expressed appreciation for Poland's participation in the international coalition which pressed the Iraqi government to comply with UNSC resolutions, as well as day-to-day representation of U.S. interests in Baghdad. The two leaders

expressed their determination to work together with other interested parties to promote diplomatic resolution to this continuing challenge to stability in the Persian Gulf.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

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.

July 3

In the late evening, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton traveled to Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK, and Washington, DC, arriving early the next morning.

July 6

The President announced his intention to nominate Kathryn Dee Robinson to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ghana.

The President announced his intention to nominate Ruby Butler DeMesme as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower, Reserve Affairs, Installations and Environment.

The President announced his intention to nominate Patrick T. Henry to be Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

The President announced his intention to nominate Carolyn H. Becraft as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

The President announced his intention to nominate Charles F. Kartman for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Envoy for the Korean Peace Talks.

The President announced his intention to appoint Philip Condit, Lodewijk J.R. de Vink, Gary DiCamillo, John P. Manning, Ernest Micek, and Jonathan Tisch to be members of the President's Export Council.

The President announced his intention to nominate Ambassador Richard Henry Jones to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The President announced that he has accepted an invitation from President Boris Yeltsin of Russia to meet in Russia in early September.

July 7

The President declared a major disaster in New York and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms and flooding beginning June 25 and continuing.

The President announced his intention to appoint Linda Chavez-Thompson as a member of the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities.

The President announced his intention to appoint Thomas K. Thomas to serve as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation.

The President announced his intention to nominate D. Bambi Kraus to serve as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development.

July 8

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Arlington, VA. Later, he returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to nominate Simon Ferro to be Ambassador to the Republic of Panama.

The President announced the nomination of David Gordon Carpenter to be Assistant Secretary of State for Diplomatic Security and Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, with the Rank of Ambassador.

The President announced his intention to nominate Eugene A. Conti, Jr., to serve as Assistant Secretary for Domestic Transportation Policy at the Department of Transportation.

July 9

In the morning, the President traveled to Atlanta, GA. In the afternoon, he traveled to Daytona, FL.

In the evening, the President traveled to Miami, FL, and later, he returned to Washington, DC, arriving after midnight.

The President announced his intention to nominate William B. Milam to be Ambassador to Pakistan.

The White House announced that the President has invited President Julio Maria Sanguinetti of Uruguay for a working visit on July 23.

July 10

In the afternoon, the President had a telephone conversation with President Boris Yeltsin of Russia and then met with Prime Minister Jerzy Buzek of Poland in the Oval Office. Later, the President and Hillary Clinton were interviewed by Stars and Stripes in the Map Room at the White House and later participated in a celebration for the 200th anniversary of the Marine Band on the South Lawn.

The President announced his intention to appoint John Silberman, Jeff Valdez, and Ruth Whetstone Wagner as members to the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted July 7

Carolyn H. Becraft,
of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice Bernard Daniel Rostker.

Ruby Butler DeMesme,
of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Rodney A. Coleman, resigned.

Bert T. Edwards,
of Maryland, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of State, vice Richard L. Greene, resigned.

Patrick T. Henry,
of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Sara E. Lister, resigned.

Joseph H. Melrose, Jr.,
of Pennsylvania, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Sierra Leone.

John Shattuck,
of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czech Republic.

David G. Carpenter,
of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Eric James Boswell, resigned.

David G. Carpenter,
of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service, vice Eric James Boswell.

Robert Patrick Finn,
of New York, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Tajikistan.

Richard Henry Jones,
of Nebraska, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Charles F. Kartman,
of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Envoy for the Korean Peace Talks.

Kathryn Dee Robinson,
of Tennessee, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

Submitted July 9

Simon Ferro,
of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Panama.

D. Bambi Kraus,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring May 19, 2004, vice Marion G. Chambers.

William B. Milam,
of California, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Withdrawn July 9

Carlos Pascual,
of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, vice Thomas A. Dine, resigned, which was sent to the Senate on June 11, 1998.

Submitted July 10

William B. Traxler, Jr.,
of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, vice Donald Stuart Russell, deceased.

Mary Beth West,
of the District of Columbia, a career member of the Senior Executive Service, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans, Fisheries, and Space.

Withdrawn July 10

Mary Beth West,
of the District of Columbia, a career member of the Senior Executive Service, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Space, which was sent to the Senate on February 24, 1998.

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 July 3

Transcript of remarks to the pool by Press Secretary Mike McCurry and National Security Adviser Samuel Berger

Released July 6

Statement by the Press Secretary: President Clinton Announces Summit Meeting With Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin

Transcript of a press briefing by NSC Assistant Press Secretary for Foreign Affairs and Director of Public Affairs P.J. Crowley, Deputy Press Secretary Joe Lockhart, and Deputy Assistant to the President for Health Policy Chris Jennings on Medicare and the President's upcoming visit to Russia

Released July 7

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry and Deputy Assistant to the President for Health Policy Chris Jennings on compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act

Released July 8

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy Planning Bruce Reed on efforts to promote gun safety and responsibility

Released July 9

Statement by the Press Secretary: Working Visit With President Sanguinetti of Uruguay

Transcript of a press briefing by Office of National Drug Control Policy Director Barry McCaffrey, Chairman of the Partnership for a Drug Free America James Burke, and President of the Advertising Council Ruth Wooden of the national youth antidrug campaign

Released July 10

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by the Press Secretary on the appointment of Carlos E. Pascual as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Russian, Ukranian, and Eurasian Affairs at NSC

Announcement of nomination for a U.S. Court of Appeals judge for the Fourth Circuit

Text of the citation read on the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Robert R. Ingram

Acts Approved by the President

Approved July 7

S. 2069 / Public Law 105–188
To permit the mineral leasing of Indian land located within the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in any case in which there is consent from a majority interest in the parcel of land under consideration for lease