AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, August 2, 1999
Volume 35—Number 30
Pages 1471–1528

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Meetings With Foreign Leaders
American Legion Boys Nation and Girls Nation—1508
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Departure for Sarajevo—1516
High school students in Sarajevo—1522
Colorado
Democratic National Committee luncheon in Aspen—1486
Democratic National Committee picnic in Aspen—1482, 1485
Death of King Hassan II of Morocco—1485
"In Performance at the White House"—1515
Legal Services Corporation, 25th anniversary—1505
Medicare, women's benefits—1500
Morocco, American Embassy community in Rabat—1491
National economy and proposed appropriations legislation—1516
Ohio, Democratic National Committee dinner in Cincinnati—1474
Radio address—1480

Bill Signings

National Missile Defense Act of 1999, statement—1471

Communications to Congress

Bosnia-Herzegovina, message transmitting report on efforts to achieve a sustainable peace—1493
Digital computer exports, letter transmitting report—1492

Communications to Congress—Continued

Middle East peace process, message transmitting report on terrorists who threaten to disrupt—1517
North Atlantic Treaty Organization, letter transmitting report on burdensharing—1514
Transportation Department, message transmitting reports—1494

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Aspen, Colorado—1485
Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina—1517
Interview with Mike Cuthbert of "Prime Time Radio"—1495

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Bosnia-Herzegovina, Presidency Members—1517, 1519, 1522

Proclamations

Imposition of Restraints on Imports of Certain Steel Products From the Russian Federation—1471
National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day—1499
Parents' Day—1473
To Provide for the Efficient and Fair Administration of Action Taken With Regard to Imports of Lamb Meat and for Other Purposes—1524
25th Anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation—1498

(Continued on inside of back cover.)

Editor's Note: The President was aboard Air Force One en route to Washington, DC, on July 30, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

Contents—Continued

Statements by the President

See also Bill Signings
Americans with Disabilities Act, ninth anniversary—1493
Ethiopia and Eritrea, Organization of African Unity's framework agreement—1508
Deaths
Dan Dutko—1508
King Hassan II of Morocco—1472
Neelan Thiruchelvam—1523
House action to extend normal trade relations with China—1508
Senate action
Juvenile crime and gun legislation—1514
Tax cut legislation—1524

Statements by the President—Continued

Stability Pact Summit—1519
U.S. military aircraft tragedy in Colombia—1517
Vietnam-U.S. trade relations—1494

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1528
Checklist of White House press releases—1527
Digest of other White House announcements—1525
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1526

Statement on Signing the National Missile Defense Act of 1999

July 22, 1999

I have signed into law H.R. 4, the ''National Missile Defense Act of 1999.'' My Administration is committed to addressing the growing danger that rogue nations may develop and field long-range missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies.

Section 2 of this Act states that it is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense (NMD) system with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for NMD. By specifying that any NMD deployment must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, the legislation makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made. This interpretation, which is confirmed by the legislative record taken as a whole, is also required to avoid any possible impairment of my constitutional authorities.

Section 3 of the Act states that it is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces. Thus, section 3 puts the Congress on record as continuing to support negotiated reductions in strategic nuclear arms, reaffirming my Administration's position that our missile defense policy must take into account our arms control and nuclear nonproliferation objectives.

Next year, we will, for the first time, determine whether to deploy a limited National Missile Defense, when we review the results of flight tests and other developmental efforts, consider cost estimates, and evaluate the threat. Any NMD system we deploy must be operationally effective, cost-effective, and enhance our security. In making our determination, we will also review progress in achieving our arms control objectives, including negotiating any amendments to the ABM Treaty that may be required to accommodate a possible NMD deployment.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 22, 1999.

NOTE: H.R. 4, approved July 22, was assigned Public Law No. 106–38. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 23. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Proclamation 7210—Imposition of Restraints on Imports of Certain Steel Products From the Russian Federation

July 22, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

1. Article XI of the June 1, 1990, Agreement between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Trade Relations (''the 1990 Agreement''), which was entered into pursuant to title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (''the Trade Act''), provides that the Parties will consult with a view toward finding means of preventing market disruption, and authorizes the Parties to take action, including the imposition of import restrictions, to achieve this goal.

2. The Government of the United States and the Government of the Russian Federation (''Russia'') have mutually agreed that the conditions of Article XI of the 1990 Agreement have been met with respect to U.S. imports of certain steel products from Russia described in the Annex to this proclamation. Further, the Governments have concluded an Agreement Concerning Trade in Certain Steel Products from the Russian Federation (''the 1999 Agreement'') on remedial and

preventative measures to address market conditions with respect to such products.

3. Section 125(c) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2135(c)) provides that whenever the United States, acting in pursuance of any of its rights or obligations under any trade agreement entered into pursuant to the Trade Act, withdraws, suspends, or modifies any obligation with respect to the trade of any foreign country or instrumentality, the President is authorized to proclaim increased duties or other import restrictions, to the extent, at such times, and for such periods as he deems necessary or appropriate, in order to exercise the rights or fulfill the obligations of the United States.

4. In pursuance of its rights under the 1990 Agreement, the United States Government is withdrawing, suspending, or modifying its obligations under Article I of the 1990 Agreement with respect to the certain steel products described in the Annex to this proclamation by establishing import restrictions to address market conditions with respect to these products.

5. I have determined that, effective immediately and continuing so long as the 1999 Agreement remains in effect, it is appropriate to proclaim import restrictions as set forth in the Annex to this proclamation in order to exercise the rights and fulfill the obligations of the United States under the 1990 Agreement.

6. Section 125(f) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2135(f)) requires the President to provide an opportunity for interested parties to present views at a public hearing prior to taking action pursuant to section 125 (b), (c), or (d) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2135 (b), (c), or (d)). Interested parties presented their views at a hearing held on March 2, 1999.

7. Section 301 of title 3, United States Code, authorizes the President to delegate his authority to the head of any department or agency in the executive branch to perform without approval, ratification, or other action by the President any function that is vested in the President by law.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including but not limited to section 125(c) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2135(c)) and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, do proclaim that:

(1) Pursuant to U.S. rights under the 1990 Agreement and to implement and enforce the 1999 Agreement, imports of certain steel products from Russia are restricted as provided in the Annex to this proclamation.

(2) The Secretary of Commerce ("the Secretary") is authorized to exercise my authority to administer the import restrictions on certain steel products consistent with the 1999 Agreement as proclaimed herein. The Secretary shall provide instructions and any necessary interpretive guidance to the Commissioner, U.S. Customs Service, concerning the import restrictions set forth in this proclamation.

(3) Such restrictions shall be effective with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date set forth in the Annex and shall remain in effect during the period of the 1999 Agreement.

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

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:20 p.m., July 26, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 23, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on July 27. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement on the Death of King Hassan II of Morocco

July 23, 1999

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn that His Majesty King Hassan II of Morocco has passed away. The prayers of all

Americans go out to the royal family and the people of Morocco.

Over his 38-year reign, King Hassan II demonstrated time and again his leadership, his courage, and his willingness to embrace change. He worked tirelessly to promote the welfare of his people, and in recent years he took important steps to deepen freedom in his country.

He offered wise counsel to every U.S. President since John F. Kennedy. He worked to break down barriers among the peoples of the Middle East, bravely opening a dialog with Israel, helping to arrange President Sadat's historic journey to Jerusalem, seeking greater tolerance and stability across the region.

Hillary had the honor of being his guest just a few months ago. We will never forget his extraordinary hospitality, nor the many times he stood shoulder to shoulder with the United States.

King Sidi Mohammed and the Moroccan people can continue to count on the support of the United States. To King Sidi Mohammed, to the rest of the royal family, and to the people of Morocco, Hillary and I send our heartfelt condolences.

The Middle East has lost one of its greatest peacemakers. In his honor, we must rededicate ourselves to fulfilling his vision: a just and lasting peace for all the Middle East's children.

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

Proclamation 7211—Parents' Day, 1999

July 23, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Parents are the foundation of the family and a cornerstone of community life in America. They instill the values, attitudes, and guidance children need to become strong individuals and caring citizens; we turn to our parents for the unconditional love and encouragement we need to make the most of our lives and to contribute to the life of our Nation. On Parents' Day, we pay tribute to the millions of parents whose care has nurtured us, whose vigilance has protected us, and whose selfless devotion has blessed our lives.

The challenges of parenthood have changed as our society has changed. In many American families, both parents work outside the home and struggle to balance the competing demands of job, home, and family. In others, a single parent bears these responsibilities.

My Administration continues to support parents through initiatives such as the Children's Health Insurance Program and Head Start and by advocating child care, adoption, and child welfare expansion. We have worked hard to help parents support their families financially by creating new jobs, raising the minimum wage, expanding the Earned Income Tax Credit, preserving the national guarantee of health care for poor children, and increasing child support collections to record heights. We have helped parents balance work and family by enacting the Family and Medical Leave Act and releasing funds for after-school grants so that parents do not have to choose between keeping their jobs and ensuring that their children receive quality care and supervision.

Though helping parents do their job has always been a top priority of my Administration, we recognize that government programs alone cannot solve all the problems that families face today. For example, I am heartened by the passionate commitment of parents across America in response to our call for a national campaign to prevent youth violence. This campaign will ask all sectors of society to focus on this crucial issue, to discover what measures work, and to share that knowledge with other families in communities across our country.

There is no single cause or solution to ending the violence that has cut short too many young lives. But, by working together, we can change the values of our culture and influence the marketing strategies of media industries so that our children are not continually exposed to violent or other inappropriate materials in the games they play, the programs and movies they watch, or the music they hear. We also must continue our efforts to

ensure that our young people do not gain unauthorized access to guns. Parents play a crucial role in all of these endeavors by remaining involved in the lives of their sons and daughters.

The First Lady and I have issued a challenge to our Nation to celebrate the coming of the new millennium by honoring the past and imagining the future. As we prepare to enter the 21st century, let us remember that, just as parents remain a treasured link to our past, they also influence the future by raising their children to become the responsible citizens of tomorrow. On this day and throughout the year, let us honor the millions of devoted mothers and fathers who have fulfilled this solemn responsibility with extraordinary compassion, generosity, and love.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States and consistent with Public Law 103–362, do hereby proclaim Sunday, July 25, 1999, as Parents' Day. I invite the States, communities, and the people of the United States to join together in observing this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities to honor our Nation's parents.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., July 27, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on July 28. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Cincinnati, Ohio

July 23, 1999

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, first, let me say that I think in the spirit of candor, I should tell you that the real reason that the air-conditioning is not on tonight is that it's part of my continuing effort to convince the American people that Al Gore is right about global warming. [*Laughter*] And I hope you will join us now in this crusade.

When Stan gave me this purple shirt, I thought instead of saying, ''no one more regal,'' I thought he was going to say, ''I'm going to give him this purple shirt is because no one is more wounded than him.'' [*Laughter*]

Joe Andrew, every time he says that line about we're going to win everything from President to dog catcher, as if that's a wide gulf, I said, plenty of times in the last few years, I thought that was a very short distance, those two positions. [*Laughter*]

I'd like to begin, if I might, by saying a few thank-yous. I want to thank Stan and his whole family, and I want to thank Dick and his wonderful family. And to Jim, I want to thank you and all the people that are associated with you and have been there for me and for my party for all these years. I'm grateful to the people of Ohio who have voted for me and for Al Gore twice, under what would normally seem to be adverse political conditions, when the Republicans were doing pretty well here statewide, and conventional wisdom would have it that we wouldn't do so well.

I want to thank Joe Andrew for agreeing to leave the security of his home in Indiana and take on the challenge of the Democratic Party. And David Leland, who in '96, had what I thought was the cleverest idea. He had a $96 fundraiser for the Democrats, and as I remember, he had 4,000 people there, which was a pretty impressive turnout, and I knew we were going to carry Ohio again.

I want to thank Jody Richards, my longtime friend, who was the Speaker of the House in Kentucky. We were working on education together back when I was a young Governor with no gray hair and no reasonable prospects of this happy occasion. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Tony Hall, who is not only one of the finest Congressmen but one of the finest human beings I have ever known in my life, and Ohio can be very, very proud of him. And I thank you, sir, for all you've done and all you have been

and the way you have been there for me as a friend as well as an ally.

And I want to thank my friend Bill Daley for serving in the Cabinet, being a brilliant Secretary of Commerce, a great political leader, and I think that even though I have to retire in a year and a half, you haven't heard the last of him.

As you know, this has been a highly emotional week for me and for Hillary and for Chelsea. We are friends of Senator Kennedy and his family. We knew and had the greatest respect for John Kennedy. I had a wonderful, long evening with John and Carolyn. We thought the world of Jackie Kennedy. And we're Americans, so we went through this last week experiencing it both in a personal way and experiencing it just in the same way every other citizen did. So I'm not going to give you a whoop-dee-doo tonight; I'm going to ask you to think about why you're here and what you will say tomorrow if someone asks you why you came.

When Senator Kennedy—and I was just told at the table tonight that the eulogy for his nephew is now available on the Internet. It may be printed in full in your paper tomorrow. Somehow, you ought to get the whole thing and read it.

The last sentence in the eulogy was this: "Like his father, he had every gift but length of life." I say that not to be morbid or even sad, because it was actually quite a wonderful service, but to remind us all that life is fleeting and fragile; things we don't deserve happen to us, both good things and bad things, and our only obligation can be to get up every day and try to be children of God and do the best we can with the life we have.

I believe that the work that we have been engaged in, the political work of the country, is good work. I believe most people who do it in both parties are good people, and personally compassionate, by the way. I believe that. I despair that so much of the politics of the last few years has been about, you know, personal attacks, because it diverts the attention of the public from the life we share in common and the obligations we have to each other and to our children and to our country.

And today I left that church, that beautiful old church, thinking that all of us, including me, ought to do more every day to remember that life is fleeting and fragile, but a great gift; with all of its troubles and tears, it's a great gift.

And so when I think about what I'd like to say to you, it is this, that in 1992 when I ran for President—and early on in the race I saw John Kennedy, Jr., and his mother at events for me when I didn't know them, really, and I was running fifth in the New Hampshire primary—I did it because I felt the country needed to change direction. And I offered some ideas to the American people based on the premise that we ought to be trying to create a country in the new century where every responsible citizen has the opportunity to live out his or her dreams, and where we're coming closer together as an American community even as we grow more diverse in our racial and ethnic and religious characteristics, and where we do more to be the world's leading force for peace and freedom and prosperity. Now, I am very grateful that those ideas, when put into action, turned out to have pretty good results.

You know what has happened in the economy. We also have a 30-year low in welfare and a 26-year low in the crime rate. A lot of our social problems, our evading teen pregnancy and drug use, are down. Our test scores are beginning to rise after years and years and years in our schools; last year in the 4th, 8th, and 12th grade they were all up in both reading and math for the first time in a long time. Ninety percent of our children immunized against childhood diseases for the first time in the history of our country. The air and the water is cleaner; the food is safer. We've set aside more land from the Florida Everglades to the California redwoods than any administration except those of Franklin and Theodore Roosevelt. And I am very, very grateful to have had the chance to serve.

I would like to say, because now that we're in a political season, many of those who spent the last 6½ years telling the American people I had no business being President now say, "Oh, well, Clinton's like Michael Jordan; he just jumps higher than the other Democrats now. The natural order of things will reassert itself, and we Republicans will rule America again."

I want you to understand that I'm glad I had the chance to serve, but I could give the best speech in the world and if the ideas were wrong or if there were no implementation, we would no have been able to turn the country around. And I want you to understand that very little of what I did could have been done if I hadn't had the Vice President I did, who knew a lot more than I did when we started about a lot of the things we had to work on; if I hadn't had people like Bill Daley and his great predecessor, Ron Brown, and a lot of other people helping us; if I hadn't had allies like Tony Hall in the Congress. And I say that to make this point: Tomorrow when they ask you why you were here, I hope you will say, ''Because I like the ideas they had and they worked for America. And I'm not just supporting Bill Clinton; I'm supporting what we all believe.'' And we have the proof now. We no longer have to debate these things; we now have evidence.

The second thing that I'd like you to think about is, we now are in a great hazardous period. We human beings are all inherently weak in some way or another, and sometimes the worst thing in the world for us is the illusion that everything is perfect and can't go bad. And so we have all this prosperity now, and I would argue that's a hazardous time, because prosperity and security can lead people to arrogance and shortsightedness if they're not careful. I used to carry around with me when I was a Governor 10 little written rules of politics, and one of them was, ''You're always most vulnerable when you think you're invulnerable.''

And so I say to you, we have this huge surplus. We had a $290 billion deficit when I took office. We've got almost a $100 billion surplus this year. We have projected surpluses for a long time to come. The big question now is, what are we going to do with our prosperity? We've got the country working again; now what are we going to do? And there's this big debate going on in Washington. The Republicans basically say, ''Okay, we'll agree with the President. We'll save the Social Security tax surplus for Social Security, and we'll use that to pay the debt down.'' And I want to give them that, and I appreciate the fact that they've agreed with me today; they've agreed to pay it down some. ''But we want to give the whole rest of the surplus to a tax cut.''

We say, even though we're in an election season already, that's a mistake, because if you look at the real, long-term challenges of America, you can't honestly say we can afford a tax cut that big. What are those challenges? Let me just mention a few. One is the aging of America. The number of people over 65 in this country will double in 30 years; I hope to be one of them.

Anybody in America who lives to be 65 today has a life expectancy of 82. A child born in America today has a life expectancy of nearly 77 years. Within 3 years, we will finish the decoding of the human gene, and young mothers who take their babies home from the hospital will have a roadmap that will tell them—you have a fine, healthy young boy, but his genetic makeup makes him highly likely to develop heart disease in his thirties or forties. Therefore, you should do these things. Your daughter is beautiful, but she has a gene which predisposes her to breast cancer at an early age. Therefore, you should do these things.

It is not inconceivable that within a decade, the average life expectancy of newborns will be over 80—and keep in mind, that takes accounts of all the accidents and the diseases and everything that can happen to people. It is at our peril, therefore, that we pass up the chance to stabilize Social Security and Medicare and to reform Medicare so that it fits the needs of modern medicine with a prescription drug benefit and getting much more of our seniors to take preventive tests for everything from osteoporosis to cancer, because we can avoid a lot of the expensive medical bills if we prevent things from happening in the first place.

So I think we ought to not only set aside a substantial amount of the surplus for Social Security, but also for Medicare, and that we should take the interest reduction when we pay down the debt—that means less interest, right? I think we ought to take all the interest savings and put it into Social Security so we can run the life of the Social Security Trust Fund out for more than 50 years. Right now, Medicare is projected to go broke in 2015, Social Security in 2034. Under my plan, we

could take Medicare out for more than 25 years; we could take Social Security out for more than 50 years.

The second thing we have to think about is how to keep the economy going. You know, I'm sure you've all noticed, particularly those of you in business, the last 2 months, there's been this real debate about whether the Federal Reserve should raise interest rates to try to head off inflation that is not at all in evidence now, because nobody can imagine that we've had this economy growing this long in peacetime at this high rate.

Bill Daley and I kind of like it. It's our job. But people say, ''Well, you know, you haven't''—they say, ''You know, Clinton may have a good team, but they didn't repeal the laws of economics, so I mean, don't we have to raise interest rates, slow the economy down to stop inflation, because if we have inflation, then we'll have a huge increase in interest rates and the thing will crater.'' And you've been seeing all this debate.

So I ask myself all the time: What can we do to keep the economy going, to minimize the effect of the next slowdown, to ensure that the next pickup will be quicker? And I have two things that I think are quite important that are inconsistent with the Republican plan.

One is, I don't want to just pay down the debt. I want to pay it off. And under my plan, we'll be out of debt in 15 years for the first time since 1835. Now, why does that matter, and why would the more liberal of the two parties be for it? How does that help ordinary people? How does it help wealthy people? Why is it worth more to you than a tax cut? Why? Because in a global economy where money moves around in the flash of an eye all over the world, if we're out of debt, what does that mean?

It means interest rates will be lower for business; it means there will be more business investment; it means there will be more people hired for jobs; it means there will be more money available for wage increases and for ordinary middle class people or people struggling to work their way into the middle class; it means the interest rates they pay on homes, cars, credit cards, and college loans will be lower. It means the next time there are a lot of problems around the world like this financial crisis in Asia a couple of years ago, that our friends around the world will be able to get the money they need to get back on their feet at lower interest rates. It means—God forbid—if we have another terrible economic crisis in America sometime in the future and we have to go into debt, we'll be able to get lower interest rates, and then we'll be able to get out of debt again in a hurry because we won't be borrowing money just to pay the bills every week, as we have been since 1835—and especially for the 12 years before I took office.

So this is a huge deal. The other big thing we can do to keep the economy growing without inflation is to bring economic opportunity to the people in the neighborhoods, the inner-city neighborhoods, the small towns, the rural areas, and the Indian reservations that haven't felt a lick of prosperity in spite of all we've enjoyed. And that's why I took that trip across America to Appalachia, to the Mississippi Delta, to the Indian reservation, and to the inner cities to highlight the fact that as well as we are doing, there are still places that haven't felt the sunlight of our prosperity.

And I have asked the Congress to pass a tax cut that is affordable, that includes giving people in this room who have money the same financial incentives through tax credits and Government loan guarantees to invest in an Indian reservation or in Appalachia or the Mississippi Delta or the inner city that we give you today to invest in the Caribbean, in Africa, in Latin America, or in Asia. I don't want to take away those incentives. I want to help those people, too. But I think we ought to have the same incentive to give poor people in America a chance to be part of the economic mainstream. And that's what I think we ought to do.

And let me just mention two other things. We have made great improvements in education. With tax cuts already provided, we've given tax credits to everybody, practically, for the first 2 years of college and, indeed, for the next 2, and for graduate school. But we still don't have the best school system in the world for everybody, and until we have world-class education for everybody, this country is going to be held back. And as we've grown more diverse and more and

more of our kids have a first language not even English, we're going to have to work harder to have a good school system.

If the Republican plan passes, we will literally have to cut back on our present level of support for excellence in education at a time when we're trying to hook up all of the classrooms to the Internet, build modernized schools, raise standards, end social promotion, but give the schools money for summer school and after-school programs. We will have to have a huge cut in national support for education if this tax plan passes.

The last thing I'd just like to mention is the crime rate going down. I don't know if you remember this, but I had a huge fight with the Members of the other party in '94. When Tony and others joined together, we passed this crime bill. They said if we put 100,000 police on the streets, it wouldn't have any impact on the crime rate. Well, they were wrong.

Now, I've got a plan that would put 50,000 more police on the street and target them in the areas that have still real high crime. We actually have a chance to make this the safest big country in the world in the next 10 years. But if this tax cut passes, we'll have to make big cuts in what we're doing now in law enforcement, and the support we have in State and local law enforcement, and the work Federal law enforcement does.

So it seems to me—and I could give you lots of other examples—now, does that mean we can't have any tax cut? No, I actually presented quite a sizeable tax cut to the Congress. I said, but let's do first things first. Let's save Social Security and Medicare. Let's pay the debt off. Let's make sure we can do what we have to do in education, law enforcement, medical research, national defense, the environment. What we have to do—not big increases, but what we have to do—and then give the rest of it back to the taxpayers. That's the way I did it.

And there's a substantial tax—[*inaudible*]—worth hundreds of dollars a year to a lot of people for child care, for long-term care, to save for retirement. Now, one of my staff members said, ''But you see what we're doing, don't you? We haven't saved Social Security. We haven't saved Medicare. We haven't secured these other things. What are we debating first? Their tax credit.''

One of the guys that works for me says this is kind of like a family sitting down saying, you know, ''Let's take the vacation of our dreams to Hawaii, and when we get back, we'll figure out whether we can pay the home mortgage and send our kids to college.'' [*Laughter*] I mean, that's what we're doing here. And so I say to you, I think we're right. But why are you here? I'm telling you, everybody in this room—just about everybody in this room—would be better off—you ought to be at their deal, because for the first year, you'd be better off with their deal, because I think two-thirds of the benefits of their plan go to the top 2 percent or something of the economy. You'd be a lot better off in the short run with their deal. Why are you here?

Most of us believe—I think all of us believe—that those of us who are fortunate do better in the long run when everybody else does better, that we not only have a moral obligation to make sure everybody has a chance, but we actually do better. And guess what, we now have evidence.

I've got a friend in New York who runs one of the biggest companies in this country. He's going around to Wall Street, now that all these Republican and Democratic Presidential candidates are raising money, and all these Wall Street guys are saying, ''You know, you've got to go for the Republicans this time.'' And he says, ''I'll tell you what you do: If you paid more in taxes after 1993 because of Bill Clinton's deficit reduction package than you've made in the stock market, be for the Republicans.'' [*Laughter*] ''But if you haven't, you'd better think about it.''

But this is not a selfish—it is actually true that we all do better when we help each other. And so if you think about it—I think the one thing that defines the difference between the two parties today is how we think of our national community. I think they honestly believe—I don't mean this in a critical way—I think they honestly believe that they see the national community as people who say they believe the same things. We say the national community is everybody who is a responsible citizen, working together, trying to help each other reach our full potential. And we believe the Government has a role to play

when there is no other way to do it. They call us the party of Government; I've given you the smallest Federal Government since John Kennedy was President. I've privatized more programs and eliminated more than Presidents Reagan and Bush did.

The percentage of jobs created in the private sector in the Clinton administration is significantly higher than the percentage created in the two previous Republican administrations. We don't believe the Government can solve all the problems, but we believe in things like family leave. We believe that. We believe that's a good thing for America. We believe in the Patients' Bill of Rights.

We think if people are going to go into managed care, they ought to know they can see a specialist if the doctor says so. And if they get hit in an accident coming out of the concert in Cincinnati tonight, they ought not to have to go past two hospitals to get to the emergency room just because the first two aren't covered. We believe that. That's what we really believe. And I'm willing to pay what the Republicans say it would cost, 2 bucks a month on my health insurance, so somebody else can see a specialist and go to the nearest emergency room, and I think most of you are. And I think we're all better off when people are healthier. They're more secure; they feel better at work; they feel better about their country. That's the difference.

I believe we'd all be better off if we could end 100 years of oppression of the Native Americans, and they could actually make a living on those Indian reservations instead of haggling over a deal made over 100 years ago that was a disgrace to the United States. We believe that we are bound up together. And I hope that if somebody asks you tomorrow why you came here, you'll be able to tell them that.

I'll close with just these thoughts. I'll tell you three stories real quick.

I was in Iowa a few days ago, and I remembered the first time I went to Iowa after I became President—I believe it's the first time—was when they had that 500-year flood in the Mississippi River. Do you remember that? And the Mississippi just flooded its banks in '93—500-year flood.

So I go to Des Moines and I'm going out there, stacking those sandbags, feeling good—you know, I'm being a good citizen, doing it and trying to set a good example. And I look up and there is this child standing there who was then 13 years old, who was about this tall, even though she's 13 years old. And the bones in her head were bulging through her skin, and her elbows and knees were knobby and her knuckles were bony, because she was born with brittle bone disease. She's had dozens of bone breaks, all kinds of operations. Every bone in her body could have been shattered. And she's there with the people and the sandbags.

And I asked this child, I said, "What are you doing here?" I said, "Do you live in Des Moines?" She said, "No, sir, I'm from Wisconsin." She said, "But these people need help." And I don't know if you've known any children with brittle bone disease; some of them never get out of bed. This girl's really relatively strong, but still, she could—was in great danger, always.

And I said, "Aren't you afraid to be here?" She said, "I've got to go on living. These people need help. I asked my parents if I could come down here, and we came." That young woman went to the National Institutes of Health, twice a year, every year after that, so I kept in touch with her. Her name is Brianne Schwantes.

Last year I went out to American University in Washington to make a speech and I looked up, and there she was, an 18-year-old freshman, introducing me to all of her roommates. Now, I feel better that a child like that could get some of our tax money at the National Institutes of Health, and I think this country is better because of it.

I'll tell you another story. When I was in Iowa, I looked out, and on the second row of this speech I gave at this school—there were hundreds of people there—there is this radiant young African-American girl, about 8 years old now, tall, beautiful. Her name is Jimiya Poisel. The first time I met her, she was a little baby in her mother's arms in 1992 in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. There was this huge rally there. And so I went to the crowd and I was shaking hands the way I always do, and there was this very tall white lady holding this African-American baby.

So I said, ''Whose baby is that?'' She said, ''This is my baby.'' And I said, ''Well, where did you get that baby?'' She said, ''From Miami.'' I said, ''Well, why, how?'' She said, ''Well, you see, this baby was born with AIDS; so nobody wanted it, and I thought somebody ought to give this baby a home.''

I later found out this woman—that her husband had left her; she had two children of her own; she was living in an apartment, barely able to make ends meet, but she had enough heart to take this little baby. And a couple of times a year, every year between now and then, they came to the NIH—this child with AIDS. She is a beautiful child. And once every year or so, they'd come by to see me and I'd keep up with her, and when I'd go to Iowa she'd always be there. She was there in the audience, faithfully, like she always is.

The lady had a better turn in her life, good things have happened to her and her family. I think we're better off that that little girl found a home, that she had a woman who had more problems than most of us have ever had in her life, but she still had enough room for her, and that her Government helped her raise this child. And she got a $500 tax credit because of the Balanced Budget Act. That the child will be able to go to college, and that, thank goodness, because of medical research, she'll probably live to go to college.

Last thing. When I went to the Indian reservation, I was introduced by the chief of the Oglala Sioux; they now call him the President. His name is Harold Salway. Before I went to Pine Ridge, Mr. Salway and 18 other tribal leaders from Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, the high plains, came to see me at the White House. And we were sitting there, and they all went through all their concerns—you know, about education and the economy and everything. And then at the end, Salway stands up. And he's not a very tall man, but he's very dignified and he stood there like this, and he said, ''I have something I would like to say.'' He said, ''We are supporting your position in Kosovo.'' The poorest Americans. He said, ''You see, we know something about ethnic cleansing.'' [*Laughter*] But he said—let me finish—he said, ''But this is America.'' He said, ''My great-grandfather was massacred at Wounded Knee. I had two uncles. One was on the beach at Normandy. The other was the first Native American fighter pilot in the history of the military in the United States. And here am I, their nephew, with the President of the United States.'' He said, ''I have only one son, and he means more to me than anything. But I would be honored to have him wear the uniform of my country to fight against ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.'' Community. Humanity.

Thirty-one years ago Senator Kennedy gave another eulogy for his brother, Robert. Those of us who were grown then, many of us have a clear memory of it. And I want to close with this. I've thought about it a lot today. That man has borne a lot of burden. But after Robert Kennedy's campaign for President in 1968, where he'd gone into the coal mining areas of Appalachia, where he went to the Indian reservation, where he went to places and people that had been forgotten, Ted Kennedy said that he and his family hoped that what their brother was to them and what he wished for others would someday come to pass for all the world. I heard it 31 years ago; I have never forgotten it. That's why I'm here tonight, and why I hope you are.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:55 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Stanley M. Chesley and Richard D. Lawrence; Joseph J. Andrew, national chair, Democratic National Committee; James Evans, director, senior vice president, and general counsel, American Financial Group; David J. Leland, chair, Ohio State Democratic Party; and Jimiya Poisel's mother, Laura. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

July 24, 1999

Good morning. At this time of great progress and hope for our Nation, we have the chance of a lifetime to build an even stronger America in the 21st century by facing our great long-term challenges like saving Social Security and Medicare, paying off our national debt and bringing economic opportunity to people and places left behind in our recovery, giving all our children a world-class

education—and the challenge I want to speak with you about today: fighting crime and making America the world's safest big nation.

For too many years it looked as if the crime rate would rise forever. In too many places, families barricaded themselves behind barred doors and windows; children were afraid to walk to school; and once thriving communities became proving grounds for lawless gangs.

I took office determined to change this. More than 6½ years ago, Vice President Gore and I put in place a tough, smart anticrime strategy of more police, better prevention, and tougher punishments; a strategy that took assault weapons off our streets and kept illegal guns out of the hands of criminals and away from our children; above all, an anticrime strategy that funded local solutions to local problems, spearheaded by Attorney General Janet Reno, herself a former prosecutor.

This strategy, pioneered in our communities, has been taken nationwide by our 1994 crime bill. It has worked beyond all expectations. The murder rate is down to its lowest level in 30 years; overall crime, its lowest level in 26 years; violent crime has dropped by 27 percent in the last 6 years alone. And in many smaller ways, reducing crimes like vandalism that undermine our quality of life, we're beginning to restore civility to our everyday lives. Community policing has been central to our success. This May I was proud to announce that since I signed the crime bill in 1994, we've funded 100,000 community police officers to work with local citizens, identify problems, track criminals, and help bring people and life back to our streets.

Today I'm pleased to announce 65 new grants to help communities around the country hire more than 800 new police officers, including 200 community police officers right here in the District of Columbia. We'll also help the District hire 40 new community prosecutors to work closely with police and with residents on our streets, in our neighborhoods, to fight and prevent crime.

Every major law enforcement organization supports our community policing program. I propose to put 50,000 more officers in our neighborhoods, those that still have too much crime. But our ability to continue to do this—indeed, our ability to meet many of our vital national needs will be put at risk by the tax and budget plan now being pressed by Republican leaders in Congress. This week the Republicans in the House of Representatives passed a reckless plan that would cost $800 billion in the next 10 years and a staggering $3 trillion over the next two decades. It is so large, and it balloons in size so dramatically in future years that it would make it impossible to invest our surplus to save Social Security, to save and strengthen Medicare with a prescription drug benefit, to pay off our national debt.

Beyond that, the GOP tax cut is so large it would require dramatic cuts in vital areas, such as education, the environment, biomedical research, defense, and crime fighting. The Republican budget already cuts our successful community policing proposal in half. Their reckless tax plan would threaten law enforcement across the board, forcing reductions in the number of Federal agents and cutting deeply into support for State and local law enforcement. To make matters worse, of course, the House Republicans are refusing to take steps to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, like closing the gun show loophole. Indeed, they want to weaken the existing laws with a pawnshop loophole. To keep the crime rate falling, we need more police on the street and fewer guns in the hands of criminals, not the reverse.

We have a rare and fleeting chance to use the fruits of our prosperity today to build America for tomorrow. We can invest now to save Social Security and modernize Medicare for the 21st century with more prevention for cancer, osteoporosis, and other conditions and with that prescription drug benefit; to lift our children by improving their education; to pay off the national debt for the first time since 1835 and give a generation lower interest rates for businesses, for home mortgages, for car, credit card, and college loan payments—that means more jobs and higher incomes; to bring economic opportunity through investment to our poorest areas that are left behind; to have an affordable tax cut for child care, long-term care,

retirement savings, and other things Americans need; and to give our families the securities they deserve by keeping the crime rate coming down.

We can do all these things and have an affordable tax cut, or we can squander our hard-won progress on short-term thinking.

Just remember a few years ago—many people never thought we could balance the budget, but we did, and now we actually have a chance to pay off the national debt. Many never thought we could bring down crime rates, but we did, dramatically. Now we have a chance to achieve something that not too long ago would have seemed pure fantasy. In the early years of the new century, we can make America the safest big nation on Earth. We can do this, but only if we act now in the long-term interest of our Nation.

So, again, I call on the Congress and all Americans to make this a season of progress. Let's keep thinking about tomorrow.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 4:32 p.m. on July 23 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 24. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 23 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Picnic in Aspen, Colorado

July 24, 1999

Thank you very much. Thank you. First of all, let me say that the setting is too gorgeous and the day too beautiful really to have a political speech. [*Applause*] I was hoping no one would clap when I said that, but anyway—[*laughter*]. And so I will be brief. But I want to thank you for being here. I want to thank all the people involved with the Democratic Party and all of those who were hosting events or doing things for us who had to go through this mad scramble of change in our schedule because of the death of King Hassan and the absolute conviction that Hillary and I have that we should go to Morocco to the funeral service.

He was a great friend of the peace process. And after—Hillary went over there and went to see him. He stood with us in human rights battles; he's done a lot of things that were very, very good for the United States and for the world. And so—and he was our friend. So we're going to go.

But I thank all of you for changing your schedules, and I thank you for your support. I want to thank our good friends, Dianne and Dick, for having us at their humble little place here. [*Laughter*] This is a gorgeous, serene, wonderful setting, and I thank them. I want to thank Congresswoman Diana DeGette. And I know that Maggie Fox is here, Congressman Udall's wife. I thank her for being here. I thank all the officials of the Colorado Democratic Party and the people from here in Aspen who met me last night. When did I get in—12:30, a quarter to 1:00, some ridiculous hour. And 12 people came out, we had a little 30-minute discussion last night about the state of the world. It was quite wonderful.

I want to make a few points as briefly as I can. Governor Romer made many of them, and Hillary referenced the work that he and Bea and she and I did for many years when we were Governors together. First of all, this is a very different country than it was in January of 1993. A lot of people have forgotten that. This is a different country than it was in January of '93.

And it changed because we had a different set of ideas and we implemented them and they worked. And I won't bore you with all the details, but I think it's very important. And it's very important as we let the next year and a half unfold, what happens in our country, what happens in our politics system.

You know, I hear some of the people who oppose us now basically, after telling everybody for 6½ years what a bad guy I was; they're now basically saying, "Oh well, Bill Clinton is like Michael Jordan; he just jumps higher than the other guys; now the Democrats—he's gone, so we'll put them in the cellar again." There's a sort of cynical political theme.

Let me tell you something. I could not have done anything—anything in the last 6 years if our ideas hadn't been right, and if I hadn't had the help of Al Gore and Hillary and Dianne Feinstein and every Member of

Congress and all the people in our administration team who did that—and all of you who helped us throughout all these long years in the good and the bad times.

Politics is about values and ideas and actions and whether they change people's lives or not. So the first thing I just want to say to all of you who have been with us all the time, you ought to feel pretty good out here—not just because this is a beautiful day in a beautiful place but this is a different country than it was.

The second thing I want to say is we have to decide two things in the next year and a half. We have to decide what are we going to do right now with our prosperity, with our surplus, and what decisions will we make in the next election cycle about where we go.

I had a very interesting question in the press conference earlier this week. Susan Page said, ''Well, Mr. President, your approval ratings are back up after Kosovo and you won the war, and it's very strong approval ratings, but this question was asked our voters: 'Do you want to vote for someone who will just continue the President's policies, or someone who will change policies?' And someone who will change policies won 50 to 38.''

And I said, ''Well Susan, if they polled me, I'd have been in the 50 percent, too, because our country is about continuous renewal.'' And I had to spend the last 6 years trying to make sure this country could work again. Now that things are working well, the question is what kind of change are we going to have—not whether we'll change—are we going to build on what we've done and go beyond it, or are we going to go back to things that didn't work before in the blind hope that they will?

And I'll just give you a couple of examples. First of all, in the moment. The big debate in Washington is, what do we do with the surplus. Well, let me say this. We produced a balanced budget in 1997 by cutting spending rigorously and saying we would keep these caps in place by 5 years, and by continuing to grow the economy by getting interest rates down and investment up. Now, so we now have this projected surplus. But you should also know that we have an enormous number of teaching hospitals in cities throughout America, for example, saying we need to put more money in the Medicare program to take care of the health care systems in the country.

I believe that we should be investing more, not less, in education, the environment, and biomedical research. I don't think we should cut back. And perhaps most important, I think this gives us a chance to meet the challenge of the aging of America and the challenge of giving this country a long-term pattern for growth. And let me just address those briefly.

The number of people over 65 is going to double in the next 30 years. There are going to be fewer people working and more people retired. Social Security is going to run out of money in 2034; Medicare is going to run out of money in 2015. I think we ought to set aside most of the surplus to save Social Security; to save and modernize Medicare; to add more preventive tests for osteoporosis and cancer and other things to try to keep people out of the hospital in the first place; to add a prescription drug benefit that is modest, but will be very helpful to 75 percent of the people who are over 65 who don't have adequate drug coverage; and to do it in a way that would allow us to become, for the first time since—listen to this—1835, debt-free.

Now, why should the liberal party, the more liberal party, be for making America debt-free? Because in 1999 and in 2000 and from now on, in a global economy, when money travels across national borders at the speed of light, interest rates are set in a global environment. And if a wealthy country is out of debt, it means that the people who live in that wealthy country can borrow money at lower cost, which means there will be more investment, more jobs, higher wages, lower car payments, lower credit card payments, lower home mortgage payments, lower college loan payments, and higher economic growth over a longer period of time.

It also means that when a global economy gets in trouble, as Asia got in trouble, Russia got in trouble, and our friends and trading partners and people we hope will remain democracies need money, they can get the money they need at lower cost because we won't be out there taking it away from them.

And I think it is an unbelievable opportunity, and we can do it.

The point I want to make to you is, the Republicans are trying to cast the debate in Washington today as ''our tax cut is bigger than your tax cut.'' It's almost like the arguments we used to have when I was in school—[*laughter*]—''our tax cut is bigger than your tax cut.'' Well, if that's the choice, you know, that's a pretty hard deal to argue with. The question is, if you take our tax cut, which is smaller than theirs, you get to save Social Security and Medicare; you get to take the country out of debt; you get to continue to invest in education, environment, medical research.

If they get their budget through, we will do nothing to extend the life of Medicare, nothing to extend the life of Social Security. We will imperil the future stability of the country, therefore. We will pay down the debt, but we won't pay off. And we will actually have to have drastic cuts in the investments in education, in the environment, in medical research, and believe it or not, even in defense.

Now, that's what's going on here. And what I want to ask you is, after all—this debate couldn't even occur if we all had a clear memory of what this country was like in 1991 and 1992. The Democrats are being punished for our success.

Can you imagine—why is the first issue the size of the tax cut, before we really assess how much we have to give these hospitals to make them whole? Did we tell them too much, and if we did, shouldn't we fix it? What does it take to fix Social Security and Medicare? What does it take to get us out of debt? What does it take to fulfill our basic responsibilities? Then why don't we talk about the tax cut?

In Washington, it's all backwards again. And one of the young men who works for me said, ''Mr. President, this is like a family sitting down around a table and saying, 'Let's plan the vacation of our dreams to Hawaii, and when we get back we'll see if we can make the mortgage payments and send the kids to college.' '' I mean, this is—it doesn't make sense.

So the Democratic Party again is telling the American people, remember what got us to where we are. Do we need change? Absolutely. And we have a plan—and I talked about it in my radio address today—to save Social Security and Medicare, to make the country debt-free, to continue to invest in education and the environment, to literally make this the safest big country in the world early in the next century. And none of it can be done if their idea prevails.

So I think we ought to have a big debate about it. And if we look to the future—I just want to echo one thing Roy said—I'm convinced the more I think about it and the longer I live, and I'm not running for anything anymore, that the biggest difference between the two parties today is the way we think of community. It's not whether some of us are warmhearted and others are coldblooded. It's not whether some of us are nice people and others aren't nice. It's whether we believe down deep inside that those of us who are pretty fortunate would be better off if everybody else did better and that we'll be not only sort of morally satisfied, but actually better off if we try to go forward together in a country where there's opportunity for every responsible citizen and in which everybody has a place in our community.

And I'll just give you a few examples of that where their party genuinely disagrees with us, from top to bottom, from all the candidates to all the Congressmen. The Patients' Bill of Rights—I supported—unlike some people, I supported managed care, but only if the people didn't have to give up quality of care. I think it is unconscionable that a person in a managed care plan could have a doctor pleading for the person to go to see a specialist and some non-physician could block it for long enough to make the damage irrevocable.

I think it is unconscionable that in cities every day somebody gets hit by a car and has to go to an emergency room, and has to drive by the nearest one to one, two or three down the way because that's the one covered by the plan. I think it is wrong for a person working for a small business who has cancer and is in the middle of chemotherapy, or who is pregnant and having a difficult pregnancy, to have to change their doctor in the middle of the treatment because the employer has changed his coverage.

Why? It doesn't affect me. I'm the President; I have great health care. It doesn't affect you. Most of you have got—you can pay for whatever you need. So why are you here? Because we feel that our country is better if more people are healthy and if people are treated fairer.

I'll give you another example—it may not be popular in all parts of Colorado. I grew up in a State where half the people had a hunting or fishing license or both. But I think that we did the right thing to pass the Brady bill. I think we did the right thing to pass the assault weapon ban. And I think Dianne Feinstein did the right thing to pass the assault weapons ban and then keep trying to close all the loopholes in it.

Why is that? Because I think—not because I don't think people ought to be able to hunt or go to sporting events, but because I think that all of us ought to be willing to make reasonable compromises for the safety of the society as a whole, just like we do when we walk through an airport metal detector. You know, it didn't take too many planes to be hijacked before nobody screamed anymore when they walked through an airport metal detector, "You are interfering with my constitutional right to travel."

Now, think about it. This is crazy. So look at the fight in Washington. All of them, from the candidates to the Congress, were against closing the gun show loophole. We don't do background checks at gun shows and urban flea markets where a lot of criminals buy guns. And we have the technology to do it with very minor inconvenience. We think we should do it. And I think it is unconscionable that we would run the risk that one person would lose his or her life next year because we don't do that.

We're for the employment nondiscrimination act, and we're for hate crimes legislation. And we believe that it ought to specifically mention no discrimination against people because of sexual orientation. And we're not afraid of that.

Now, why is that? Because we think all law-abiding citizens ought to be part of America's community. Now, so I ask you, when you think about what we're doing in Washington now and the politics of the next year and a half, if people ask you why you're here—in Colorado a lot of people would say you're nuts, they'd say, "Don't you understand if you'd go to a Republican fundraiser that you'd get a great tax cut right now? Why are you here?"

Tell them because the country is better off, because we changed the direction of the country, and you want America to go forward into the new century together.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:55 a.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Senator Dianne Feinstein's husband, Richard Blum, who cohosted the picnic; Representative Mark Udall's wife, Margaret L. Fox; former Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado, general chair, Democratic National Committee, and his wife, Bea; and journalist Susan Page, USA Today.

Remarks Following a Democratic National Committee Picnic and an Exchange With Reporters in Aspen

July 24, 1999

Death of King Hassan II of Morocco

The President. Let me, again, offer my condolences to the family of His Majesty King Hassan of Morocco and to the people of Morocco. As all of you know, Hillary and I are going to the funeral. His Majesty was a friend of the United States for a very long time and a friend of the Middle East peace process. He also worked very hard to reconcile the differences among the Moroccan people, within Morocco, and therefore, to set an example of the kind of thing that all of us should be doing and certainly there should be more of in the Middle East.

He was particularly gracious to Hillary and other members of our family. And after she went to see him recently, Morocco once again manifested its friendship to the United States by standing with us on human rights issues in ways that had not been the case before.

So I feel very, very grateful that the United States had a partner and friend like King Hassan, and I considered him a personal friend. And I am grateful for the many kindnesses he extended to me and to our family. And so I'm looking forward to going to Morocco for the funeral and to seeing the

new King. I talked with him on the phone; I wished him well. We had met before, and I have high hopes for our continuing successful endeavors for both his partners and for the peace process.

President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria

Q. Do you expect to meet with King Asad while you're there?

The President. With President Asad from Syria?

Q. President Asad, yes, I'm sorry.

The President. No, it's okay. I don't know yet whether he is coming; I don't know who all is coming. But I will be on the ground for a few hours, as all of you know. We'll have to stay, I think, 5 hours after the service is over, and so I'll have an opportunity to see a number of people, and I'll do what I can to make the best use of the time. And as soon as I know with whom I'll be meeting, I'll let you know. I just don't know yet.

Morocco and the Middle East Peace Process

Q. Is this part of a changing of the guard, sir, in the Middle East, between King Hussein and the elections?

The President. Well, there is some change. You know, some of it is the rhythm of politics and some of it is the rhythm of life. King Hussein and King Hassan both had health problems and had had long and distinguished tenures. And that happens, you know. Everybody's time runs out. Mine does, too.

But I think the important thing is that Morocco has been a model of reconciliation within the country and a model of partnership and friendship for peace in the Middle East. And I think that direction will continue. That's the really important thing for me, that this change be a positive thing for the people of Morocco and for the people of the region. And I'm going to do everything I can to be a good friend to the new King and to the country.

Press Secretary Joe Lockhart. Thank you very much.

The President. Thank you.

Michael Jordan

Q. Who told you you were Michael Jordan?

The President. One of my Republican friends was being crude. That's what I said to him. I said no one in their right mind could compare me to Michael Jordan. Well, he said, ''I meant it only in the political context.'' [*Laughter*] I said, ''I can't jump 4 inches. I have a vertical jump of about 4 inches.''

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:10 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to King Mohammed VI, successor to King Hassan II; and former NBA Chicago Bull Michael Jordan. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Luncheon in Aspen

July 24, 1999

Thank you. Thank you very much. Well, first of all, I'm sorry that there's some people out there under umbrellas. I'm tempted to say, thank you very much; we're right; they're wrong; thanks for the money; go out and work hard; goodbye. [*Laughter*] But what the heck. [*Laughter*]

I'd like to thank all the Members of Congress and the members of the administration who are here, and all the people from the DNC. I'd like to thank the people who served our food, and I'd like to thank these young people who provided such wonderful music for us. Thank you very much.

But I would especially like to thank Mel and Bren for making the extraordinary effort, first of all, to have this event, and secondly, to change it around. And it's been perfectly beautiful. Thank you so much. I'm grateful to you.

I appreciate very much the support that so many of you have given us over the years, to me and to Hillary, to the Vice President and Tipper, to all of our administration, the chance you've given us to make this a better country. I will try to be as brief as I can here, but I want you to think about this question: What will you say tomorrow if someone asks you why you were here today? And will it be a good reason for them to join you politically? And is it something that will sustain

your efforts as you talk to your friends and neighbors over the next year and a half? That's really important to me.

You know, yesterday, when Hillary and I had the privilege to go as friends and as representatives of the United States to the memorial service for John Kennedy, Jr., and Carolyn Bessette, I, like everyone, was profoundly moved by the eulogy that Senator Kennedy gave, the last sentence of which was, ''Like his father, he had every gift but length of life.'' I say that not to be morbid, but to remind us all that life is fleeting and fragile.

When I was a boy growing up, I was obsessed with the fact that my own father had died at 29, before I was born. These things don't affect families evenly; there is no rhyme or reason to it. But they serve as a reminder to those of us who are privileged to get up for yet another day of life that there are responsibilities associated with good fortune, and the way we can honor our loved ones who aren't here and honor those who have given so much to our country whose time was cut short is to be good citizens and to be visionaries and to remember that even the oldest people on Earth last a very short time in the grand scheme of things. So it always pays to think about tomorrow.

When I ran for President, I did so because—not because I had any hostility of the kind we had become so used to in politics to the then administration. I actually like President Bush very much personally. I had a lot of friends in the administration. I often represented the Democratic Governors in negotiations with them. I did it because I thought the ideas that were driving the policies were wrong and because there was no animating vision to get this country into the 21st century.

And I hope very much that all that we're seeing now is some indication that we are about to return to that sort of politics, that we can actually have an honest debate about whether—not whether somebody is a good or a bad person, but whether they have good or bad ideas and what the consequences will be.

But I would like to say, if someone asks you why you were here, the first thing you ought to say is that the Clinton-Gore administration came to power with certain ideas that were different from the ideas that had been put forward in the past: that Government was neither the enemy, nor the solution, but should be a partner in creating the conditions and giving people the tools empowering them to make the most of their own lives; that we had to reduce the deficit and we could do it and still increase our investment in critical areas like education; that we could grow the economy and improve the environment; that it was not necessary for people to choose between being successful as workers and being successful as parents. Those are just some of the things that we said we believed.

And what you can say is, ''Hey, they came in; they put their ideas into action, and they worked. So the first reason I showed up is it worked, and it was different.''

I said before, I will say again, I'm so gratified whenever someone comes up and says they think I've done a good job as President and they think I've been able to involve the American people in this; I'm grateful. But I want you to understand, I could be the greatest speaker since Cicero, and if our ideas were wrong, the country would still be in the wrong place. The most important thing is to have the right ideas, the right vision, and a good team implementing it.

I could not have done anything that I have achieved if I hadn't had Al Gore as Vice President, because he's plainly the best Vice President, with the largest amount of responsibility, in the history of the Republic. It is plainly not even close. And I couldn't have done it without the help of our friends in Congress. Even when we've been in the minority in Congress, as long as they stayed with me, I knew in the end we could prevail on all of the great issues. I couldn't have done it without those of you who have helped us.

So, first say, ''They had some ideas; they put them into effect; and they worked.'' It's not just that we have the longest peacetime expansion in history, the lowest minority unemployment in history, the highest homeownership in history. We also have a 30-year low on welfare rolls, a 26-year low in the crime rate. Teen pregnancy, teen smoking, teen drug use is down. Test scores are up in our schools for the first time in years in

the 4th, 8th, and 12th grades, in both reading and math, which is a big deal because every single year we have more and more of our kids whose first language is not English. So this country is moving in the right direction. The air is cleaner; the water is cleaner; the food is purer than it was before. We set aside more land, protected it or preserved it, than any administration except those of the two Roosevelts. We've had a hundred—that's big in Colorado—we had over 100,000 young people serve this country through AmeriCorps, our national service program, in communities all over America, earning money to go to college. That happened in 4 years. It took the Peace Corps 20 years to reach 100,000. Ninety percent of our children immunized against serious childhood diseases for the first time ever. We've had a more active Government, but we now have the smallest Government in terms of employment we've had since 1962, when John Kennedy was President. So we had these ideas; we put them into effect; and they worked. So I hope you will say that to people.

The second thing is I hope you will say you were here because you agree with what we should do now, because we can't just sit on our lead. The question now is, we've spent 6 years trying to get this country to work again, just trying to have it work, knowing that we could work together; that the economy could sustain growth; that we could bring the crime rate down, something a lot of people didn't believe we could do anymore; that we could get rid of the deficit. So what are we going to do now? What are we going to do?

And there are these two competing visions. I'll give you the Republican vision in the argument most favorable to them. If one of them were here, they'd say something like this: ''Look, we agree with the President; we'll take the surplus that's attributable to Social Security taxes, and we won't spend it anymore. And so that can be used to pay down the debt some. But we think we ought to give you the rest of the money because it's your money; it's your tax money; and if we leave it in Washington''—I heard this, I heard them on the floor the other day. I watched them on C–SPAN, and one of their young leaders said, ''If we give them the money, they will spend it on their friends.'' ''Their friends.''

Now, that's their argument. Our argument is, we have a once-in-a-lifetime chance to deal with the long-term challenges of the country. And if we have a tax cut as big as they want, we'll never do it. We've got to deal with the aging of America, the doubling of the number of people over 65 in 30 years. And therefore, we ought to use a lot of this surplus not only to set it aside, but to pay down—to extend the life of Social Security, extend the life of Medicare, provide more preventive screenings for older people so they don't get sick in the first place, and provide for a modest prescription drug benefit, because three-quarters of the seniors in this country don't have it. And if you set aside the surplus and you do it in the right way for both Social Security and Medicare, you can then deal with another big challenge which is the long-term health of the economy, because we could make America debt-free for the first time since 1835 in just 15 years, guaranteeing long-term stability, lower interest rates, higher investment, a stronger economy—debt-free.

If I had told you in 1992, when I was running for President, ''Elect me, and 6½ years later I'll come back, and we'll talk about what to do with the surplus and how to make America debt-free,'' you would have said, ''He's a nice young man, but that's hopeless. The kid, he is clueless. He doesn't have any idea what's going on.'' But it is before us now, and we have to decide what we're going to do.

We also have to realize that if their tax cut passes, it will require huge cuts in education, in the environment, in biomedical research, even in national defense, which they say they support—massive cuts.

And we have a tax cut that's smaller, that helps families to save, to deal with long-term care and child care, primarily. Also helps us to build modern schools and gives people like you incentive to invest in the poorest areas of America by giving you the same tax incentives through tax credits and other mechanisms to invest in Indian reservations, the Mississippi Delta, Appalachia, and the inner city that you have right now if you want to invest in the Caribbean, in Africa, and Latin

America or Asia, which I think is very important.

So they'll say, ''Well, our tax is bigger than your tax cut.'' You ever heard those arguments when you were a kid, you know, the sixth grade? [*Laughter*] ''My daddy drives a bigger car than your daddy does.'' And if that's the argument, we don't do very well. If that's the argument, why are you here? Most of you should be over there with them.

But you know life is fleeting. This is the opportunity of a lifetime. We have never had an opportunity like this, none of us in our political lifetime. And we have these big, looming challenges: how to keep the economy going, how to deal with the aging of America, how to deal with the needs of all of our children for a world-class education. And we've got a way to deal with them now. And we have proved that if we deal with them, the economy will be stronger, and we'll all do better.

So I hope you'll say, ''The second reason I'm there is they're having a big debate in Washington about what to do with this prosperity, and I agree with the Democrats. I think we ought to deal with the long-term challenges of this country.''

And the final thing is, I think the real difference between us is how we define community in America. Some Republicans obviously are very harsh and negative; some are very soothing and nice, and they like to get everybody together. There are all kinds of reasons. I don't like this personal attack business, but the question is, do you believe that each and every person in this country is important to our common success, and do you believe that each and every person in this country should have a right to be treated with dignity? And how do you define that?

Is the American community all those people who say they believe in the same things, or is it all of us who are responsible citizens who are entitled to be treated in a certain way and have a certain set of opportunities? I'll just give you two or three examples where there is almost a complete difference of opinion in the modern parties today, from the left to the right in the Democratic Party and from the left to the right in the Republican Party.

Almost all of us are for the Patients' Bill of Rights. Almost all of them supported killing it in the Congress. Why? The health insurance companies say it will raise your health insurance premiums if your doctor says you need to see a specialist, and they can't stop it; if you get to go to the nearest emergency room; if you get to keep your doctor during the course of treatment even if you change your HMO provider. I think we're right and they're wrong. Even they say it only raises your insurance premiums $2 a month. I think it's worth $2 a month to give people the security of a decent health care system.

But all of them, from top to bottom, were against it, just about. We got a handful of votes.

I believe we ought to control—close the gun show loophole. We did the Brady bill—I remember when we did pass the Brady bill, they said, oh, this was the end of the world. They beat a bunch of our House Members in '94 over the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban, and they said, oh, the hunters were going to all lose their weapons. And I remember going back to New Hampshire in '96—now, by the way, 400,000 people with criminal backgrounds have not gotten a handgun because of the Brady bill. And I remember talking to all of these hunters in New Hampshire, saying, ''You beat a Congressman in '94 here because he voted for the Brady bill. And he did that because I asked him to. So if there is a single hunter here that has been inconvenienced in your hunting, I want you to vote against me, too. But if you haven't, they didn't tell you the truth, and you need to get even.'' Our victory margin in New Hampshire went from one to 13.

People knew they were being sold a bill of goods, once they saw it. So now we come along and say, but there are still a lot of criminals buying guns at these gun shows and urban flea markets, and let's do a background check there. And well, you would think it was the most burdensome thing that we had ever come up with. So our crowd said, ''Let's do it,'' and their crowd said, ''Let's don't.''

How do you define community? What does it really mean to say, ''I think it's worth a lot to keep every kid we can keep alive,

a lot.'' You don't see—I told somebody—you never hear anybody anymore complain about going through an airport metal detector, saying, ''I really resent this; my constitutional right to travel is being infringed.'' [*Laughter*] You're laughing, but you know, there was a lot of apprehension when we started this. All you had to do was think about your plane being hijacked.

But we ought to think—we ought to support this because we should think about not just ourselves being the victims; we should think about our neighbors being the victims.

We're in Colorado. Our hearts were broken by Columbine. I was elated by those 90 kids from Colorado who came, Republicans, Democrats, Christians, Jews, Asians, Hispanics, African-Americans—all kinds of people—90 kids from Colorado descended on the Congress last week, asking them, what in the living heck had happened to them? Had they forgotten about Columbine? Where was their gun safety legislation? It was fabulous. It was fabulous.

But what I want to say to you is, what we forget is 13 kids get gunned down in this country every day. It's worth to us—we should go to a little trouble to try to keep more of them alive. That's what community means to me. We should go to a little trouble to try to keep more of them alive.

So I just give you those examples. There are a lot more. The hates crime legislation—from top to bottom on their side, there's not a handful of them who want us to pass the hates crime bill that explicitly protects gays. Well, I think we should. I think about that Matthew Shepard out in Wyoming and his fine family; I think about the friends that we all have. Haven't we learned that we have nothing to fear from law-abiding citizens who are different from ourselves, as long as we treat them with dignity and respect, whatever their differences are, whether they're religious or whatever? I think this is a big deal. It's part of the way we define community.

I never will forget the first conversation I ever had about this with one of Evan's colleagues, Senator Chuck Robb from Virginia, represents a very conservative State, President Johnson's son-in-law. I believe he saw more combat than any Vietnam veteran in the United States Congress. Distinguished Marine combat veteran in Vietnam. He looked at me without blinking an eye, and he said, ''I am for this.'' And he said, ''I am for anything.'' He said, ''I served with people who risked their life for this country, who were gay, and we ought to give them the protections every other citizen gets.'' And to me, that's part of community.

Let me just close with this story. Some of you have heard this before, but I was on the Pine Ridge reservation in South Dakota recently, with the chairman of the Oglala Sioux, the tribe of Crazy Horse. And the new chairman's name is Harold Salway. He was in the White House with 19 of the tribal chieftains from the high plains to talk about their terrible economic and social problems, which are a stain on this country, I might add, that we have to do something about.

And at the end of the meeting—Lynn Cutler is smiling; she was there, and she's heard me tell the story—there was not a dry eye in the place and no one could breathe when Harold Salway stood up, and he said, ''Before we go, I want to tell you that we are for your position in Kosovo.'' Keep in mind, these people represent the poorest Indians in America; they come to see me; they tell me they want to say, we're for your position in Kosovo. And he said, ''You see, we know a little about ethnic cleansing.'' He said, ''My great-grandfather was killed at Wounded Knee.'' But he said, ''This is America. I had two uncles. One was on the beach at Normandy; one was the first Native American fighter pilot in the history of the U.S. military. And here today their nephew is with the President of the United States.'' He said, ''I only have one son. He means more to me than anything. But I would be proud to have him wear the uniform of my country to fight against ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.''

Community. Why do we fight for peace in the Middle East? Why do we work for it in Northern Ireland? Why do we ask people to stop* killing each other in Africa? Why do we try to get the American people to look at the interdependent nature of the world? Why do all of you who are quite comfortable believe that these young people who have served us today ought to all be able to go

* White House correction.

to college, so we ought to raise the minimum wage periodically to make sure people who work are not in poverty? We honestly believe that it is not only the right thing to do, but that we are better off when others are.

Senator Kennedy yesterday carried a great burden, as he has for more than 30 years now. I'd like to close with a reminder of something he said when his brother was killed in 1968, and once before he had to give a eulogy that the world listened to. And at the end of it he said that he and his family hoped that what his brother wished for others and what he was to them would someday come to pass for all the world.

That is the dream that animates us. Tomorrow, if they ask you why you were here, give them a good answer.

Thank you. God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:13 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks he referred to luncheon hosts Melvin and Bren Simon; murder victim Matthew Shepard; and Senator Evan Bayh.

Remarks to the American Embassy Community in Rabat, Morocco

July 25, 1999

Thank you very much. First, thank you for your warm welcome. To those of you who brought the children here today, thank you, especially for bringing them. I would like to thank Congressman Gilman and Congressman Martin Frost, who is with him from Texas, for joining us. I thank Secretary Christopher and Secretary Baker for dropping everything at a moment's notice to make this trip, to manifest their respect for King Hassan and the friendship between the United States and Morocco.

I'd like to say a special word of thanks to President Bush, who came here, again, on a moment's notice and had to leave early because he now has to go down to Casablanca to take a plane to Belgium to meet another appointment. But I'm very grateful to him for making this trip.

And I'd like to thank all the people from the State Department and the National Security Council, represented by Mr. Berger up here, for putting this trip together in a hurry. And Ambassador Gabriel, thank you and Kathleen and the other members of our Embassy community for making us so welcome.

I'd also like to say that the First Lady would very much like to be here to thank you for making her trips to Morocco so successful. And Chelsea is here, and Hillary's mother is here, who, as I'm sure you know, has been here at least twice, maybe more, since I've been here. I think she's thinking of moving to Morocco. [*Laughter*]

We are all profoundly grateful for the friendship between Morocco and the United States and for the personal kindness and friendship that His Majesty, King Hassan, displayed to me, to my family, to many of us on this podium, and to President Bush and to so many others over the years. So this is an important day for us. And Hillary would be here, but she and Chelsea and my mother-in-law have gone to visit with the mother and the sisters of the new King, and that is why they are not here. But they asked me to give you their best and to thank you.

Now, let me say, especially to the Moroccans who work for the American Embassy here, I know this is a difficult day for many of you. King Hassan was the only King most Moroccans ever knew. And I hope it is some measure of comfort to the people of this nation that among the throngs, the millions of his fellow citizens who came out to honor his passing today were leaders from every part of the world, from every political and religious background, united in their support for Morocco and their respect for the life that he lived.

King Hassan knew every American President since John Kennedy. He, himself, endured great turbulence and personal risk. The thing that always impressed me about him is he was never embittered by the dangers that he faced and, over time, he grew in wisdom, stature, and standing in the world; and as he grew, so did Morocco. I'm told he was known as the great survivor and, of course, we all know those survivor stories. We had another laugh about them on the plane over and shook our head in amazement.

But I think that, in effect, to call King Hassan a survivor is not to do justice to him. Because when we think of a survivor, we think about someone who is very clever, all

right, but just—just enough to escape the slings and arrows that fortune places in our path, just enough to survive. And His Majesty King Hassan did more than that. I think of him instead as a pathfinder, a leader who survived, yes, but who survived to expand the possibilities of the Moroccan people and all the people of this region.

He showed it is possible to be commander of the faithful and a champion of tolerance and a bridge between faiths. He showed it is possible to represent continuity and stability and to build the society that is more and more democratic and open—open to competing ideas and other people. He showed it is possible to promote Islam's holy sites in Jerusalem and to reach out to Israel and the dream of peace, dignity, and security for all God's children in this region. He was a leader of the Arab world and a friend of America.

With our modern world still so bedeviled by ancient animosities of race and religion, King Hassan believed that there is no inevitable clash of civilizations but, instead, a clash between those brave enough to seek a future of peace, prosperity, and harmony and those who fear it. He was brave enough to seek that kind of world. He belonged to a generation of brave leaders—King Hussein of Jordan, Yitzhak Rabin of Israel, Sheik Isa of Bahrain—a generation that brought this region to the turning point we now face. The opportunity for lasting peace is now at hand.

I met with your new King this afternoon. I spoke with him also shortly after I learned that his father had passed away. I have confidence in him. We spoke about the challenges ahead. We spoke about my family's gratitude for all the trips that they have taken to Morocco and the kindness that His Majesty extended to them. King Hassan made her feel not only at home but a part of his family. And I told King Mohammed that now we would be proud to have him feel a part of our family.

The people of Morocco should know they are in the thoughts and prayers of the American people today, and that our partnership can only grow stronger. You know, sometimes we come together to mourn the death of a friend and we are heavy with sorrow because we think about what might have been. Today we pay tribute to the long life of a wise King and a good man. And we think about what still might be because of the life he lived. We are grateful for that life, and we pray for the future that he worked for. We pray for the future partnership and peace of the peoples of this region. And we hope our prayers will be answered, for we remember the words of the prophet that rewards for prayers by people assembled are twice those said at home.

Thank you for assembling for our country every day. God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:05 p.m. in the Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to former Secretaries of State Warren M. Christopher and James A. Baker III; former President George Bush; Ambassador Edward M. Gabriel and his wife, Kathleen; and the First Lady's mother, Dorothy Rodham. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Actions Concerning Digital Computer Exports

July 23, 1999

Dear _____:

In accordance with the provisions of section 1211(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) (the "Act"), I hereby notify you of my decision to establish a new level for the notification procedure for digital computers set forth in section 1211(a) of the Act. The new level will be 6,500 millions of theoretical operations per second (MTOPS). I have taken this action based on the recommendation of the Departments of Defense, Commerce, State, and Energy. The attached report provides the rationale supporting this decision and fulfills the requirements of section 1211(d) of the Act.

Section 1211(d) provides that any adjustment to the control level described in section 1211(a) cannot take effect until 180 days after receipt of this report by the Congress. Section 1211(e) provides that any deletion of a country from the Tier 3 group cannot take effect until 120 days after the Congress is

notified. Given the rapid pace of technological change in the information technology industry, these time periods are too lengthy. I hope that we can work together to reduce both notification periods to 30 days. Such changes will permit implementation of my current decision and future changes in a more timely fashion.

I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to adjust the level at which an individual license is required for computer exports to Tier 3 countries. For sales to military entities, the level will be raised from 2,000 MTOPS to 6,500 MTOPS. For sales to civilian end users, the new level will be raised from 7,000 MTOPS to 12,300 MTOPS. The Secretaries of Commerce and Defense will review these levels, as well as the level described in section 1211(a), in 6 months to determine whether further adjustments will be necessary at that time. They will conduct additional such reviews at regular 6-month periods thereafter.

Such action will complement other actions that I am taking with respect to the export and reexport of computers. I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to adjust the level at which an individual license is required for computer exports to Tier 2 countries from 10,000 MTOPS to 20,000 MTOPS. I have also asked the Secretaries of Commerce and Defense to assess whether further adjustments to 32,000–36,000 MTOPS will be required in 6 months. They will conduct additional reviews at 6-month intervals thereafter. Additionally, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to move the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Brazil from Tier 2 to Tier 1. It is likely that additional countries will be moved from Tier 2 to Tier 1 in the coming months.

All these adjustments will take place immediately, with the exception of the change to the individual licensing level for military end users in Tier 3, which will coincide with the change for the notification provisions of section 1211(a) of the Act. Both these changes will become effective at the end of the 180-day notification period, unless the Congress provides for a shorter period.

I also want to inform you of my support for section 1407(c) of S. 1059, or similar legislative language that would permit me to adjust the level of computer exports above which the Department of Commerce is required to perform post-shipment verifications in Tier 3 countries. Failure to adjust this level will result in the expenditure of scarce enforcement resources for questionable benefits to our shared national security concerns.

I look forward to working cooperatively with the Congress on these issues.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to John W. Warner, chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services; Phil Gramm, chairman, Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Floyd Spence, chairman, House Committee on Armed Services; and Benjamin A. Gilman, chairman, House Committee on International Relations. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 26.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on Efforts To Achieve a Sustainable Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina

July 23, 1999

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 7 of Public Law 105–174, the 1998 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act, I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on progress made toward achieving benchmarks for a sustainable peace process.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 23, 1999.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 26.

Statement on the Ninth Anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act

July 26, 1999

Today I join citizens across the country in celebrating the ninth anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). In

the past, many Americans have presumed that disability meant a life of dependence. Now, we recognize that people with disabilities want to, and can lead independent lives and contribute to our Nation's prosperity. Throughout our administration, Vice President Gore and I have endeavored to empower individuals with the tools they need to bring their tremendous energy and talent to the American work force.

My Task Force on Employment of Adults with Disabilities is building on the foundation of the ADA by developing a coordinated and active employment agenda for people with disabilities. We have taken strong action to promote the employment of individuals with disabilities, including implementing new regulations that increase the amount of income that over 250,000 Americans with disabilities can earn while still receiving critical cash and medical benefits, instituting new steps to remove Federal hiring barriers for people with mental illness, and directing the Office of Personnel Management to develop a plan for Federal hiring of people with disabilities. And under the leadership of Tipper Gore, we are beginning to address the stigma and discrimination confronted by people with psychiatric disabilities.

I am proud of the actions that this administration has taken to fully integrate Americans with disabilities into the workplace. It is now time for Congress to act. In my State of the Union, I challenged the Congress to pass the bipartisan "Work Incentives Improvement Act," sponsored by Senators Jeffords, Kennedy, Roth, and Moynihan, which would improve job opportunities for people with disabilities by increasing access to health care and employment services. It was my hope that I could have signed this legislation into law today, but the House has not yet acted on it. I remain committed to enacting this legislation in this Congress.

We should also work together across party lines to enact a strong, enforceable Patients' Bill of Rights, provide new tax options to assist individuals with disabilities with their work-related expenses, and double the available funding for assistive technologies that will facilitate employment. We must make this a season of progress, not a season of partisanship. We can achieve this end by passing all three of these critically important initiatives. There would be no better way to celebrate the ninth anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Statement on Vietnam-United States Relations

July 26, 1999

I am pleased that the Office of the United States Trade Representative and the Vietnamese Trade Ministry reached an understanding in principle on the terms of a broad commercial agreement between the United States and Vietnam. This provisional arrangement is a major step forward for both countries, and I congratulate our American negotiators and those of Vietnam on their work. I will review the agreement carefully and consult further with the Congress and the Government of Vietnam in the hope that we will be able to move on to finalization, formal signature, and the establishment of normal trade relations very soon.

In addition to promoting American commercial interests, enhancing our economic relations with Vietnam will also help advance cooperation with Vietnam on other issues of importance to our Nation. These include obtaining the fullest possible accounting of our missing from the war, encouraging continued progress in the freedom of emigration, and seeking improvements in the human rights situation in Vietnam. Since the United States normalized relations with Vietnam in 1995, we have made steady progress in each of those areas. A bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam constitutes one more positive step in that process.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Transportation Department Reports

July 26, 1999

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1996 calendar year reports as prepared by the Department of Transportation on activities under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, the Highway Safety Act, and the

Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act of 1972, as amended.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 26, 1999.

Interview With Mike Cuthbert of "Prime Time Radio" in Lansing, Michigan

July 22, 1999

Mr. Cuthbert. Hi. I'm Mike Cuthbert in Lansing, Michigan; welcome back to "Prime Time Radio." As we promised you, we'll present full and indepth discussion of the proposed changes in our health care system, with particular focus on Medicare, as the year 2000 campaign begins. But the discussion of Medicare has not waited for the campaign to start, as you know.

With us here in Lansing, Michigan, is President Clinton, who just finished having a discussion with folks from Michigan on Medicare. Mr. President, welcome to "Prime Time Radio."

The President. Thank you. I'm glad to be here.

Health Care Reform and Medicare

Mr. Cuthbert. Back in 1992, in a long discussion about health care reform, you stopped the proceedings and you said, very firmly, "Without wholesale health care reform, we have no hope of a stabilized, long-term economic recovery." The economic recovery has been long, but health care reform didn't happen. How does that impact on the Medicare plans?

The President. Well, the one thing that I didn't believe that has happened that was good is that we had—I didn't believe that we could get health care inflation down to the general rate of inflation without moving to universal coverage. And I think what happened was we got all the benefits of managed care in the early years—and we were very fortunate to do so—but now we're also living with the burdens, as you hear all the horror stories that prompted me to push the Patients' Bill of Rights.

So I think where we are now is—where I am, at least, is I'm trying to extend health insurance coverage to discrete groups that don't have it, to try to improve the way the system works and do more preventive care, and try to modernize and stabilize the Medicare program. For example, we, 2 years ago, provided for funds to cover 5 million children who don't have health insurance. In this Medicare reform package, we have a proposal to allow people between the ages of 55 and 65 who don't have insurance to buy into Medicare.

But the most important thing we can do now is to stabilize Medicare financially by putting some more cash into it over the next 10 years, by adopting the most modern practices, and by providing more preventive services free, like testing and screenings for osteoporosis and cancer and other things, and adding a prescription drug benefit that we can afford.

So I think that this will be a very good, balanced package. It's completely voluntary. It gives seniors another choice on Medicare. But the most important thing is it stabilizes Medicare for 27 years, and that's very, very important, because all the baby boomers start retiring in—well, they'll start retiring sooner, but the baby boomers start turning 65 in 2011. The oldest baby boomers are already in the AARP. That seems impossible to me, but there it is. [*Laughter*]

So to me, it's very, very important that we not spend too much of this surplus on a tax cut before we do the first things first, before we stabilize Social Security, stabilize Medicare and reform it. And incidentally, my proposal, if it's adopted as I sent it to Congress, would also make America debt-free in 15 years, for the first time in 160 years. So that would be a good thing to do, as well.

Link Between Medicare, Social Security, and Education

Mr. Cuthbert. One thing I noticed you have done since this focus began—and you did it again here in Lansing—was you always mention Medicare and Social Security and you never fail to mention education. This program talks a lot about "sandwich generation" issues. What do you see, and what should the American people see, as the importance of that link between Medicare, Social Security, and education, which seem to

me to be appealing to two different audiences?

The President. Well, I think that they tie families together, and they tie the future together. For example, younger people should care a lot about stabilizing Social Security and Medicare, not just for themselves but so that they will not be financially burdened by their parents' aging. The number of people over 65 is going to double in 30 years—double. People over 80 are the fastest growing group of Americans.

So if you're going to be—in 10 years from now, if you're going to be 45 years old and have kids going to college, you ought to be interested in this because you ought to want our programs to be strong so that your parents can support themselves with their own retirement from the Social Security, and you'll be free to raise your parents' grandchildren. So it is an intergenerational thing.

If you look at the education issue, the ability of America to sustain our economic dominance long term will rest increasingly on the ability of America to educate all American kids to world-class standards so they can occupy tomorrows with jobs. And so the older people have a big vested interest in education, apart from generally caring about how their grandchildren are going to do in the world, because it will stabilize and strengthen America. And we should look at America as a whole. We ought to—we've got to deal with the aging of America; we've got to deal with the challenges to the children of America; and we've got to make sure we can keep the economy going. If you do those three things, I think we'll solve a lot of the other problems just on our own.

Budget Surplus

Mr. Cuthbert. Critics of the surplus debate have said that nobody can guarantee the economic growth that is at the bottom of your plan. It seems to me—and I wish you to comment on this—that that may be the most important part of that education you're talking about, that without that education, that economic growth underlying this whole thing and the surplus isn't possible.

The President. Absolutely. Let me say though, to people who say that you can't be absolutely certain the surplus will be there as projected for 10 years or 20 years, to me that's an even stronger argument not to go out and give it away before it materializes with a big tax cut. At least if you adopt my plan, you know that we're going to be saving the lion's share of it for Social Security and Medicare and paying the debt down. So if it doesn't all materialize, at least you're going to be making headway.

But I should say a little something about economic forecasting, because it relates to what you said about education. When we say the surplus will be such and such over 10 years, based on the economists' forecasts, it doesn't mean that we think every year will always be better than the next and there will never be a recession or never be an economic slowdown. What these economists do is they factor the patterns of economic performance over a long period of time and they say, ''If you assume the average number of downturns and the average number of upturns and the economy performs as it has been performing for the last 10 to 20 years, then this is what the surplus will be.''

In other words, we have eliminated the so-called structural deficit. We never really had a big permanent deficit in America until 1981, you know, in peacetime, just a permanent deficit. And we quadrupled the debt in 12 years. We have gotten rid of that. So now if we had—God forbid—a big downturn next year or the year after next, we might even run a little deficit because there would be fewer people working and more people getting tax money. But over the 10 year period, the surplus estimate is almost certainly right.

Nursing Homes

Mr. Cuthbert. Can we turn for a moment to nursing homes? They've been running ads recently in major papers across the country about the effects of the Balanced Budget Act amendment cuts, some $2.6 billion. My mother is in a nursing home, and I can see the effects on her—less exercise periods, more difficulty getting service, more turnover in staff. How would your Medicare reforms and stabilization affect that problem, which appears to be growing?

The President. Let me, first of all, describe what the problem was. When we passed the Balanced Budget Act, we agreed

with the Republicans, we would try to achieve a certain level of savings in the Medicare program, which funds nursing homes and hospitals and home health and all that. We then produced, from our health care experts who deal with all the providers, the list of changes we thought were necessary to achieve that level of savings. The congressional budget people said they thought it would require more changes than that. So under the law, we had to do it. They didn't do this on purpose. What happened was they cut more than was necessary; they realized much bigger savings than they estimated. To that extent, our surplus is larger than it otherwise would be.

And we believe that it is mostly because we did too much that some of our nursing homes and hospitals and other programs are in trouble. And what I have done in extending, in taking the savings of the Balanced Budge Act for '97 out another 10 years, we have taken out of that some of the things we put in last time. And we have also set aside a fund of $7.5 billion that can be allocated by Congress to the hospitals and the nursing homes that have been particularly disadvantaged by this, to try to alleviate this quite difficult financial situation a lot of them found themselves in.

Prescription Drug Coverage

Mr. Cuthbert. Much of the discussion here in Lansing concerned the prescription program that so featured part of your Medicare stabilization program. I have not, in all my reading and listening, been able to discern too much opposition to that. Have you?

The President. Well, I think there's opposition. The only opposition I'm aware of now is there are some in the Congress who are opposed to it, who say that—mostly the Republicans who want to use the money for the tax cut—they basically say, ''Well, two-thirds of our seniors already have drug coverage.'' But as I pointed out today—we produced our report today—only about 24 percent have really good private sector drug coverage related to their former employment. The other coverage—either they don't have coverage at all, a third of them don't have any coverage; and the rest of them have coverage that's too expensive and too unreliable and is shrinking every year. Some of them have coverage that has $1,000 ceiling. And the most rapidly growing drug coverage has a $500 ceiling. Well, for people with drug problems, you know, if they have $2,000, $3,000, $4,000 worth of bills every year, that's not much coverage.

So we think that—this is a purely voluntary program, but we think that people ought to have another choice. They ought to have the option to have more adequate drug coverage at a considerably lower price than you get in the Medigap policy. Medigap is just too expensive. And it also goes up as people get older. And the older you get, the less able you are to pay, normally, and the higher the premium is. So I feel that this is quite a good thing to do.

Mr. Cuthbert. Speak to the fears of the people who say, ''If this prescription drug program comes in, my company will cut drug prescription benefits.''

The President. Well, we were concerned about that, because the 24 percent that have this drug coverage already, some of them actually have programs that are more generous than the one we're offering, and we don't want to mess that up. So we have offered, as a part of this program, quite generous subsidies to employers to continue such programs. And I think, actually, it might be that more employers will be willing to provide this coverage.

What's happening now is these employers are dropping this coverage like crazy right now; they're dropping it anyway. And so what we want to do is to give incentives for them to keep it, and then to add it back if they've dropped it. This will not aggravate this problem; this will make that problem better. However bad or good it is, it'll be better after this because it's totally voluntary. But the employers will have no financial incentives to drop it and put their people on the Medicare program because they're going to get direct subsidies from Medicare to keep what they've got.

President's Future

Mr. Cuthbert. As we'll hear in just a moment, we're going to hear from some of the folks who were at this meeting in Lansing,

the people from the audience and their stories. As you said in the presentation, those who criticize stories as ineffective don't know America. We are a collection of stories.

It seemed to me that since this is your last year in the Presidency—and, as you say, you're not running for anything—President Carter had the Habitat for Humanity; what are the chances that President Bill Clinton, after he's President, will focus on health care reform and health care issues as your next job?

The President. Well, I think it's one of the things that I will do. I've tried to bring this country together politically, economically, socially, across racial and religious lines. And one of the things that I expect I will be doing is to use the center that I will establish at my library to try to find ways to close the gaps in the fabric of our American community, including the health care gaps. You know, I care a lot about it.

But I think it's very important that we recognize we can do a huge amount in the one year and 5 months I have left. It would be a big mistake for us to all check out here—or a year and 6 months we've got left.

Mr. Cuthbert. You don't seem to be checking out.

The President. No, I think we ought to bear down. I tell my friends in the Congress all the time, I say, you know, we still get a check every 2 weeks. People are paying us. We need to show up for work. There will be an election, and time will take care of all the rest of this, and then we'll all go on about our business and do other things.

But it's funny, sometimes the pressure of an election—a lot of people have forgotten this, but in 1996 we passed welfare reform with overwhelming bipartisan majorities in both Houses; we passed an increase in the minimum wage; we did two or three other big things in '96. In '98, at the very end of the 11th hour, we passed a budget that provided for a downpayment on 100,000 teachers to take class size down to 18 in the first 3 grades. And we've already funded almost a third of them. I mean, this was a huge deal. So if we all just stay in harness here and focus and show up for work everyday, good things can happen.

Mr. Cuthbert. You said here in Lansing that you want the debate to be harmonious; you want it to be civil; you want it to be intelligent; and we hope it will remain this way on this program.

We thank you for contributing to that atmosphere and the information and inspriration you've given us today. Thank you very much for being on "Prime Time."

The President. Thank you very much. I'm delighted to be here. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 2:20 p.m. on July 22 in Room 252 of the Dart Auditorium at Lansing Community College and was taped for later broadcast. "Prime Time Radio" is a production of the American Association of Retired Persons. This item was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 27.

Proclamation 7212—25th Anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation, 1999

July 26, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The Bill of Rights guarantees that no American shall be "deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." This promise lies at the heart of our free society and reflects our reverence for impartial justice and the rule of law. In a few simple words, it cements the fundamental covenant between our government and the people it serves.

Our Nation's founders understood that true justice cannot exist unless it is accessible to all. In this same spirit, Congress established the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) 25 years ago to secure equal access to justice under the law for all Americans by making available high-quality legal assistance in civil matters to citizens who otherwise would be unable to afford it.

Designed as a private, nonprofit, independent entity, the LSC focuses its efforts on funding local legal services programs that are rooted in and accountable to the communities they serve. The dedicated staffs of

these programs, and the many private attorneys who donate their time and expertise, strive to protect and defend the interests of their clients and to maintain the highest standards of the legal profession. In recent years, the LSC has provided grants to legal services programs serving every county in our Nation, as well as the U.S. territories. Each year, almost 60 thousand private attorneys participate by performing pro bono legal services, and almost 2 million people benefit from LSC-funded efforts.

The extraordinary success of the LSC highlights the importance of the legal profession's long-standing tradition of community service. It also reminds us of how much our society has been strengthened by the conscience and conviction of lawyers standing up for what is right. As part of my Call to Action to the American Legal Community, I hope to build on this tradition of service by challenging all attorneys across our Nation to donate some of their time and apply their skills to help those among us who cannot afford to pay for the representation they need.

As we mark the 25th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation, I salute the dedicated members of the Board of Directors, attorneys, paralegals, support staff, and volunteers associated with the LSC who have worked with talent, generosity, and determination to uphold America's fundamental commitment to justice for all.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim July 25, 1999, as the 25th anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation. I urge all Americans to join me in recognizing the contributions that the Legal Services Corporation, and the local programs that it supports, have made in fulfilling the promise of equal justice under the law.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., July 28, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 27, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on July 29.

Proclamation 7213—National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day, 1999

July 26, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

In 1950, North Korea invaded its free neighbor to the south, raising the specter of armed communist expansion as a threat to democracies around the world. During the next 3 years of bitter struggle, more than 54,000 Americans gave their lives for the cause of freedom. With the signing of a negotiated armistice in 1953, the Korean War became for a time the "Forgotten War." But each year on National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day, we pledge never to forget the lessons of that savage and costly conflict nor the members of our Armed Forces who risked their lives to defend democracy, human dignity, and the right to self-determination.

The Korean War taught us that we have many allies in our ongoing crusade for human freedom and democratic rule. Under the auspices of the United Nations, 22 countries joined the United States and South Korea in resisting communist aggression by sending troops and providing medical support. Etched in stone on the Korean War Veterans Memorial in our Nation's capital, the names of these countries remind us that free nations everywhere share a profound responsibility to assist those who seek to defend themselves from the aggression of brutal and oppressive regimes. The Korean War also taught us the importance of vigilance in recognizing threats to freedom and the need for vigorous and decisive action in resisting such encroachments. Though the dark shroud of the Cold War has lifted from our world, new regional and ethnic conflicts remain a threat to international peace and human rights.

Whether in Iraq, Bosnia, Kosovo, or elsewhere, we will continue to defend the same eternal values for which so many courageous Americans fought in Korea.

The Congress, by Public Law 104–19 (36 U.S.C. 127), has designated July 27, 1999, as ''National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day'' and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this day.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim July 27, 1999, as National Korean War Veterans Armistice Day. I call upon all Americans to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities that honor and give thanks to our distinguished Korean War veterans. I also ask Federal departments and agencies and interested groups, organizations, and individuals to fly the flag of the United States at half-staff on July 27, 1999, in memory of the Americans who died as a result of their service in Korea.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., July 28, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 27, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on July 29.

Remarks on Women's Medicare Benefits

July 27, 1999

Thank you. She was great, wasn't she? Let's give her a hand. [*Applause*] Well, I must say that Judith did such a good job, there's hardly anything left to say. [*Laughter*] Thank you very much for being here, and we welcome your daughter here.

I want to thank Secretary Shalala and acknowledge the presence in the audience of Deborah Briceland-Betts, the executive director of the Older Women's League; the people here from the Henry Kaiser Family Foundation; and the other representatives of women's groups, senior women's groups, and Medicare advocates. Hillary and Secretary Shalala and I are delighted to welcome you to the White House today, and we thank you for your interest in this critical issue.

We are here to discuss what I have repeatedly called a high-class problem. The American people are living longer, especially women. And it is a high-class problem because we have this surplus today, and a projected surplus for several years into the future, which will enable us to deal with the challenge of people living longer and spending more money on Medicare, and then the retirement of the baby boomers, which will put additional pressure on Medicare and on Social Security. It is a high-class problem, but we don't want it to turn into a nightmare because we walked away from it when we could have dealt with it, and we had the money to deal with it—when we had the time to deal with it, and we know good and well we ought to deal with it.

So, again I say I thank you for being here, and I hope today we can get out some information which will persuade the American people and Members of the Congress that the approach I have recommended for the future is the right one.

For 34 years now, Medicare has protected the health of our seniors; it has enriched the lives of the disabled; it has eased the financial burdens on families as they cared for their loved ones. For millions of American women, in particular, Medicare has been the lifeline to a dignified retirement.

As the report released today by the Older Women's League so clearly tell us, a strong and modern Medicare system is absolutely vital to the health and future of America's women. First, it is critical because the majority of beneficiaries quite simply are women. Listen to this: 20 of the 34 million Americans currently enrolled in Medicare are women. I think we've got a chart that says that. But look here, 41 million—41 percent of the people in this country on Medicare over 65 are men; 59 percent are women. And, of course, as time goes on, the percentages get better or worse, depending on your perspective. [*Laughter*] Twenty-nine percent of the people over 85 are men; 71 percent are women.

Seventeen percent of people over 100 are men; 83 percent are women. You may think those numbers are insubstantial, but Americans over 80 are the fastest growing population group in the United States, and I'm sure that most of us hope to be among them some day. So this is very important.

Second, without Medicare the doors to hospitals and doctors' offices, to basic medical treatment and good health would actually be closed to millions of older women. Throughout their lives, women's incomes have always lagged behind those of men, a gap underscored in retirement through smaller pensions and Social Security checks. So even as they must make ends meet on smaller incomes, women must meet greater health care needs. Nearly three-fourths of older women have two or more chronic illnesses, compared to just 65 percent of older men. For these women, Medicare has truly meant the difference between a healthy retirement and one clouded by uncertainty, untreated illness, and poverty.

Now, as you have just heard, the clock is ticking on Medicare's ability to meet the needs of our seniors in the next century—people living longer than ever, the retirement of the baby boom approaching, the Medicare Trust Fund will become insolvent by 2015. Now, you may think that's a good ways away, but let me tell you, when I took office, Medicare was supposed to become insolvent this year. And we took a lot of very strong steps to stop it from happening.

But we have taken all the easy steps, and some that, arguably, have gone too far. Everywhere I go, people say, you know, the therapy services have been cut back too much, or the inner-city hospitals with big teaching loads or the teaching hospitals generally—not just in the big urban centers—everywhere I go, people talk to me about this. So it should be obvious to everyone there are no longer any easy ways to lengthen the life of the Medicare Trust Fund, just as people are living longer and accessing it more. So that is problem one.

Problem two is that Medicare's benefits have not changed significantly since 1965, although the world of modern medicine has changed dramatically. There are some who really believe we can afford to put off this until later. I disagree. To them I say, listen to Judith Cato's story. Like millions of women in the same situation, affording prescription drugs for herself is right around the corner, and for her mother is today. The typical 65-year-old woman retiring this year can expect to live to be 84. That's 19 more years of retirement. But if we don't act soon, the Medicare Trust Fund will expire in 16 years.

Over the past 6½ years, we have managed to transform an economy burdened by an unconscionable deficit of $290 billion to an economy that today is the picture of fiscal health, with a surplus of $99 billion and a large projected surplus over the next decade. We've done this by balancing the budget, cutting unnecessary spending, expanding our investments in education and training, expanding our trade abroad—all of it bringing interest rates down and getting investment up and giving us a remarkable period of economic growth, the longest peacetime expansion in our history, nearly 19 million new jobs and the lowest minority unemployment and the highest homeownership ever recorded.

The question is, what are we going to do with this? We know what one plan is. You have talked about it. The majority in Congress say, "Well, let's approve a big tax cut now and worry about Medicare and extending the life of the Social Security Trust Fund scheduled to run out of money in a little more than 30 years, let's worry about that later." One of my bright staff members said, "It's kind of like a family sitting around the kitchen table saying, 'You know, we have always wanted to plan a really fancy vacation to Europe. Let's just do it and blow the works, and when we get home, we'll figure out whether we can pay the mortgage, the car payment, and send the kids to college.' " [*Laughter*] You're laughing, but you know, it's not just a question of the size of the tax cut.

Why are we even discussing it before we decide what it takes to save and strengthen Medicare, what it takes to save Social Security, and what we have to invest in the education of our children, the defense of our Nation, the protection of our environment? Why don't we ask ourselves what it is we have to do before we ask ourselves what it is we would like to do?

So what do I think we have to do? Here's what I think we should do. I think, first of all, my plan would secure Medicare by dedicating over $320 billion of our budget surplus for 10 years, to extend the life of the Trust Fund from 2015 to 2027; that would be the longest projected life we've had on a Trust Fund in many years. But we have not been this financially healthy in many years, nor have we faced the challenge of so many people retiring and living so long ever before. So we need to know it's going to be all right for a good while.

Secondly, we will introduce more modern mechanisms of competition to improve quality but to control costs as well as we can, as private sector innovations have done. We will give seniors the chance to choose between lower cost Medicare managed care plans and the traditional program, but we will not support changes that would force them to move from one to the other.

I also believe it's important to modernize benefits, and over the long run, the economical thing to do. Over the last 30 years, a medical revolution has transformed health care, and in many cases, prescription drugs now supplant what used to be routinely dealt with with surgeries. They have lengthened and improved the quality of life.

As the Older Women's League study shows, women have borne the greatest cost of this pharmaceutical revolution. According to the next chart, women spend $1,200 a year on prescription drugs, on average, about 20 percent more than men. Now, as you have already heard, our plan will help seniors to afford the prescription drugs that have become essential to modern medicine. The plan is completely voluntary but available to all Medicare beneficiaries. This is a challenge, I might add, not just for poor women. It is also a challenge for middle class women as well.

Look at the next chart. Half of all middle class women—that is, for seniors, those who make at least $12,700 a year or, with couples, $17,000 a year—have no prescription drug coverage at all. So among those who have no coverage, a quarter are below the poverty line, a quarter are between 100 and 150 percent of poverty, half are over 150 percent of the poverty line; although, if your drug bills are big enough, it doesn't take long to get down below the poverty line again.

Women who have tried to buy extra coverage through private Medigap policies have to cope with escalating premiums as they get older. That's one of the great ironies of these Medigap policies that I keep hearing about, you know, we don't really need this because of Medigap. They get more and more and more expensive as you get older and older and older and less and less and less able to come up with the money to pay for them.

Now, I think anybody that says we don't need to do this is out of touch with people's real lives and out of date. I'd also like to point out that our plan would eliminate the last barrier between seniors and preventive screenings—tests for breast cancer, colon cancer, prostate cancer, diabetes, and osteoporosis—that can help save their lives. For too many seniors on fixed incomes, especially low income women, the cost of the modest copayment is prohibitive. Last year for example—listen to this—just one in seven women took advantage of the mammograms covered by Medicare.

So what we want to do is to eliminate the deductible and the copayments for the preventive screenings, and we pay for it by introducing a modest co-pay on lab tests that are frequently overused, ones that have been identified, and by indexing to inflation the modest part B premium, which will be much less burdensome because it's more broadly spread in a smaller amount of money. But the people who need these preventive screenings, this will save lives.

Consider the irony of this. Every condition I just outlined, we pay for the doctor benefits, we pay for the hospital benefits, but we don't want to let people get the preventive screenings that will keep them from spending that money in the first place to keep them healthy and keep them alive. This is a good thing to do.

Now, this is a good plan. It is a responsible plan. And it is important that we deal with the Medicare challenge now, while we have the funds and the prosperity to do so. I have proposed to dedicate the Social Security portion of the surplus to Social Security, but also to lengthen the life of the Trust Fund by taking the interest savings we'll have, because

this will allow us to pay the debt down, and putting it into the Social Security Trust Fund, so it will last longer. So we'll have at least over 50 years of life on the Social Security Trust Fund.

And as I said, I proposed to put over $320 million in Medicare. There's not a single expert on this program who believes that we can stabilize the fund and lengthen the life of it and deal with the coming demographic challenges without more money. No one who has looked into this believes it. And I think this is very, very important, because if the tax cut being pushed by the congressional majority, which includes vast benefits for people in my income group and higher—who have done quite well in the stock market, thank you very much—[*laughter*]—and are not clamoring for it, and are worried that it will destabilize the economy—even today, there are stories in the paper that if we have a big tax cut, with the economy growing as fast as it is, it might stimulate inflation, which would cause increases in interest rates, which would take away all the economic benefits of the tax cuts in higher interest rates.

So I say to you, I do not believe that is the wise thing to do. I think first we should say, let's save Social Security and Medicare; let's add this responsible prescription drug benefit; let's decide the commitments that we ought to make—to give our children good education, to keep our streets safe, to biomedical research, to national defense, to the environment—and then let's decide what we can afford in a tax cut. Let's do first things first.

In addition, another benefit of my plan, not present in any other one, is that if my proposal were to pass the Congress, in about 15 years we would actually be out of debt as a nation, for the first time since 1835.

Now, the significance of that for older Americans is quite important. Why? Because if we are out of debt, it means we will have long-term prosperity; lower interest rates, which means lower costs for business borrowing, more investment, more jobs, higher incomes; and for families, lower home mortgages, car payments, credit card payments, and college loan payments. That amounts to a very big tax cut over 10 or 15 years, getting this country out of debt, making us less vulnerable to the vagaries of the international financial system, securing the long-term economic stability for the young people here in the audience and throughout our country.

Believe it or not, we can do all that and still have a fairly sizable tax cut. I propose to let people use it for retirement savings, for long-term care, for child care. But the point I want to make today is not so much what we spend it on but how much it can be, and in what order we are doing this. We did not get to this moment of prosperity by figuring out how to eat our cake, and then looking around for the vegetables. [*Laughter*] That's not how we got here. We got here—and a lot of Members of Congress lost their jobs over it—because we took the tough decisions in 1993 to get the deficit down, to bring interest rates down, and to do it without having to give up on our obligations to education and to our other important national priorities.

So here we are with this opportunity of a lifetime to deal with this, and I think we ought to do it. Now, I regret that, as all of you know, the congressional majority appears to have a different philosophy. Look what happened. Last week, in the House of Representatives, they passed an irresponsible tax bill that would spend our surplus; it wouldn't devote a dime—not a dime—not one dime to extending the solvency of Medicare. And interestingly enough, these tax cuts are worded so that they won't go into full effect until the year 2010, just when the baby boomers start to retire. And in the second 10 years, they'll cost way over twice as much as they did in the first 10 years. So the whole impact of them will hit us right between the eyes as the baby boomers retire, Medicare nears insolvency, Social Security starts to show strains.

This week the Senate is going to take up a similar bill. They also, I might say, as all the analysis done—I don't know if you've had—I don't want to take time today to do this, but if you haven't seen the analysis of the bills, you ought to, because they're standing up there saying, "If we don't give this money back to you, 'they' "—i.e., me and my allies in Congress—"will spend it on 'their' friends."

Well, Judith is my friend. [*Laughter*] It sounds so great: ''We want to give it back to you; they're going to spend it on their friends.'' We want to spend it on saving Social Security and Medicare, educating our children, paying down the national debt, and getting us out of debt, to help our friends, the American people.

They tickle me, you know, these guys. They were fighting the Patients' Bill of Rights several days ago, and they said, ''Oh, these Democrats, all they do is stand up and tell stories; we're talking about something besides stories.'' Well, I don't know about you, but the older I get, the more it seems to me like life is just a collection of stories. [*Laughter*] And people are pretty important, a lot more important than statistics.

And I'm telling you, I've been at this business a long time. This country may never have an opportunity like this. And they're spending it on their friends. [*Laughter*] And, ironically, their friends are better off under our plan because the stock market has more than tripled. Their friends have done very well under our plan. We have had an economic policy that has been nondiscriminatory, benefiting Republicans and Democrats alike. [*Laughter*]

Look, today I want you to read the papers today. They point out that the Congress, the majority, has begun resorting now to accounting gimmicks, because they've approved such a big tax cut, they can't meet the fundamental obligations of Government without beginning, right now, to spend the surplus. And they don't want to acknowledge that, so they've resorted to accounting gimmicks to disguise the fact that they're dipping into the surplus. They can't live within the budget limits we set in 1997. I told you, we all know we cut Medicare too much in '97; we're going to have to fix it. A lot of you know it. A lot of you deal with these programs and these health care providers. But they want to give the illusion they're living within the budget limits, nothing has to be done, and they can have this tax cut. I'm telling you what's going to happen. If this tax cut were to become law, it would mean huge cuts in education, huge cuts in the environment, huge cuts in medical research, huge cuts in health care, and huge cuts in national defense. Or if they didn't do that, we would see balloon in the deficit again, just like we did in the 12 years before I took office, when the national debt quadrupled. We tried it that way; it didn't work very well.

Why are we going down the same road we tried before, when we have a road that we have tried for 6½ years that has brought us to this point? Why would we reverse course instead of building on what we've done and going beyond it? It is a big mistake, and it's wrong. It's not just wrong for the seniors; it's not just wrong for the women of this country; it's wrong for all Americans. It is not the right thing to do.

Now, it also—it will take away the single best opportunity any of us will ever have in our lifetimes to save Social Security for the baby boomers, to save and strengthen Medicare, and to get us out of debt for the first time since 1835, to give the young people in this room a chance at a generation of prosperity. And I don't believe any thinking person, once they understand what the real numbers are—let's get out of the rhetoric here, who's going to give it to whose friends and all that. What are the numbers? This is an arithmetic problem.

You know, I told people when I got elected President, I'd come from a State with fairly straightforward values and ways of doing things, and I thought we ought to have a radical new idea in Washington. We'd bring basic arithmetic back to the budget. [*Laughter*] And basic arithmetic has worked pretty well. This doesn't add up.

And so I ask you to help me send the word to the Congress that let's do first things first. Let's fix Medicare. The women of America especially need it.

You know, we have to work together. Every time we get in one of these fights, people throw their hands up. But there's normally a process that goes on here. When we were doing welfare reform, I vetoed two bills because it took away the mandate of health care and nutrition for children. We finally got a welfare reform that I thought was right; it carried by big majorities in both parties, in both Houses; we have the lowest welfare rolls in 30 years. And we did it in an election year.

Then the next year we did the Balanced Budget Act, and it has worked superbly. The only problem with it is that the Medicare cuts were too burdensome on certain groups, and we're trying to fix that. But I can tell you that if this tax cut passes, there will be breathtaking cuts in every area of our national life that you would believe is important, over and above what it would do to totally rob us of any chance to stabilize and improve Medicare and save it for the baby boom generation.

We have big tests as a country. How are we going to deal with the aging of America? How are we going to give all of our kids a world-class education, especially since more and more of them come from families whose first language is not English? Those of us who expect to be alive in 20 years, or hope to be, better hope we do a good job of educating those kids. How are we going to deal with all these other challenges? How are we going to bring economic opportunity to people who still haven't felt it? How are we going to stabilize the economy so that we'll still be growing even better 10, 15, 20 years from now? These are big challenges. But they are high-class problems in the sense that nations rarely get these opportunities.

Once-in-a-lifetime you get a chance to stand up with your country in good shape, bring people together, look down the road, and say, yes, these are big challenges, and we're going to check them off—one, two, three, four—because we have the money and the vision to deal with them.

So my appeal today is that we not get into a big fight; we just go back to basic arithmetic. These tax bills the majority is pushing could not get the support of their own Members if we had a chart up on the wall that says, here is what we have to spend just to stay where we are today in education, defense, the environment, medical research; here's what every expert says it takes to stabilize Medicare; here is the interest savings you ought to be putting into the Social Security Trust Fund; here is what we have to do to fix health care. They agree we have to do some more for veterans care. They agree with these things.

The numbers don't add up. We cannot take the vacation without paying the home mortgage, the car payment, and the college loan bill. We can't do it. We can't eat the cake until the vegetables and the soup are out of the way. And we cannot defy the basic laws of arithmetic. And contrary to some of the debate, we cannot forget the stories.

This is about how millions upon millions upon millions of Americans will live. Will they live in dignity and health, or will they live in want and insecurity, imposing unconscionable burdens on their children, and limiting their children's ability to raise their grandchildren? Or will we use this moment to build a more prosperous, more just, more decent society? This is about way more than drugs and trips to the doctor. This is about what kind of people we are and whether we can look beyond today to the tomorrow we all want for all of us.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:24 a.m. in Presidential Hall (formerly Room 450) in the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Judith G. Cato, member, Maryland Commission on Aging, who introduced the President. The transcript made available by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of the First Lady. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks on the 25th Anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation

July 27, 1999

Thank you very much. Let me say, first of all, I apologize for being late. I've been over meeting with the Russian Prime Minister, and you would have given me a pass, I think. I was doing good work, I hope.

Lucy, thank you for your statement, and on behalf of all of us, for the award. Let me say, I could just sit here and sort of look at all the people that are here. I hesitate to even call people by name, but I want to thank all the Members of Congress who are here, including Congressman Berman and Congressman Ramstad. I'd also—I see Mr. Conyers and Congressman Cardin, Congressman Allen, Congresswoman Waters, former Congressman Fox, and Father Drinan, we're glad to see you here, sir. Thank you. Sarge and Eunice Shriver; the ABA presidents, Jerry

Shestack, Bill Ide, Roberta Cooper Ramo, William Paul. And I see former Secretary of Commerce and Trade Ambassador Mickey Kantor, who was on the Legal Services board with Hillary.

We all go back a long way, all of us who care about this, it seems like. Doug Eakeley and Tom Allen and I, we went abroad together as young men 30 years ago. We must have gotten infected with a Legal Services virus. [*Laughter*] Judge Broderick, it's good to see you here. And Jim Ramstad said, we were there 36 years ago—is that how long it was? [*Laughter*] They're coming tomorrow; you should come back. Make you feel old, or young, as the case may be.

I want to say that for our family, the Legal Services Corporation has been very important. My wife has done many things I've been proud of, but I have never been more proud of anything than her service on the Legal Services Corporation to which President Carter appointed her, and the work she did as the chair of that Corporation.

You know, here in Washington, everybody's got a lawyer. Whether you need one or not, everybody's got a lawyer, you know? [*Laughter*] We forget what it's like to have a lawyer be the difference between homelessness and having a stable home; between unemployment and the security of a job; between the disintegration of a household and holding a family together in difficult times. The Legal Services Corporation has made equal justice not a political cause, but an everyday occurrence. We have tried to advocate that—I see our former chief advocate, Mr. Dellinger, there—but this is a personal thing for those of us who have experienced it.

Hillary's brother, in the back, was a public defender for many years in Miami. And Janet Reno, as a prosecutor, supported efforts to make sure that everybody had a decent defense—something that I think is a sterling example.

Every one of you in this room has that sort of story. But those of us who are old enough to remember when it was different feel it perhaps the more strongly. And I want to thank Howard Berman and Jim Ramstad for giving voice to the struggles we're now engaged in in Congress. Sometimes I think that the Legal Services Corporation, even though it's very young—25 years old—is suffering from the infirmity of its success and, perhaps, from the success of our economy at this moment that we have people who may make this decision without the benefit of memory. So I ask you to remember.

It was in 1962, not that long ago, when the Supreme Court had not yet established a constitutional right to counsel in criminal cases. Then the idea of legal assistance in civil cases was a distant dream. Disadvantaged Americans who had a hard enough time just getting through the day found that the legal system was stacked against them, and even if it wasn't, they couldn't possibly know it because they couldn't get a lawyer.

Our country's faith in the law was strained in the hearts of many because of injustice and the stain of racism. But the men and women who founded the Legal Services Corporation knew that educating people about the legal rights they did have was critical in the fight for equal rights; that if people did not know about their rights and could not exercise them, the fact that the Supreme Court had enshrined them was of little practical impact.

Today, thanks in large measure to the efforts of the Legal Services Corporation and the countless lawyers you have inspired, it is clear that a lot of progress has been made. Lucy's story really tells the tale. The doors of opportunity are open wider, and we are fortunate now to be living in a period of unique prosperity, with the lowest minority unemployment in our history and the highest homeownership in our history. We have the lowest crime rates and welfare rolls in a generation. But you and I know there are still a lot of poor folks out there. There are still people in places that have been left behind, even by this great recovery.

I traveled across the country a couple of weeks ago, from Appalachia to the Mississippi Delta, to East St. Louis, to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, south Phoenix, and East Los Angeles. And there are still people out there—most of them, by the way, are working; most of them are working, doing the same thing you and I do every day, for much lesser rewards—who are having enormous difficulties. So we have this.

It is also true that in spite of the progress that we've made in meeting the promise of equal justice, there are still a lot of people out there who don't trust the legal system or the law enforcement system. So there is a need, a crying need for the work of the Legal Services Corporation. And that's idealistic, hard-working lawyers—virtually 100 percent of whom could be making a lot more money doing something else—who believe that the law should be an instrument that benefits us all equally and that the rights that are enunciated in the law books and in the Supreme Court cases should be real in the lives of all Americans.

President Kennedy did call for equal justice here 36 years ago. Last week in this room, with another glittering array of legal talent, from lawyers to judges to scholars of all races and backgrounds in this country, we renewed our pledge to that ideal.

Today I think we have to say again, equal justice is the birthright of every American. It is the obligation of those of us in public life and politics to try to bring the benefits of this economic recovery into every corner of our country. But the Scripture says that the poor will be with us always. But American law says they will not be disadvantaged under the law. And until we close the gap between our principles and our reality, we will need the Legal Services Corporation.

For years now, some in Congress have tried to dismantle it. They have seen it as a political thing. I do not believe it is political to say a poor person should have the same right as a rich person. I do not believe it is political to say we have to bring the law into the real lives of all Americans.

We have stood firm against the opposition to the Legal Services Corporation. I'm proud that every budget we have submitted has requested more funding for Legal Services. Like Congressman Ramstad and Congressman Berman—and by their presence here, all the other Members who are here—I was deeply disappointed that last week the Appropriations Subcommittee in the House voted to cut my request in half, leaving hundreds of thousands of American families without the critical legal protections they need.

But need is the wrong word. Under the law, they are entitled to them as citizens. For 25 years, the Legal Services Corporation has stood above the fray of partisanship, but in the fray of the grimy details of daily life that require legal protection and legal assistance. I ask Congress to put politics aside, to follow on this issue the model of the Legal Services Corporation, and give the full funding and support the Corporation needs. In a very large budget, it is a very small item. But it has an enormous impact.

Think how outraged Americans of both political parties in all political philosophies would have been if this fine woman and all of her fellow tenants had been thrown on the street for failure to pay electric bills that they paid. We could have passed the hat in America and collected the annual budget of the Legal Services Corporation to help them. You know that's true. How then can we walk away from the people who save them, and can save so many like them every day, in every way—in publicized and quiet ways that we will never know?

Thomas Jefferson once said that equal justice is a bright constellation of our political faith. With conscience and conviction, let us get the support for the Legal Services Corporation it needs. We cannot let the bright constellation dim. Twenty-five is too young, and there are still too many people out there who need you.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:08 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Sergey Stepashin of Russia; Legal Services Corporation client Lucy Johnson, who introduced the President; former Representative Jon D. Fox; R. Sargent Shriver, honorary cochairman, Consortium for the National Equal Justice Library, and his wife, Eunice Kennedy Shriver; Father Robert F. Drinan, professor of law, Georgetown University; Jerome J. Shestack, R. William Ide III, Roberta Cooper Ramo, former presidents, and William G. Paul, president-elect, American Bar Association; Douglas Eakeley, chair, Legal Services Corporation board of directors; retired Marin County, CA, Superior Court Judge Henry J. Broderick; former Justice Department Solicitor General Walter E. Dellinger; and the First Lady's brother, Hugh

Rodham. The transcript made available by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of the First Lady.

Statement on the Death of Dan Dutko

July 27, 1999

Hillary and I are deeply saddened by the untimely death of our good friend Dan Dutko. Dan has been a friend, an ally, and an adviser for nearly three decades. He enriched our lives with his enthusiasm and served his country with distinction. He deeply believed in the cause of the Democratic Party and worked tirelessly to ensure that it would have the ability to communicate effectively with the voters. He was a devoted supporter of Israel and a champion of national service.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Deborah, and their two young children, Matthew and Jonathan.

Statement on House Action To Extend Normal Trade Relations With China

July 27, 1999

I welcome the strong bipartisan vote in the House today to extend normal trade relations (NTR) with China.

Extending NTR is the right way to advance America's interests. Our exports to China have nearly tripled over the past decade to $14.2 billion. NTR boosts not only America's economy, but also those of Hong Kong and Taiwan, as well as China.

NTR promotes China's integration into the global economy, which in turn strengthens market-oriented reformers within China. Expanding trade can help bring greater social change to China by spreading the tools, contacts, and ideas that promote freedom. Maintaining NTR helps us to move China toward global norms on human rights, weapons of mass destruction, crime and drugs, and the environment, as well as on trade. China clearly has far to go in all these areas, and we will continue to address our differences directly and protect our national interests.

I remain determined to pursue an agreement for China to join the WTO on viable commercial terms—not as a favor to China but as a means of opening and reforming China's markets and holding China to the rules of the global trading system. I remain ready to work closely with Congress to secure permanent NTR status for China in the context of a commercially strong WTO agreement.

Statement on the Organization of African Unity's Framework Agreement for Ethiopia and Eritrea

July 27, 1999

I welcome the announcement by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) that Ethiopia and Eritrea have accepted the OAU Framework Agreement and the Modalities for its implementation, and agreed to steps proposed by the OAU to facilitate implementation of the Agreement. This is a significant step toward peace.

We have worked intensively with the OAU in recent weeks to help bring an end to this devastating conflict. My Special Envoy, Anthony Lake, has just returned from the region, where he met with the leaders of both governments and the OAU. The United States will continue to support the efforts of the OAU under the chairmanship of Algerian President Bouteflika to bring this tragic conflict to a speedy conclusion.

Remarks to the American Legion Boys Nation and Girls Nation

July 28, 1999

Thank you very much. I always look forward to your coming every year because I know we'll have plenty of enthusiasm to light up the old house here. [*Laughter*]

Let me begin by thanking Secretary Riley, who is, I'm almost sure, the longest serving Secretary of Education in American history, and I am quite sure the finest Secretary of Education we have ever had. And I thank him for his service.

I would like to thank the officials of Boys and Girls Nation who are here: the American Legion National Commander, Butch Miller;

Boys Nation Director Ron Engel; Director of Activities Jack Mercier, who was a counselor when I was at Boys Nation, in 1904 or whenever—[*laughter*]—a long time ago—1963—Girls Nation Director Dianne McClung, Youth Program Coordinator Kenya Ostermeier.

I'd also like to acknowledge the presence in the audience of some alumni of Boys and Girls Nation: Congressman Jim Ramstad of Minnesota, who was there with me in 1963—stand up, Jim. [*Applause*] And I see one of my two White House staffers who is an alumnus, Fred Duval of Arizona, who is here. [*Applause*] Thank you. And Janet Murguia from Kansas is—I don't know if she's here or not, but she went to Girls Nation—a long time after I did. [*Laughter*]

I also can't help noting that—I think the State of Nevada today is represented by Patrick Sergeant. His father, Colonel Steve Sergeant, is the new Deputy Executive Secretary of the National Security Council here at the White House, and we're glad to have his service. [*Applause*] Thank you very much.

I want to thank your Boys Nation and Girls Nation officers who are here: Vice President Denise Battle and Vice President John Feeny. If Al Gore were here, he would tell you that's a very important job. [*Laughter*] And I might say it is a very important job.

The Vice President has this great joke. He says every time he votes, we win. [*Laughter*] And as all of you know, we only vote when there's a tie in the Senate. And actually, we've had some of the more important—perhaps one of the two or three most important votes taken in the Senate in my term as President was the vote on the economic plan of 1993, which led to big reduction in the deficit and gave us the biggest leg up on the balanced budget. It was a tie vote, and the Vice President broke the tie. So you might think about that as you contemplate your future. It's a good thing to break ties.

I want to thank President Teah Frederick and President Ryan Rippel for their comments and their example.

I look forward to this day every year, partly because of my own memories of being at Boys Nation and the debates we had. When you talked about the issues you were dealing with—we had this huge debate on civil rights in 1963, and I was one of the four representatives from the South that voted for the civil rights plank. And in the light of history, it looks pretty good. I feel good about it. But I've never forgotten what it was like that week hearing from the Cabinet members, meeting Senators and Congressmen, and all the debates that occurred.

I've never forgotten that President Kennedy met with us and made us feel that public service is a noble endeavor and that we all could make a difference. And I hope all of you feel that way, because your country needs you. You have so much to give.

One of the young people here today may go on to be President. One might command the first human mission to Mars. One might develop a cure for cancer or AIDS. Perhaps you will teach the next generation of young people or help to alleviate poverty or violence in your own communities. As long as you keep setting goals and working hard and using your talent for the common good, there's no limit to what you can do. And America needs you.

This country has been around a long time because we have remained faithful to our ideals, but forever young and open to change. I don't want to conduct a tour of the White House today, but the old house was finished in 1800. So, on our millennial year, we will celebrate the 200th birthday of the White House. The painting of George Washington to my left, to your right, was painted by Gilbert Stuart in 1797 and purchased for the then enormous sum of $500, for the White House. It is priceless today.

But it's worth remembering how important it is to keep democracy alive, that in 1814, when we were in the last throes of the War of 1812 and the British were coming up the Potomac, the President of the United States, James Madison—who was the last President to be the active Commander in Chief for the Armed Forces, and so was up in Maryland, where he mistakenly thought the British would be—at the head of an army, sent word back to his wife, Dolley, who was preparing this vast banquet—the White House was full of food; this room was full of food—that the British were on the way and she should get out, but no matter what,

she had to take the picture of George Washington.

So Dolley Madison cut that picture out of its frame, rolled it up, and got out of the White House. The British arrived to find the empty frame, ate the food, and burned the house. [*Laughter*] But we rebuilt the house, and the picture still lives. And every time I see that picture, I think about it.

It was in this room that Thomas Jefferson met with his secretary, Merriwether Lewis, to plan the Lewis and Clark expedition—right where you're all sitting. The place was covered with bearskins and ancient maps, and they were—President Jefferson was in love with the geography and science, and he saw this whole thing as not only a geographical expedition, but he thought that all kinds of scientific information would be gathered along the way. So a lot of very important things have happened where you are sitting today that remind us that America is a place with great opportunities and great responsibilities.

Today, our country is the greatest force for peace and security and human rights and prosperity in the world. We have the longest peacetime expansion in our history. We have almost 18, 19 million new jobs now. We have the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years, the lowest crime rate in 26 years, the smallest welfare rolls in 30 years. Our social problems, in general, are getting better. Teen drug abuse, pregnancy, teen smoking are declining. And the country is learning to live with the most amazing array of diversity—racial diversity, ethnic diversity, religious diversity—and still find a way to be bound together as one community.

This is a very important time. And rather like you at this time in your life, your always-young Nation faces the question of what to do with our prosperity and our promise, just as you face the personal question of what to do with your promise. Will we seize this chance of a lifetime to meet the long-term challenges of America, to ensure that when you are our age, you will have a great country to live in and cherish and pass on to your children and grandchildren? I would argue that that is the real challenge we face today, just as you must decide whether you're willing to continue to forgo certain things today in order to achieve your goals tomorrow.

Will we invest in creating the best system of education in the world, with smaller classes, better-prepared teachers, modern and safe schools? Will we save Social Security and Medicare before the baby boomers retire and the number of people over 65 doubles, which will happen in 30 years? Will we make America debt-free for the first time since 1835, and so ensure your prosperity, and do those things which will enable economic opportunity to come to the people and places who still have not felt this recovery?

These are some, but not all, of the great long-term questions before us as a nation, as you gather here. And so we're having this enormous debate in Washington. It is a good-faith debate, based on competing visions and values. It will help us to define what we see as our most fundamental responsibilities to our parents, to our children. It is a debate about the future of our Nation and, to be sure, about your future.

I want to talk just a minute about it today, because it is a debate that 6½ years ago, when I was taking office, no one thought we would ever have. Everywhere I go in America now I say, ''You know, when I was here in 1992, if I had said to you, 'Now, I want you to vote for me and in 6½ years from now, I'll come back and we'll talk about what to do with the surplus,' they would have laughed me out of the room. I never would have carried a single State. They would have said, 'That poor young man seems like a nice fellow, but he's terribly out of touch.' '' [*Laughter*] Because we had a $290 billion deficit, high interest rates; we had averaged 7 percent unemployment for a long time, and we quadrupled the national debt in 12 years.

All I could do was to tell the American people I was going to bring the debt down; I would do my best to balance the budget; and if we did it, we'd get interest rates down, and investment would come up. And I said, but we had to do it in a way that allowed us to continue to invest in education, in the environment, in health care and research, the things that were critical to our future.

So that's what I did. You probably won't remember this because you were all young, but in the year I ran for President in 1992,

one of the best selling books—quite a well-written book, written by two journalists from Philadelphia—was entitled: ''America: What Went Wrong?'' Thanks to the hard work of the American people, our country has made a seismic shift in the last 6 years. Now we're looking at $99 billion in surplus this year, and we look forward to a new decade of budget surpluses and a new century full of confidence and pride.

I'm also proud that while we have eliminated the deficit and produced the surpluses, we nearly doubled our investments in education and training programs, because that is the most effective investment we can make in our long-term future. Without good teachers and high expectations, I wouldn't be here today. But education is even more important to your generation and will be even more important to those coming along behind you because of the nature of the way the information age works.

Secretary Riley has already talked about the historic investments we've made to open the doors of college to every American, to do more for underprivileged children, to try to make sure every classroom in the country is hooked up to the Internet by the year 2000, and that because of the so-called E-rate, even the poorest schools will be able to afford to log on in all those classrooms—and the other things that we're trying to do.

This year Congress is debating whether to work with us to finish the job that Congress made an initial commitment to last year of hiring 100,000 teachers so we can lower class size to an average of 18 in the first 3 grades all across the country. And I have asked Congress to pass a tax incentive to help us build or modernize 6,000 schools across America, because enormous numbers of young people are going to schools that are very, very old, a lot of them not even capable of being wired; and a lot of other young children are in housetrailers out beside the old schools because we now have, finally, a class of schoolchildren bigger than the baby boomers. And we have to do more in that regard.

I have also asked Congress to help us to strengthen performance—with higher standards for schools, for teachers, for students—to say that Federal aid should go only to those schools that end social promotion but also provide summer school programs, after-school programs, and extra help to turn schools around that aren't doing the job.

So far, the main thing that the Congress has heard in all this is the siren call of large tax cuts on the theory that we have a surplus, it's your money, and we ought to give it back to you. Now, it only takes 5 seconds to say that, and it sounds great. I heard one Member of Congress the other day, in all seriousness, said, ''If you let them''—referring to the President and the members of my party—''if you let them keep your money, they'll spend it on their friends.''

Well, what I have proposed to do is to take most of the surplus and set it aside for Social Security and Medicare, and in the years when we don't use the money, use that to pay down the debt so we can be debt-free in 15 years, for the first time since 1835, which means lower interest rates for everybody, more investment, more jobs, higher incomes and, for your families, lower mortgage rates, college loan rates, credit card rates, and car payment costs. And it would guarantee the long-term stability of the country. I think that's the right thing to do.

And I have also proposed to spend adequate amounts of money to continue the Federal role's investment in education and medical research, national defense, and other things and then to take what's left and spend it on a tax cut. It is, admittedly, much smaller than the one that the majority approved.

Now, they believe—to be fair—it is your money, it's the taxpayers' money. And they believe that the best thing to do is to give it back. It would cost about $800 billion over the next 10 years and $3 trillion over the 10 years after that. Sounds like an unimaginable sum—that's real money there. And that's when the baby boomers will be retiring.

Now, the problem I have with it is that under their plan, to be fair, we could save the Social Security surplus to pay down the debt, partially, but we would not lengthen the life of the Social Security Trust Fund or the Medicare Trust Fund, and we'd have to have big cuts in education and the other items that I've mentioned. But people would get the tax cut. But that would be the price tag; in other words, it's not free. So we're having this big debate.

My argument is that we quadrupled the debt of this country between 1981 and 1992. And I don't believe we should be even discussing the tax cut until we decide what our obligations are—to deal with the aging of America. And let me say, this is not just an issue for you—I mean, for us. I mean, I'm the oldest of the baby boomers. But it's not just an issue for us. It is an issue for you. Why? Because I can tell you that my generation is absolutely obsessed with the notion that if we retire, there will be so many of us that we will break the bank of Social Security and Medicare and we'll have to depend on our kids to support us and then our children won't have the money they need to raise our grandchildren.

So this—when you hear about the Social Security and Medicare debate, it's not just about senior citizens. It's about the compact between the generations in America and whether we can continue to, in effect, let seniors take care of themselves by and large so that their children by and large will be free to take care of their grandchildren. That's really what is going on here.

So—and if I had my way, we would decide this issue in the following order: We would decide what are we going to do—what does it take to fix Social Security and Medicare; what do we have to have to take care of education, defense, research, and the things that we should do as a nation? And then let's take what's left over and give it back in a tax cut. The way we're having the discussion about the size of the tax cut first, it would be like if you go home this weekend, when you finish, you go home and you have dinner and your folks say to you, ''You know, we have always wanted to take this month-long vacation to Hawaii, and we're going to take it. We're going to fly first-class; we're going to go to the most expensive hotels; we're going to have everything we've ever dreamed of. And when we get home, we'll figure out whether we can pay the home mortgage and send you to college.'' [*Laughter*] Now, you being—I'm sure you need the vacation. I'm sure it would be a good thing. [*Laughter*] But you wouldn't make the decision in that order.

So that's the debate we're having here, in part. I believe that a lot of people who voted for this tax cut, they know I'm going to veto it if it passes, so they don't think it will be law. And they want to be on record as, ''I was for a bigger tax cut than President Clinton was.'' But what we should be doing, I think, is saying, ''Hey, we have—once in a lifetime you get this kind of chance where there's no more deficit, projected surpluses, and you know what the big challenges of the country are. You know it's dealing with the aging of America, dealing with the education of our children, dealing with keeping the economy going and bringing economic opportunity to people who haven't felt it. There are other things, but let's just focus on those three.'' I think we ought to decide what we ought to do.

And let me give you an idea of what would happen if a tax cut of this size were to become law, so you can focus on it. Because there is no such thing as a free decision. It is your money, and if you tell the Congress you want it back, they could by enough—if they could override my veto, they could give it all back to you. I mean, everything you give us is your money. We could abolish the Department of Defense tomorrow and everything else we do and give it all back to you and have no Federal Government. So it is your money.

But let me give you an example. If we pass the tax cut, and we stayed with a balanced budget, according to our Office of Management and Budget, here's what the consequences would be. Today we're helping 12 million children in high-poverty areas get extra help. I have proposed reforms to raise standards for them and give them more help. This plan, if it passed, with this tax cut, would require us to say to 6 million of those children, ''We can't help you.''

Today, we provide funds to help a million children learn to read independently by the end of the third grade. If the tax plan passes, we'd have to say to 480,000 of them, ''We're sorry; we can't do that.''

Today, we're nearing our goal of enrolling a million people in Head Start. If the plan passes, we'd have to say to 430,000 preschoolers, ''We can't do that.''

Last year we reached across party lines to hire 30,000 of that 100,000 teachers I talked about. It was a wonderful moment—like

when we passed the balanced budget in '97, overwhelming majorities of both parties in both Houses; when we passed welfare reform in '96, overwhelming majorities of both parties in both Houses. That's the way the country ought to work. And we did that last year. And it will allow us, as I said, if we finish the job, to reduce class size to an average of 18 in the first 3 grades. But if the tax cut passes, and we keep a balanced budget, we'd have to say to a million students, ''No smaller classes.''

So I think this is a big problem. Today, we're helping 400,000 students with after-school programs. This is a huge deal. Every inner-city, tough neighborhood that has after-school programs that are aggressive sees a big drop in the juvenile crime rate and a big increase in learning in the schools. We propose to triple the number of people who would be included in those programs next year. If this tax plan passes, we'd have to cut that in half.

The school construction tax cut I mentioned to you earlier, to help us build or modernize 6,000 schools, ironically, is not in the plan. In this plan, only 10 percent of that many schools would be fixed.

Now, these are not just numbers; these are children. And keep in mind, most of you are going to be fine regardless. I mean, you got to Girls Nation, you got to Boys Nation. Somebody will give you a scholarship if your family doesn't have the money to go to college. You have to ask yourself whether you will be better off if your country is better off. If we try to make sure that we all go forward together—you came here because you believed in the American system, a system that is designed not to just address the needs of the most talented and the most fortunate among us but a system premised on the fact that nearly everybody, nearly everybody in a free country can do what is necessary to be a good, productive, hard-working citizen if given the tools to do so. And I believe that.

The reverse is true, that those of us who are most fortunate will also have the quality of our lives diminished to the extent that we do not provide everyone the chance to live up to their God-given abilities. So that's what's going on now. And believe me, this is an honest, philosophical debate. If the people who disagree with me were here, they would say, ''Well, we just think Government wastes too much money, and this is your money, and you paid the taxes, and we ought to give it back to you.''

There's another element here I want to say to be fair. We might keep spending all this money, but if we did that and pass the tax cut, then we'd be right back in the same fix we were in before I took office—huge debts, higher interest rates dragging down the economy, higher unemployment. So I know it's easier for me to say, maybe, because I'm not running for anything. You know—under our system we have a two-term limit, and I can't run for anything unless I go home and run for the school board some day. [*Laughter*]

But I believe that the American people can be told the truth about our long-term challenges. And I believe the American people feel good about the decisions we made that were hard decisions at the time that have brought our country to this moment. And there are still such big things out there.

So what I say is, let's do first things first. Let's lift the burden of your parents' aging off your shoulders by securing Social Security and Medicare. Let's give you a chance to have an even more successful economy than we have today, by getting this country out of debt for the first time since 1835 and taking extra steps to bring money into these inner-city neighborhoods, the rural neighborhoods, the Indian reservations, where there has been no economic recovery.

Let's continue to make sure that we are investing in the education of our young people. We'll still have money for a tax cut that could include long-term care, child care—for me, helping ordinary families save for retirement; but the main thing is not so much what the elements of it are, but that it's not so big that it either throws us into debt or requires us to compromise our future.

Now, that is the way I see this. I wonder if 36 years from now you will remember what was going on in Washington with the same clarity that I remember. But I can tell you, it was by no means certain that Congress and the country would do the right thing on civil rights. Indeed, President Kennedy, when he

addressed the Boys Nation delegates, thanked us for our resolution on civil rights and bemoaned the fact that the Governors, who had just met a week before we did, could not reach agreement; they could not reach across party lines and regional lines to stand up for the elemental principal of civil rights. And he thanked us for doing it.

Thirty years later, 36 years later, it looks like Boys Nation was right, and the Governors' Association was wrong. [*Laughter*] Just look around this crowd today. Look at all the differences represented by the young men and women here. Who could possibly say that America is not better off for the progress we have made? But you need to know a lot of people lost their jobs in election sticking up for civil rights in places where it wasn't so popular. A lot of Congressmen lost their jobs in 1994 because they voted to bring the deficit down, or they voted for the Brady bill or the assault weapons ban, which helped to give up the lowest crime rate in 26 years.

But sometimes you have to look to the long run. And one of the things that the sad events of the last couple of weeks have reminded us all of is that the gifts of life and the burdens of life do not fall according to some rational plan—that all of our lives, even if we live to be 80—or in the case of Secretary Riley's father, over 90—life is still fleeting. And the great test is to try to enjoy and make the most of every day and still sow the seeds for your children to have a better tomorrow.

That is what we are trying to do here. Thomas Jefferson said every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. If we can remember that here, I think we can once again reach across the party lines and the regional lines and think about the long-term interest of America. It has been a long, long time since our country has had a chance to make provisions for the next generation with absolute confidence, unencumbered by the burdens of just getting through the day. That is where we are. And I am determined to do everything I can to see that we make the most of it to give you the chance to live your dreams.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:52 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Teah Frederick, president, Girls Nation; Ryan Rippel, president, Boys Nation; and authors Donald L. Barlett and James B. Steele.

Statement on Senate Action on Juvenile Crime and Gun Legislation

July 28, 1999

Today, after weeks of partisan delay, the Senate finally appointed conferees on juvenile crime and gun legislation. While I am heartened by this modest progress, more than 3 months have passed since the tragedy at Columbine, and Congress has yet to send me a bill to make commonsense gun reforms the law of the land. I challenge the House to follow the Senate's lead and appoint conferees before the August recess, so that the full Congress can get back to work and pass a bill with strong gun provisions as our children go back to school.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Burdensharing in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

July 28, 1999

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Pursuant to section 3 of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949, on the Accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic (the "resolution"), I hereby transmit a report concerning Burdensharing in the Alliance.

This report is comprised of two sections, which provide the information required by section 3(2)(B) of the resolution to the extent that such information is available. The unclassified section covers common NATO budgets, national defense budgets and their adequacy, costs incurred to date in connection with the membership of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, and the status of discussions concerning NATO membership for Partnership for Peace countries. A classified addendum covers NATO members'

capabilities to deploy and sustain combat forces.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to John W. Warner, chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services; Floyd Spence, chairman, House Committee on Armed Services; Ted Stevens, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations; C.W. Bill Young, chairman, House Committee on Appropriations; Jesse Helms, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and Benjamin A. Gilman, chairman, House Committee on International Relations. An original was not available for verification of the content of this letter.

Remarks at "In Performance at the White House"

July 28, 1999

The President. Thank you. The first thing I want you to do is relax, because I'm not going to play, and you'll have to—[*laughter*]—but I'll be wishing.

At the millennium event on jazz we had here last year, the great Wynton Marsalis said that just as we wouldn't have democracy without the foundation of our Constitution, so we wouldn't have jazz without the foundation of the blues. Like our Constitution, the blues is a great American tradition, whose power to move never seems to diminish and whose influence never seems to stop growing.

This compelling and wonderful music, once heard only on rural Southern porches and in South Side Chicago bars, now enjoys an audience as broad as America itself. In fact, now the whole world knows about the blues, and there are fans from Berlin to Bangkok who can tell you the life stories of blues icons like Bessie Smith and Robert Johnson. Today, there are more blues artists, more blues listeners, more blues clubs, and more blues recordings than ever before. Even TV commercials now feature the blues, which dramatically reduces the number of people who hit the mute button. [*Laughter*]

Tonight we celebrate the music that has given birth to or influenced the whole large landscape of American music, from "Rhapsody in Blue" to rap. So it's fitting that our host is a master of the great range of American music and entertainment, Miss Della Reese. If talent and personality are truly gifts from above, then Della Reese really has been "Touched by an Angel." [*Laughter*] Please join me in welcoming Della Reese. [*Applause*]

[*At this point, the program proceeded. Following the performances, the President made brief remarks, which are joined in progress.*]

The President. ——whether I want to be young like Jonny, or like B.B. when I'm a little older. [*Laughter*] They were all magnificent.

You know, we saw tonight in all these wonderful performers why blues is truly one of America's great gifts to the world. Its appeal, we saw, literally spans the generations. Tonight we've been privileged to hear blues greats from every era.

I want to thank each and every one of them. Thank you, B.B. King. Thank you, John Cephas and Phil Wiggans. Thank you, Marcia Ball. Thank you, Jonny Lang. Thank you, bands. And thank you, Della Reese.

Thank you, and good night. Thank you.

[*At this point, B.B. King presented the President with a guitar pick.*]

The President. Now before you go, I've been saving my B.B. King picks for almost 20 years now. I've got another one tonight. [*Laughter*]

There is one more person that all of us have to thank this evening, Dick Notebaert with Ameritech. Let me tell you—Dick, I want you and Peggy to come up here, come on. He is about to leave his present position to start on a new adventure in life, and Hillary and I want to thank him for his longstanding support for these wonderful WETA's "In Performance at the White House." We have had so many incredible, incredible concerts here, thanks to the generosity of this gentleman and his fine company. And Dick and Peggy have accompanied us on so many nights, along with Sharon and Jay Rockefeller and many of you who've been here.

I want to thank all of you for coming tonight, especially the very large number of people from my native State and others who

occupy that portion of the Mississippi Delta between Memphis and New Orleans, where all of this really got started. We are very glad to be here, but we offer a special thank you to you, my friend, and to you, Peggy. We've got a little expression of our thanks here. Bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:10 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks he referred to musician Wynton Marsalis; Richard C. Notebaert, chairman and chief executive officer, Ameritech Corp., and his wife, Peggy; and Senator John D. Rockefeller IV and his wife, Sharon. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks on Departure for Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina

July 29, 1999

National Economy and Proposed Appropriations Legislation

Good morning. Before I leave for Sarajevo, I'd like to say just a word about our country's continuing prosperity and what we have to do to keep it going.

It was 6 years ago this summer that America made a visionary decision to set a new course for our economy; to abandon the large deficits and high unemployment of the previous 12 years; and to pursue an economic strategy of fiscal discipline, investing in our people, and expanding trade in American goods and services abroad. The strategy is working and has lifted our Nation to an unprecedented level of prosperity.

Now we have nearly 19 million new jobs, the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years, the highest homeownership ever. From a $290 billion deficit in 1993, we're moving toward a record high surplus of $99 billion in 1999.

The Senate is about to make a pivotal choice—whether to move forward with a sound strategy that led us to this point, or to return to the reckless policies that threw our Nation into stagnation and economic decline. Congress must decide whether to invest our surplus, to honor our obligations to the future—saving Social Security and Medicare, continuing to invest in education, and paying down the debt—or to squander the surplus on a shortsighted, irresponsible, overlarge tax plan.

The right choice for me is clear, putting first things first. First, we must maintain our strategy of fiscal discipline and seize this moment to address the large, long-term challenges of the Nation. We must dedicate the bulk of the surplus to saving Social Security and to strengthening Medicare and modernizing its benefits with a prescription drug package. I have proposed a balanced budget that honors these values. It upholds our commitments to educating our children, protecting our environment, promoting biomedical research, strengthening defense, and fighting crime.

The Republican majority, it appears, is determined, however, to pass this large and risky tax cut. It would exhaust our surplus without: one, devoting a penny to lengthening the life of the Social Security Trust Fund; two, devoting a penny to lengthening the life of the Medicare Trust Fund; three, it would force huge cuts in education, agriculture, the environment, defense, biomedical research, indeed, everything we are doing to strengthen our country if we are going to stay on a balanced budget.

If those cuts are not made, it would cause us to revert to the dark, old days of huge deficits, high interest rates, low economic growth, and stagnation. We tried it that way for 12 years, and it didn't work.

As the Federal Reserve Chairman, Alan Greenspan, told the Senate yesterday, this tax cut will cut into the surplus and, quote, "risk a great deal of good to the economy."

So I say to Congress, if you send me a tax cut that shortchanges America's priorities and our children's future, I will veto it. Let me be clear again: I do strongly support tax cuts, but not if they are so large they undermine our strength and they undermine our ability to save Social Security, to strengthen and modernize Medicare, and to get this country out of debt for the first time since 1835.

My balanced budget contains targeted tax cuts to help ordinary families with retirement savings, child care costs, long-term care costs. It is responsible in size. This debate is not about whether we should have tax cuts; it's about how big they should be and what else

this country has to do and whether we want to go back to a failed economic strategy after being so richly rewarded for doing the right thing for our children and our future.

I hope, again that we can get a bipartisan agreement that will save Social Security, save and reform Medicare, continue to invest in education, and get this country out of debt. If we do those big things first, there's still money left for a good size tax cut. But what is being done now is wrong.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:05 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Statement on the United States Military Aircraft Tragedy in Colombia

July 29, 1999

I am deeply saddened by the loss of five U.S. Army personnel in southern Colombia, who perished in the crash of a U.S. military aircraft providing reconnaissance support for combined U.S.-Colombian counterdrug operations against illicit traffickers. Also lost in this tragedy were two Colombian military personnel.

Our thoughts and prayers are with our service members' families and friends as they cope with this tragic loss. These dedicated Americans and their Colombian comrades were engaged in the vital work of combating the drug trade, which threatens the welfare and security of both our nations.

We honor their commitment and remember their sacrifice as we intensify our efforts here in this country and around the world to counter the global drug problem.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on the National Emergency With Respect to Terrorists Who Threaten To Disrupt the Middle East Peace Process

July 29, 1999

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 29, 1999.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 30.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With Balkan Leaders and an Exchange With Reporters in Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina

July 30, 1999

The President. Let me, first of all, say that I appreciate very much the leadership of President Jelavic, President Izetbegovic, President Radisic, and the other leaders here in putting together this stability conference. It's a real tribute to the progress made in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the last couple of years that they could host this conference. And I want to emphasize that with all the work we still have to do here, there has been a great deal of effort, thanks to the leaders, in increasing cooperation in political and economic ways. The economy is beginning to grow briskly again. And I am committed to doing what I can to see that the United States remains a good partner, with this nation and with the European Union, in continuing to work toward the future.

Secondly, I want to compliment the European Union in taking the lead in our efforts here to do a Stability Pact for the Balkans, beginning in Kosovo. Secretary Albright was in Kosovo yesterday, and we think things are moving in the right direction there. And I want to reaffirm our commitment to do our part there.

But I think the larger, important point to be made is, we want to promote the integration of all the democracies within the region and then the integration of the region with Europe. And anything I can do to assist that, I am prepared to do.

So I think this is a very important day, and I would hope it is a very proud day for the people of Bosnia-Herzegovina because of their hosting this meeting and because of what it means for the future.

Multiple Shooting in Atlanta

Q. Mr. President, I wonder if you would share some thoughts about what happened in Atlanta, if you've been brought up to speed, and what could have been done or should have been done, and if there are any lessons to be learned from this?

The President. Well, I think it's too soon to draw conclusions about that. I watched the reports from home last night on CNN for an hour before I went to bed, and I've gotten, obviously, the final reports today. Our thoughts today primarily are with the families of the victims and with those that are still struggling for their lives in the hospitals.

I am pleased with the work that the Federal authorities have done. The Vice President has been back home coordinating that, and I think we have done a good job of working with the State and local officials. But in terms of what could have, should have been done and what this means for other issues, I think we have to wait until all the facts are in. I don't believe I have enough to make a judgment on that.

Balkan Peace Process

Q. As far as the situation in the Balkans is concerned, there's been a lot of concern expressed about, here in Bosnia, that it's been done the wrong way, and that reconstruction in Kosovo, they should learn the lessons of what the mistakes were in Bosnia and try not to repeat those mistakes in Kosovo. What should have been done in Bosnia and what should be done in Kosovo now to make sure that those mistakes aren't repeated?

The President. If you ask these leaders, I'm sure they would say we should do more and do it faster. But I want to say, I believe that, if you remember where we were in Bosnia—keep in mind, here we had 250,000 people killed. You know, they've done a remarkable, astonishing job of rebuilding Sarajevo. It doesn't even look like the same place I visited 2 years ago. And I compliment you. But we had 250,000 people killed. We had 2.5 million refugees. The conflict went on for more than 4 years. And in the time since 1995, look at the level of cooperation here: You now have a common currency; we have other common institutions; we have opposition political parties, we have, last year, very brisk economic growth. We have a lot more to do. But I think the people who are overly critical should come here and look and see.

In Kosovo, we were able to act more quickly because the facts were different. And so I hope we'll be able to turn it around more quickly. But I think the work being done by these leaders in Bosnia shows us what can be done if we work together and if the international community is properly supportive. And I think the leadership, the initiative of the EU in setting up this Stability Pact, is a good sign and should be encouraging to people.

Supreme Allied Commander Europe

Q. Do you think General Wesley Clark was treated properly in the way he was told about his early retirement?

The President. I'm not sure what the facts are. I can tell you this: Any inference that it amounts to an early retirement or that somebody was disappointed in his performance is just simply wrong, just flat out wrong. We actually extended his term of service as Supreme Allied Commander of NATO and asked him to serve another year.

And it's a very complicated challenge, as you implied in your former question, for us to do the right thing, so we have to get an equally strong person to come in behind him. And we wanted General Ralston to go, and under the military rules, he has to take up another post within 60 days of the termination of his present post, or he would have to retire. So that in order to have the right continuity, it has to be about a 2-month adjustment there. And that's all this is about.

I was, myself, a little distressed about the way it broke, and how it did, because of the inference that many people drew. But that is literally all there is to it. I think Wes Clark's done a terrific job. As you know, I've known him for 30 years. I have great confidence in him, and his strength and determination were very important to the outcome of what

happened not only in Kosovo but, earlier, his pivotal role in the peace process coming in Bosnia. So I don't think anyone should have any doubt about that.

So I'm disturbed about the way it became public. I don't know that—because I think it opens the way to an inference that is absolutely false on my part. I have the highest regard for him, but I want to make sure that when he's gone we have the highest quality successor, and that's why I wanted Joe Ralston in there.

That's all there is to this. It's just a question of working out the transition within the rules of military retirements and reassignments. That's all there is. There is nothing else.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:42 a.m. in Room A 103 at Zetra Stadium. In his remarks, he referred to Presidency Member (Croat) Ante Jelavic, Presidency Member (Muslim) Alija Izetbegovic, and Presidency Chairman (Serb) Zivko Radisic of Bosnia-Herzegovina; and Gen. Joseph W. Ralston, USAF, Vice chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement to the Stability Pact Summit in Sarajevo

July 30, 1999

We are meeting in Sarajevo conscious that we have come to the end of the most turbulent decade in Europe since the 1940s. I am grateful to our Bosnian hosts and to President Ahtisaari for making this important Summit possible.

Ten years ago, more than 300 million people who lived to the east of the old Iron Curtain won the right to shape their destiny. And together we set out to build a Europe that would be, for the first time in its history, undivided, democratic and at peace. We knew the opportunity was there, and that from St. Petersburg to Sofia, millions of courageous people wanted to seize it. But we also knew that the collapse of the old order could just as easily give rise to bloodshed and chaos if a new community based on democracy, tolerance and law did not rapidly take its place.

Ten years later, Germany is united. Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic are in NATO. The Baltic nations are models of free market and democratic reform. Most of the nations of southeast Europe have chosen democracy and integration and supported, at great risk and cost, our effort to bring stability to the Balkans. Russia has faced perhaps the most difficult legacy of all with great resilience, and a determination to keep building a normal, prosperous and open society.

Across most of central and southeastern Europe, the progress of open societies and open markets has exceeded our most optimistic hopes. But what has happened here in the former Yugoslavia has confirmed our most terrible fears. A decade long campaign by Mr. Milosevic to carve out a greater Serbia has left more than a quarter of a million people dead, uprooted millions more, and undermined the stability of this entire region. It has shocked our conscience, tested our resolve, threatened the region's progress and the values on which we want a new Europe to be built.

That is why NATO and its partners acted, first in Bosnia, now in Kosovo. But stopping the destruction is not enough. We cannot say our job is finished when refugees are returning to shattered lives. We cannot pretend our work is done when Serbia is still ruled by leaders who maintain power by manipulating ethnic differences, living off corruption, and threatening their neighbors. We cannot pretend our victory is complete when the people of a vast region of Europe are still suffering from the disruption brought about by a decade of violence.

At the NATO summit in Washington, when the outcome of the conflict was not yet clear, many of us came together to begin discussing these challenges. It is far more significant that we are meeting now when the immediate danger is over. The unity that helped us win the war has endured to help us win the peace.

We are here today with two basic principles in mind.

First, Sarajevo cannot be like the Balkan conferences of Europe's past, where great powers met to carve up the map and decide the fate of weaker nations. The nations of southeast Europe are taking the lead, telling us their needs and determining their destiny. And none of us have any interest in redrawing borders. On the contrary, our goal is the

full integration of this region into a Europe where borders unite rather than divide. That is how we solved the problem of aggressive nationalism in western Europe after World War II. That is how we can solve it here. Our answer to calls for a ''greater Serbia'' and a ''greater Albania'' must be a greater Europe.

Second, the transformation and integration of this region cannot be achieved piecemeal, one province, one country, one crisis at a time. Nor is it a race, in which the most prosperous countries compete to ''escape'' from the Balkans at the expense of their neighbors. The pace will certainly vary, but we have to move forward together. And we all have responsibilities to meet.

The countries of southeast Europe have a responsibility to work and plan together for a future of shared security and prosperity, just as the nations of western Europe did after World War II, and the nations of central Europe did after the Cold War. I am gratified that the leaders of the region have taken the initiative, coming to Sarajevo with plans to improve regional cooperation, from the advancement of democracy and human rights, to the development of their infrastructure, to the cooperation in border areas, to the fight against narcotics, corruption and crime. I am pleased that neighbors such as Ukraine and Moldova, who are still struggling with the challenges of transition themselves, are here with us as well, demonstrating their commitment to integration with a united, secure, and prosperous Europe. And it is gratifying to have representatives here from central Europe, whose experience in the transition from dictatorship to democracy can benefit their neighbors in southeast Europe.

The countries of the region also have a responsibility to accelerate their economic reforms and to improve their investment climate. The region's economies will not grow unless its markets are open, its laws are fairly enforced, and investors are willing to bank on its future. This is very hard work. But change must come from the inside out before it can come from the outside in.

In turn, the region's partners in Europe and North America must do our part to help the nations of this region to stand on their feet, to remove obstacles to trade, and to encourage investment.

On Wednesday in Brussels, we held a donors conference to meet the immediate humanitarian needs caused by the conflict in Kosovo. Today, we are focused on the economic future of the region as a whole.

We are making a commitment to take generous, immediate, and unilateral steps to improve market access for products made in southeast Europe. I will work with the United States Congress to establish a trade preference program similar to our Andean initiative, which will offer duty-free treatment for most of the region's exports.

All of us will work to bring the nations of the region into the World Trade Organization on commercially acceptable terms—and provide the technical assistance they need to meet those terms. We will encourage the participation of private companies in the region in the reconstruction of Kosovo and eventually Serbia as part of a fair procurement process.

We will also work to mobilize private investment in the region's economies, and to support the development of its private sector. To that end, America's Overseas Private Investment Corporation will establish a $150 million investment fund for the region and a $200 million credit line. In addition, in consultation with Congress we will work with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development on the creation of a trust fund that would be used to help businesses in the region become more competitive and viable and provide project finance. We would be willing to contribute $15 million in the first year, and to consider up to $50 million overall, as long as the EBRD targets an additional $80 million for the region. In addition, we will support the creation of a regional equity fund of up to $300 million, with financing from the international financial institution, to make equity investments in private enterprises in the region. Our Commerce Secretary William Daley will also sponsor a mission to the region to showcase trade and investment opportunities and build new business partnerships.

I expect that our EU partners will take similar steps. This effort can only succeed if you do. While access to America's markets

is important, integration with the EU market offers the greatest prospect of boosting the economy of southeast Europe.

And as the region's economies grow and its democracies grow stronger, we must work together to speed their integration into European and transatlantic institutions.

NATO's doors remain open to new members prepared to assume the responsibilities of membership. We will work with aspiring allies in southeast Europe to help them become stronger candidates—through the Partnership for Peace, through NATO's Membership Action Plan, and by encouraging deeper security cooperation within the region. And we will not forget the sacrifices they made to support NATO's continuing operations in Kosovo.

Although the United States is not a member of the European Union, we also have a strong interest in encouraging its expansion to move forward as rapidly as possible. We welcome any steps the EU can take to strengthen its relationship with countries in this region, including increased access to trade. Even if membership is not around the corner for those nations that are struggling economically, it must be a realistic prospect, or Europe will remain a continent of haves and have-nots and our work here will be in vain.

The commitments we are making today will benefit every part of this region that is governed democratically. They will benefit Kosovo. They will benefit the Republic of Montenegro. They will benefit Bosnia. We look forward to the day when they will benefit Serbia as well. But that day has not yet come. For Serbia is still ruled by a government that rejects the most basic principles of the Stability Pact—the very government that is responsible for the destruction, despair and displacement that we are here to overcome.

I believe that the people of Serbia want to be part of the mainstream of Europe again, governed by leaders who share their desire to live in a normal, democratic and prosperous nation. I do not believe they want to be manipulated into fighting more losing wars on behalf of indicted leaders who only wish to preserve their own power and stolen wealth. We must provide them humanitarian aid, so that they do not go hungry and cold. But we must also remember that Serbia is a country in which all meaningful economic activity is controlled by political leaders and their cronies, who have led Serbia to ruin. Assistance for reconstruction would only perpetuate the Milosevic regime. And that, in turn, would only perpetuate the suffering of the people of Serbia.

Serbia will only have a future when Mr. Milosevic and his policies are consigned to the past. Therefore, the best way to express our concern for the people of Serbia is to support their struggle for democratic change. I will work with our Congress to provide $10 million this year, and more over the next two years, to strengthen non-governmental organizations in Serbia, the independent media, independent trade unions, and the democratic opposition. I am pleased that the countries of the region intend to support this effort as well. Those who have experience leading to democratic transition can offer invaluable assistance and advice to those who aspire to lead one in Serbia.

Finally, let me thank our partners in the European Union for their leadership and their willingness to be the principal contributors to the reconstruction of Kosovo and the development of southeast Europe. The International Donor Coordinators Process, chaired by the World Bank and the European Commission, will also play a key role in answering needs and mobilizing resources. We will do our part to work closely with the Stability Pact partners and the countries of the region.

At the same time, the United States will do its part, because it is in our interest to help complete the construction of an undivided, democratic and peaceful Europe. We want to see an end to conflict in this region. We want to see freedom take firm root. We want to see human rights enshrined not only in formal documents but in daily lives. We want the nations of the region to be our partners in security and prosperity.

We strongly support the Stability Pact and pledge our support for it. The challenge now is to agree to a solid work plan and produce concrete results in the weeks and months ahead. We look forward to working with the Presidency of the EU, with the Stability Pact

coordinator Bodo Hombach, and most important with our friends and partners in this region to turn promises into progress and to make this effort a success.

NOTE: The statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary but was not issued as a White House press release.

Remarks to High School Students in Sarajevo

July 30, 1999

I think we should give a round of applause again to Jana Jakic; she did a very good job, I think. [*Applause*] I would also like to thank your principal, Emina Avdagic. And I'd like to thank the Sarajevo Canton Prime Minister, Mr. Belkic. And especially all the students here on the platform with me, I thank them very much. I also would like to thank the bands that performed before me. I think they were of much greater interest to the students than the President, but I'm glad to see them here. [*Laughter*]

I'm very glad to be back in Sarajevo, and especially to come to this school to see the rebuilding that is going on. Not long ago the Third Gymnasium was at the center of the cruel war. Today, as we can all see, the building still bears the scars of the past. But thanks to you, it holds the promise of Bosnia's future.

If all of you were to come and visit me in Washington, DC, at the White House, you would see that in the entrance to my office, the Oval Office, there is a picture of a woman in her very damaged apartment in Sarajevo. It was taken at the end of the war, and there is a quotation from the woman at the bottom of the picture expressing her thanks to me and to the United States for our help in bringing the Bosnian War to an end.

Every person from all over the world who comes to see me sees that picture, because I am proud of the role the United States had in bringing this war to an end.

But it is not enough to end a war; we must build a peace. It is not enough to reject a dark past; we must build a bright future. That is why the rebuilding of the Third Gymnasium can symbolize, not only for the students but for all the people of this nation, what we should be doing for tomorrow.

I know that students sent letters to the Sarajevo Canton asking that this school be repaired. One student wrote, ''Please think of future generations.'' This school is a monument to Sarajevo's proud tradition of teaching young people from all backgrounds. Saving this school will save that tradition and will help all young people to have the future they deserve.

I want to thank all those involved in this effort, including the Sarajevo Canton and the city of Stockholm, Sweden—we have a representative from the Swedish Embassy here today—and USAID, and Hattie Babbitt from USAID is here. We are proud that the United States could be part of a genuine international partnership to restore this school to its rightful position.

You know, for so many people who have never been to this beautiful place, Sarajevo is a name associated only with violence. People know World War I started here, and they know how badly the city was shelled during the recent war. Often they do not know that for centuries, and for decades in the 20th century, a spirit of tolerance defined this beautiful place—a place where people lived and worked together, a place where Muslims, Orthodox Christians, Roman Catholics, and Jews were free to worship God as they chose.

That is the Sarajevo I want the world to know about. If you can draw on the best parts of your heritage to build a united future here, then it can be done elsewhere in Bosnia and throughout this region.

The Dayton agreement in 1995 did not rid Bosnia of all anger and fear or frustrating problems like high unemployment, corruption and crime, but Dayton did offer all the people of Bosnia peaceful means to resolve their differences and move forward.

I want the world to know what you have achieved in the last 4 years: fair elections, a free press, reformed courts, a new single currency, the beginning of economic growth, better ties with your neighbors, war criminals out of power, nearly twice as many minority refugees returned in the first half of '99 as in any previous period. And though more needs to be done in many areas, especially

in helping the economy to grow and in completing minority refugee returns, this is quite a record of accomplishment for the last 4 years, and you should be proud of it.

As all of you know, we had a summit here in Sarajevo today to talk about the future of southeastern Europe. Perhaps the most impressive thing to me was that the Bosnian Presidency spoke with one single, united voice. Two years ago, when I came here, I met with the Bosnian Presidency, and President Izetbegovic was there then. He had two different partners, a Croatian partner, a Serbian partner. And the wounds of war were still very fresh. So we sat around the table together, but they weren't really together. Today I saw three men who were really working together, who really believe that they could do things together. And I was very moved.

We have to bring these kinds of things throughout the Balkans and all of southeastern Europe. Think about what it was like here just a few years ago and realize today that there were 60 delegations—from Europe, North America, Asia, and international institutions—here to talk about how to build a better future for all of southeastern Europe.

We talked about how to lift the economy, how to bring the nations of this region together, and how to bring them closer to the rest of Europe and to North America. The contrast was stark. Remember, Mr. Milosevic tried to build a Greater Serbia based on dividing people and ethnic cleansing. Together we came to talk about building a greater Europe based on including people and healing.

I promised that the United States would do our part. Yesterday we pledged $500 million for humanitarian aid to Kosovo. Today I pledged to ask our Congress to reduce tariffs for most exports to the United States from Bosnia and other countries in the region. I pledged to provide an investment fund of $150 million to encourage Americans to invest here and to help others to set up small businesses.

I pledged to work with our friends here to bring all nations who comply into the world trading system so that we can have more benefits flowing into Bosnia and the other countries in the region. We pledged to expand NATO's political and economic partnerships throughout southeastern Europe. And I asked the Europeans to join with me in helping you economically and politically. It is time to build the peace. The war is over, but we have to build a better peace for Bosnia and all the people of southeastern Europe.

Let me say I hope that before long, Serbia, too, will participate in this economic reconstruction. But I do not believe that we should give reconstruction aid to Serbia as long as it rejects democracy and as long as Mr. Milosevic is in power. We have had enough of ethnic cleansing.

But I want you to understand, I did not involve the United States in Bosnia or in Kosovo to hurt Serbian people. We took a stand for the humanity of all people and against anyone who seeks to use racial, religious, or ethnic differences to promote hatred and crush people's hopes and deny children like those on this stage with me their God-given right to an education and a safe future.

I want this school—this school rebuilt—to be the symbol of all of our tomorrows. And I will do my best to see that the United States is your partner and your friend.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:52 p.m. in the courtyard at Treca Gimnazija (Third High School). In his remarks, he referred to student Jana Jakic, who introduced the President; Sarajevo Canton Prime Minister Beriz Belkic; former Bosnia-Herzegovina Presidency Members Kresimir Zubak (Croat) and Momcilo Krajisnik (Serb); current Presidency Members Alija Izetbegovic (Muslim), Ante Jelavic (Croat), and Zivko Radisic (Serb); and President Slobodan Milosevic of the Federal Repubic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

Statement on the Murder of Neelan Thiruchelvam

July 30, 1999

Hillary and I were shocked and saddened by the tragic death of Neelan Thiruchelvam at the hands of terrorists in Sri Lanka today. We extend our deepest condolences to his wife and family.

Neelan Thiruchelvam was a constitutional lawyer and human rights advocate who was well-known and well-respected far beyond his country. He devoted himself to seeking a peaceful and just solution to the tragic conflict that has caused so much bloodshed in Sri Lanka.

Hillary was deeply moved by her meeting with Mr. Thiruchelvam during her 1995 visit to Sri Lanka. With his death, a powerful voice for reconciliation in Sri Lanka has been silenced. I hope that this tragedy will spur efforts to find an end to the fighting and to build a lasting peace in Sri Lanka.

Statement on Senate Action on Tax Cut Legislation

July 30, 1999

The Senate made the wrong choice for America's future today. By pushing through a tax plan that is too big and too bloated, the majority party has pushed aside our vital national priorities.

The Republican tax cut is so large it would undo our fiscal discipline and imperil our prosperity. It would crowd out our commitments to pay down the debt, to save Social Security, and to strengthen and modernize Medicare with a long-overdue prescription drug benefit. And it would demand drastic cuts in defense, education, law enforcement, agriculture, and the environment.

Let's be clear on what exactly this fight is about and what it isn't. It's not about whether to cut taxes. It's about whether to have tax cuts that save Social Security and Medicare, or tax cuts that undermine them; tax cuts in the national interest, or tax cuts for special interests.

I will not sign a tax plan that shortchanges our seniors and our young people. I will not sign a plan that signs away our future. If Congress passes that kind of plan, I will veto it.

We should put first things first. We should pay down the debt, save Social Security, strengthen and modernize Medicare, and keep our crucial national commitments. We can do these things and still have the right kind of tax cuts. I urge the Congress to put aside plans that are plainly wrong for America and to work with me for what's right.

Proclamation 7214—To Provide for the Efficient and Fair Administration of Action Taken With Regard to Imports of Lamb Meat and for Other Purposes

July 30, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

1. On July 7, 1999, I issued Proclamation 7208, which implemented action of a type described in section 203(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2253(a)(3)) (the "Trade Act"), with respect to imports of fresh, chilled, or frozen lamb meat, provided for in subheadings 0204.10.00, 0204.22.20, 0204.23.20, 0204.30.00, 0204.42.20, and 0204.43.20 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS). Proclamation 7208 took effect on July 22, 1999.

2. Proclamation 7208 established import relief in the form of tariff-rate quotas (TRQs) and increased duties but did not make specific provision for their administration. I have determined under section 203(g)(1) of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2253(g)(1)) that it is necessary for the efficient and fair administration of the action undertaken in Proclamation 7208 to exempt from the measure goods that were exported prior to July 22, 1999.

3. I have further determined under section 203(g)(1) of the Trade Act that in order to provide for the efficient and fair administration of the TRQs established in Proclamation 7208 it is necessary to delegate my authority to administer the TRQs under that section to the United States Trade Representative.

4. On May 28, 1999, I issued Proclamation 7202, which took certain actions to eliminate circumvention of the quantitative limitations applicable to imports of wheat gluten that were proclaimed in Proclamation 7103. I have determined that a technical correction in the description of an action taken in Proclamation 7202 is appropriate.

5. Section 604 of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2483), authorizes the President to embody in the HTS the substance of the relevant provisions of that Act, and of other acts affecting import treatment, and actions thereunder,

including the removal, modification, continuance, or imposition of any rate of duty or other import restriction.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including but not limited to sections 203 and 604 of the Trade Act, and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, do proclaim that:

(1) In order to provide for the efficient and fair administration of the TRQs on imports of fresh, chilled, or frozen lamb meat classified in HTS subheadings 0204.10.00, 0204.22.20, 0204.23.20, 0204.30.00, 0204.42.20, and 0204.43.20, subchapter III of chapter 99 of the HTS is modified as provided for in the Annex to this proclamation.

(2) The United States Trade Representative is authorized to exercise my authority pursuant to section 203(g) of the Trade Act to take all action necessary, including the promulgation of regulations, to administer the TRQs relating to imports of lamb meat provided for in HTS subheadings 0204.10.00, 0204.22.20, 0204.23.20, 0204.30.00, 0204.42.20, and 0204.43.20.

(3) The third sentence of initial paragraph 4 of Proclamation 7202 is hereby stricken and the following sentence is inserted in lieu thereof: "Such action shall take the form of a reduction in the European Community's 1999/2000 wheat gluten quota allotment in the amount of 5,402,000 kg., which represents the amount of wheat gluten that entered the United States in excess of the European Community's 1998 quota allocation."

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

(5) The actions taken in this proclamation shall be effective on the date of signature of this proclamation and shall continue in effect through the close of the dates on which actions proclaimed in Proclamation 7202 and Proclamation 7208 cease to be effective, unless such actions are earlier expressly modified or terminated.

(6) The modifications to the HTS shall be effective with respect to goods exported on or after July 22, 1999, and shall continue in effect as provided in the Annex to this proclamation, unless such actions are earlier expressly modified or terminated.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., August 3, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on August 4.

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 24

In the evening, the President returned from Aspen, CO, to Washington, DC. Later, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton traveled to Rabat, Morocco, arriving the following day.

July 25

The President met briefly with Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority at the Royal Palace in Rabat.

The President and Hillary Clinton then met briefly with King Mohammed IV of Morocco, successor to King Hassan II, before attending the funeral of King Hassan.

In the evening, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton returned to Washington, DC.

July 26

The White House announced that the President announced the release of Treasury Department regulations implementing the

administration's new humanitarian-based food and medicine sanctions policy.

July 27

The President announced his intention to nominate Anne H. Chasser to be Assistant Commissioner for Patents and Trademarks at the Department of Commerce.

The President announced his intention to appoint Paige E. Reffe as a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

The President announced his intention to appoint J. Shelby Bryan as a member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

July 28

The President announced his intention to nominate Martin N. Baily to be Chair and member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The President announced his intention to nominate Dorian Vanessa Weaver to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

The President announced his intention to nominate James G. Huse, Jr., to be Inspector General at the Social Security Administration.

The President announced the nomination of Thomas B. Leary to be a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

The President declared a major disaster in Minnesota and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms, winds, and flooding beginning on July 4 and continuing.

July 29

In the morning, the President traveled to Aviano Air Base in Italy.

The President announced his intention to nominate Susan M. Wachter to be Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The President announced his intention to nominate Zell Miller to be a member of the Board of Directors for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

July 30

In the morning, the President traveled to Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina, where he met with Prime Minister Milorad Dodik of Republika Srpska and Prime Minister Edhem Bicakcic and Deputy Prime Minister Dragan Covic of the Federation Government (Muslim and Croat) at Zetra Stadium. In the afternoon, he attended the Stability Pact Summit meeting at the stadium.

In the evening, the President participated in a roundtable discussion with regional media from Bosnia and Serbia. He then returned to Washington, DC, arriving the following morning.

The President announced his intention to nominate Edward W. Stimpson to be the U.S. Representative on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization, with the rank of Ambassador.

The President announced his intention to nominate Robert H. Griffin and Sam Angel to be members of the Mississippi River Commission.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

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

Submitted July 27

Anne H. Chasser,
of Ohio, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, vice Lawrence J. Goffney, Jr., resigned.

Brian Theadore Stewart,
of Utah, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Utah, vice J. Thomas Greene, retired.

Petrese B. Tucker,
of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, vice Thomas N. O'Neill, retired.

Thomas B. Leary,
of the District of Columbia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years

from September 26, 1998, vice Mary L. Azcuenaga, resigned.

Submitted July 28

Martin Neil Baily,
of Maryland, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, vice Janet L. Yellen.

James G. Huse, Jr.,
of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Social Security Administration, vice David C. Williams, resigned.

Dorian Vanessa Weaver,
of Arkansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2003, vice Maria Luisa Mabilagan Haley, resigned.

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 24

Announcement: Official Delegation to Rabat, Morocco, July 25, 1999

Released July 25

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Adviser Samuel Berger and Ambassador Dennis Ross, Special Middle East Coordinator, on the funeral of King Hassan II of Morocco

Released July 26

Statement by the Press Secretary: Implementing Humanitarian Exemptions From Sanctions

Advance text of National Security Adviser Samuel Berger's remarks to the Council on Foreign Relations

Released July 27

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Announcement: The President's Special Envoy for the Americas, Kenneth H. (Buddy) MacKay, Jr., To Attend Ministers Hemispheric Energy Conference in New Orleans July 28–30

Released July 28

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Adviser Samuel Berger and National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling on the President's trip to southeast Europe and budget legislation

Released July 29

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's gratitude to National Science Board member Chang Lin Tien

Statement by the Press Secretary on National Security Adviser Samuel Berger's announcement of the appointment of Special Assistant to the President and Counselor for Southeast European Stabilization and Reconstruction

Announcement: Official Delegation to Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina

Released July 30

Transcripts of press briefings by National Security Adviser Samuel Berger and National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling on the President's trip to Bosnia-Herzegovina

Fact sheet: Building a Durable Peace in Bosnia: Implementation of the Dayton Accord

Fact sheet: Promoting Democracy in Serbia

Fact sheet: Promoting Trade and Investment in Southeast Europe

Fact sheet: Stability Pact for Southeastern Europe

Acts Approved by the President

Approved July 28

H.R. 2035 / Public Law 106–39

To correct errors in the authorizations of certain programs administered by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration