AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, November 15, 1999
Volume 35—Number 45
Pages 2267–2372

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Signings; Meetings With Foreign Leaders
Arkansas, teleconference with rural radio stations on agricultural issues in Hermitage—2267

Budget negotiations—2283, 2306, 2356

Congressional Gold Medals, presentations to the Little Rock Nine—2307

Democratic National Committee
Hispanic Leadership Forum dinner—2312

Women's Leadership Forum reception—2310

Georgetown University—2286

Illinois, Englewood community in Chicago—2271

National Coalition of Minority Business award dinner—2341

On-line townhall meeting—2293

Addresses and Remarks—Continued

Pennsylvania
Departure for York—2319
Harley-Davidson Motor Co. employees in York
Remarks—2323
Roundtable—2321
Radio address—2280
Ronald H. Brown Corporate Bridge Builder Award dinner—2348
Virginia
Return from Arlington National Cemetery—2356
Veterans Day ceremony in Arlington—2353
Y2K readiness—2319

Bill Signings

Financial system, legislation to reform
Remarks—2361
Statement—2363
Legislation to locate and secure the return of Zachary Baumel, a United States citizen, and other Israeli soldiers missing in action, statement—2305

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

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

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

Contents—Continued

Communications to Congress

Cyprus, letter transmitting report—2340
Drug producing and transit countries, letter reporting—2338
Iran, message on continuation of the national emergency—2282
Sudan, message transmitting report on continuation of the national emergency—2283
Ukraine-U.S. treaty mutual legal assistance with documentation, message transmitting—2341
Weapons of mass destruction, message reporting—2331

Communications to Federal Agencies

Assistance to refugees and victims of the Timor and North Caucasus crises, memorandum—2353
Protecting Consumers from Fraud, memorandum—2281

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Cabinet Room—2306
Oval Office—2356, 2359
South Grounds—2283, 2319
Interview with Maria Elvira Salazar of Telemundo Noticiero—2275

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Indonesia, President Wahid—2359

Notices

Continuation of Emergency Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction—2330
Continuation of Iran Emergency—2282

Proclamations

Suspension of Entry as Immigrants and Nonimmigrants of Persons Responsible for Repression of the Civilian Population in Kosovo or for Policies That Obstruct Democracy in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (''FRY'') or Otherwise Lend Support to the Current Governments of the FRY and of the Republic of Serbia—2366
Veterans Day—2292

Resignations and Retirements

International Monetary Fund, Managing Director, statement—2310

Statements by the President

See also Bill Signings; Resignations and Retirements
Colombia, funding to assist in fighting drug production and trafficking—2329
Death of Joseph Serna, Jr.—2282
''Ending Discrimination Against Parents Act of 1999,'' proposed—2359
Minimum wage legislation—2310
Senate
Confirmation of Carol Moseley-Braun to be Ambassador to New Zealand—2329
Ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor—2275
Serbia, Proclamation to expand sanctions against the Milosevic regime—2366

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—2371
Checklist of White House press releases—2371
Digest of other White House announcements—2367
Nominations submitted to the Senate—2368

Remarks in a Teleconference With Rural Radio Stations on Agricultural Issues in Hermitage, Arkansas

November 5, 1999

The President. How are you doing?

Stewart Doan. Fine, sir. Welcome back down to Arkansas.

The President. Nice to hear your voice, Stewart.

[*Mr. Doan of the Arkansas Radio Network began the conference listing American farmers' problems, including low commodity prices, high production costs, reduction in exports juxtaposed with a rise in imports, and the growing number of farmers exiting the business. He asked what incentives existed for crop growers to stay in farming for the next century.*]

The President. Well, let me say first of all, I think we've got to change the '95 farm bill. When the Republican Congress passed it at the end of the session, they did it in such a way that I had to sign it, because otherwise we would have been left with the 1948 law, which was even worse. But the problem is, it has no safety net that's adjustable to the conditions. And I think that's very important to change.

And while it is true that we have put a ton of money into emergency payments to farmers the last 2 years, it's basically given out under the distribution system of the existing law, which means some really big farmers get it even if they don't plant and don't need the money, and they get a windfall; and then some of the family farmers that are actually out there really killing themselves every year, in spite of all the money we're spending, are not adequately compensated.

So I think—you know, I think it's a mistake. And I think that it's because—I frankly believe that the majority in Congress is not as sensitive as they should be to the existence of family farmers and individual farmers, and less concerned if we have more of a corporate structure. I think that's a mistake. I think, on the concentration issues, I think they all ought to be looked at. And if they're not legal, I think they ought to be moved against. But under our system, I have to be very careful as President, legally, not to comment on specific potential violations of the antitrust laws.

And the reason we had a decline in markets is because the American economy was booming and the Asian economy collapsed, and the Russian economy collapsed. I believe the markets will pick up now, as Asia's economy picks up and as Europe's picks up. But we're going to have this World Trade Organization meeting in Seattle, Washington, next month. And I think it's very important that we start a new trade round, and that agriculture be at the center of it, because we've always known if we got a fair shot to sell our products around the world, we could outcompete anybody.

And I think in the short run, we've got to fix the farm bill to deal with emergencies. In the longer run, we've got to have more markets. And that's what I'm going to be working on.

Mr. Doan. Thank you sir.

[*Mike Adams, president, National Association of Farm Broadcasters, noted many farmers would like to see markets in Cuba opened. He asked the President if he was in favor of lifting the embargo on Cuba and, if not, why.*]

The President. Well, I'm not in favor of a total lift of the embargo, because I think that we should continue to try to put pressure on the Castro regime to move more toward democracy and respect for human rights. And it's the only nondemocracy in our whole hemisphere.

And let me say, I have bent over backwards to try to reach out to them, and to try to provide more opportunities for person-

to-person contacts, to get better transfer of medicine into Cuba, and all kinds of other things. And every time we do something, Castro shoots planes down and kills people illegally, or puts people in jail because they say something he doesn't like. And I almost think he doesn't want us to lift the embargo, because it provides him an excuse for the failures, the economic failures of his administration.

Now, on the other hand, there is consideration being given in the Congress to broad legislation which would permit us to, in effect, not apply sanctions and embargoes to food or medicine. And under the right circumstances, I could support that. Now—and it had broad bipartisan support. My understanding is that it has been held up in the Congress because Senator Helms and others don't want us to sell any food to Cuba. But under the right circumstances, a general policy which permitted me to—which basically said it is the general policy of the United States not to include food and medicine in embargoes, but under emergencies they could be—I could support that kind of legislation. And I think that would provide a lot of relief to the farmers.

But it would have to be written in the proper way. And I have worked with both Republicans and Democrats on that. But it's my understanding that Cuba is the very issue that's preventing it from being passed in the Congress today.

Mr. Adams. Thank you, sir.

The President. Let me—if I could just follow up on the question. We supported lifting sanctions against Pakistan and India and reforming the sanctions law. And we have sold a great deal of corn to Iran, for example. And before the Ayatollah took over, in my State sometimes we sold as much as 25 percent of our rice crop over there. So it's a big issue with me, and I'll do what I can to help. We're for sanctions reform in the right kind of way, to basically exempt food and medicine from sanctions.

[*Price Allan of Kentucky Ag Net described how the President's proposed 55 cent tax on tobacco would affect rural communities in Kentucky and the Southeast and asked the President to discuss his plans to compensate tobacco growers.*]

The President Well, first of all, the last increase, pursuant to the settlement that the tobacco companies made with the States, didn't have any protections for tobacco farmers at all. And I thought it was wrong. And that's because we couldn't get Congress to ratify and participate in the settlement.

Let me remind you, when I became President, I said I would keep the tobacco support program. I said—I did what I could to increase the domestic content, to protect American tobacco sales in the American market. And I always said that the tobacco farmers had to be taken care of in any tobacco settlement.

So we had, in our proposal—you said you had losses of $300 million. We had, I think, $5 billion in support to tobacco farmers and tobacco communities, to help to deal with the adverse impact of any increase in the price. And, you know, it sounds funny—since I've been so strong for increasing the price, because I want to reduce teen smoking, and I want funds to pay for health programs related to cigarette-related illnesses and to discourage young people from smoking—but I never would sanction a price increase of the kind that you have already experienced under the settlement between the States and the tobacco companies, without a huge increase in the investment in tobacco farmers and families and tobacco communities. I think that it's wrong to do that.

The tobacco farmers didn't do anything wrong. We ought to be paying for major transition assistance and other kinds of economic development and support to the tobacco farmers and to the communities in which they live. So under my plan, you'd get something like $5 billion, which would be much more than the short-term economic damage, to create a whole different future and to actually compensate for the actual out-of-pocket losses.

Mr. Allan. Thank you, sir.

Bill Ray. Mr. President, Bill Ray here at Kill Devil Hills, North Carolina.

The President. Hi, Bill.

[*Mr. Ray of the Agrinet Farm Radio Network asked the President what suggestions he had to give American food producers better access to Japanese and European markets.*]

The President. Well, I think there are two things we have to do. I think the most important thing we can do is to get the Europeans and the Japanese to agree to include broad agricultural talks in a new trade round to be completed within 3 years. That is, we need a global opening of markets. And as the economy recovers in Asia and in Europe and elsewhere, we will see an increase in food consumption and an increase in the capacity to buy American food. So I think the most important thing is that we've got to have a real broad trade round.

Then the second thing I think is quite important is that we bargain very tough with the Europeans and the Japanese in our bilateral relations. You know, they're always wanting to sell things to the United States, and they're always wanting to close their markets to our food products.

Mr. Ray. Exactly.

The President. Now, we've had some real success in opening Japan to specific food products, particularly. But the biggest problem, frankly, is the trade barriers and, specifically, tariffs on farm products. Worldwide, the average tariff on farm products is 50 percent. In the United States, the average is less than 10 percent. So I think we just have to tell people, ''Look, we've tried to give you access to our markets, but you've got to give us access to yours.'' We have to have better parity here. And if we can get it, then we can do fine.

Now, in a lot of places—you know, a lot of these other countries, their farmers are just as strong politically as our farmers are. And they're not as strong agriculturally. But there is a way for them to get the benefits of being able to sell their products in our markets, which the Japanese plainly do and the Europeans do. And they ought to give us a chance to sell into theirs.

And that's why I wanted to host this meeting at the World Trade Organization, and why we want to kick off this trade deal, because I think that the biggest advantage, not just for farmers but for all of America, out of new trade talks is the advantage we'd have in greater agricultural sales.

Mr. Ray. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. Allan. Mr. President, may I follow up with a question to that?

The President. Sure.

Mr. Allan. Looking to the WTO talks in Seattle, there are reports that Charlene Barshefsky is prepared to offer up the program crops, such as peanuts, sugar, and tobacco, and their support quotas, in return for foreign countries removing their tariffs and subsidies. Is that currently the game plan? And if so, what suggestions do you have for farmers that will be affected if that happens?

The President. To the best of my knowledge, there has been no pre-existing offer like that put on the table. If there was one, they'd have to discuss it with me first, and I—then I'd be glad to answer that question.

But I—to the best of my knowledge, there has been no decision to do that yet, because neither the Secretary of Agriculture nor I have been consulted on that. And I just don't believe some position of that magnitude would be taken without prior consultation with us. And it wouldn't hold water if we didn't agree.

Mr. Allan. Thank you, sir.

[*Mr. Doan asked if the issues of genetically modified organisms (GMO's) and overly hormone-treated beef were discussed when the President met with the President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi.*]

The President. Yes. Yes, and let me tell you where we are on that.

Let's talk about the GMO's first. We told—we have repeatedly told the Europeans, and the whole world, that the United States has prided itself on having not only the cheapest but the safest food supply in the world, and that we never want to sell anything to our people, much less to anybody else, that isn't safe; that we have confidence in the finding of our Food and Drug Administration that these foods are safe. And if we didn't believe that, we wouldn't be selling them. And we certainly wouldn't be eating them.

And one of the big problems is—and the Europeans recognize this, by the way—one of the big problems they have is that there is no equivalent organization to the American Food and Drug Administration, certainly in the European Union as a whole, and, frankly, in individual European countries. So what we tried to do is get them—not necessarily to

agree with us on everything, but not to panic, and to make a commitment that this ought to be a decision made based on the science and the evidence, not on politics and fear; that, you know, the United States is not about to sell other people, or feed its own people, food that we think is dangerous. We would never, ever do that.

And all these things have been reviewed by the appropriate authorities that we have reason to have confidence in. And they say that it cuts the cost of production and is perfectly safe. So what—our goal with the Europeans is to get them to commit unambiguously to making decisions with GMO's based on science.

Now, with the beef, it's a different issue. We have a decision there, by the governing body of the WTO. We won, and they lost. They were all panicked, as you might understand, over their so-called mad cow problem. And as a result, it became an occasion to discriminate against our beef. It's just wrong.

We've won two important agricultural cases, one involving beef, the other involving bananas, which are not produced in America but are owned by American companies. And the Europeans have to give us satisfaction. Once you play by the rules, you know—if we lose a case in the WTO to them, they expect us to honor the ruling. We have won not once, not twice, but three times, and they keep ignoring the rulings.

And so all I can tell you is I've already imposed some sanctions and will impose more until we get satisfaction. We won the beef case, and we're entitled to the results of our victory. And you know, if they take us in here and they beat us fair and square, we've got to let them win.

So we're in a real serious confrontation with the Europeans over the beef and banana issues. I think we'll prevail, and I think we'll prevail in fairly short order. Romano Prodi is a very able man, the new head of the European Union. He's a very serious person, and he has great potential for long-term leadership and partnership with the United States. And the other—he's got a whole crowd of immensely talented people in there. So I'm very hopeful we're finally going to get some good results.

But anyway—the GMO's, we've got to give the Europeans a chance to look at it. But it's got to be done on a science basis, because—you know, you know yourself that I would never permit an American child to eat anything that I thought was unsafe. If we had any reason, based on our own scientific reviews, to question this, we would question it. So all we want the Europeans to do is to have the same kind of scientific approach. If we get there, we'll work through this GMO thing, and it'll all come out just fine.

Mr. Doan. Thank you, sir.

[*Mr. Adams asked the President if American negotiators will be at a disadvantage in the upcoming World Trade Organization talks in Seattle, WA, without fast-track trading authority and if he'll make another push to obtain it before leaving office.*]

The President. The short answers are yes and yes, but we're not at too much of a disadvantage. That is, we can still negotiate, actually, because we have the WTO framework. We can still start a new trade round and bring it back to Congress. And it's 3 years down the road anyway.

So to the extent that we're at any disadvantage, it's more psychological than anything else, because other countries traditionally have been far more protectionist than America—because we have a stronger economy, and we just tend to be more competitive, and we understand the benefits we get from open markets. So when we refuse to adopt fast track, it makes it easier for other countries to refuse to reduce their tariffs on farm products and to otherwise be more protectionist. So it's like a psychological advantage.

But in the way the WTO system works, we'd launch this new trade round. It wouldn't have to be ratified for 3 years, or completed for 3 years. So the fact that we don't have the fast-track authority right now is not a big problem there. It's a bigger problem in our efforts to develop a Free Trade Area of the Americas and get our own neighbors to keep buying more and more of our products. And our trade has grown more with Latin America than with any other part of the world in the short run.

So that's the real answer to that. We could still get a very good WTO deal without fast

track, because we can't ratify for 3 years anyway.

[*Mr. Allan asked the President how he would like farmers to remember his Presidency.*]

The President. Well, I want them to remember first of all that I turned the American economy around, and that until the collapse of the Asian economy, we had very, very good agricultural years, in the beginning of my administration. We had record exports, record farm income.

I want them to remember that I had a special emphasis on rural development. I'm down in south Arkansas today at a tomato cooperative to try to emphasize the importance of having very, very strong co-ops of individual farmers, so that little guys can have a better chance to make a living; and that I've worked to try to find nonfarm sources of income to support farmers in small communities.

I want them to remember that we did a really good job on increasing food safety and that that was good for marketing, because safe food sells, and that the food is safer now than it was when I took office.

And I want them to remember that—I don't know yet if I'm going to succeed, but that I opposed the so-called freedom to farm concept without an adequate safety net for family farmers. I am—I think it does matter whether family farmers can make a living on the land. I don't think that America would be the same kind of country, and that rural America would have the same kind of character, if all the farmers of any size were corporate farms and individual family farms couldn't make it.

So I hope I'll be remembered for the prosperity of the years before the Asian financial collapse, which I hope will return before I leave office; for a real emphasis on rural development; for an emphasis on food safety; and for a genuine concern for the family farmer.

Secretary of Agriculture Daniel Glickman. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:07 p.m. by telephone from the Hermitage Tomato Cooperative. In his remarks, he referred to President Fidel Castro of Cuba. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of Messrs. Doan, Adams, Allan, and Ray. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks to the Englewood Community in Chicago, Illinois

November 5, 1999

Thank you very, very much. And thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for coming and for being so full of enthusiasm and making me feel so welcome. Mr. Speaker, thank you for coming. We are honored by your presence and your alliance.

I want to also thank my good friend Congressman Bobby Rush. We've been friends a long time, and he has worked in these last weeks through his own personal sadness still on your business and to bring us all here today. And I thank him for that.

I thank this great array of Members of the House of Representatives who are here, Congressman Danny Davis—we're the Arkansas contingent on the platform, Danny and I are—[*laughter*]—Congressman Jesse Jackson, Jr., and Congressman Paul Kanjorski who has made this whole tour with us twice, coming all the way from Pennsylvania—a good man.

I thank the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the State treasurer of the State of Illinois, all of them, for being here. I thank Secretary Slater and Small Business Administrator Alvarez for their strong support for our new markets initiative and their involvement. I want to thank Samuel Williams, your principal here, for welcoming us. [*Applause*]

You know, this is the second biggest hand he's gotten here. [*Laughter*] Bobby, I hope you have made sure he's not interested in running for Congress. [*Laughter*] This is amazing. When he got his first big hand, the Speaker leaned over to me and said, "You know, when a school principal gets that kind of hand, something must be going right there." [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Paul Vallas, the CEO of the Chicago public schools, for being here and for the great job that Chicago is making in turning around its schools. This school, I was just told by the principal—when I walked in, the first thing he said was, "Thank you

for Goals 2000.'' The second thing he said was, ''We are hooked up to the Internet in this school; we are ready for the 21st century.''

I want to thank David Shryock for his leadership and all the other CEO's who are here, Jack Greenberg from McDonald's and all the others from the banks and the other companies. Thank you all for being here.

And let me say, this has acquired a greater significance here because the Speaker's come in, and in honor of this bipartisan event, we had the Speaker of the House, and out of respect, Reverend Jackson has dressed up like a Republican today. [*Laughter*] So this is a whole new day. [*Laughter*]

I am glad to be back here in Chicago. I have been interested in this city for a long time. And as you know, the First Lady is a native of Chicago, and we spent lots of years here. And I was interested in all these neighborhoods long before I even thought I'd have a chance to be President. And I worked with the South Shore Bank and set up a parallel bank in Arkansas, where we just were today.

There's one other thing I would like to say before I go further, both as President and as a citizen of this country. I am very grateful for the life and the example of Walter Payton. I know that this is the day of his service, and tomorrow there will be a great memorial service, and there will be sadness and sorrow. But what a magnificent life. And what gifts he gave us, not just on the playing field but on the playing field of life. And right to the very end, he showed us a lot of lessons about how we should all conduct ourselves and what kind of legacy we should leave to our children. And I think we should remember that today, for this is a day about our children.

Let me tell you—we use this word, ''new markets,'' and Bobby issued all these announcements, and I want to make a few more. But let me try to put this into some context for you. Compared to the day I became President, this is a different country, economically and socially. We have nearly 20 million new jobs; a 4.1 percent unemployment rate, the lowest in 30 years. We have the lowest female unemployment in 46 years; the lowest minority unemployment ever recorded. We have the lowest welfare rolls, the lowest crime rates in 30 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, over 5 million men, women, and children lifted out of poverty. We have the highest homeownership, including the highest minority homeownership, in the history of our country, and the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years.

Now, we are here because we know there are people and places, in spite of all these wonderful numbers, that have still not been touched by this prosperity. In spite of the fact that this is the longest economic recovery in peacetime in our history—and in February will become the longest recovery of any kind in our history—there are people and places untouched by our prosperity. We know that we have an opportunity now, with all this good fortune, to deal with our obligation to bring the American dream to those people and places.

And I believe that the only way we can keep this economic recovery going is to find new customers, new jobs, and new businesses. There's a huge debate—I say this because this is, yes, about discharging our responsibility to our fellow citizens, but it's also very much in the self-interest of everybody from Wall Street to Silicon Valley. You can't imagine how many hours we spend in the White House talking about how in the world we can keep this economic expansion going.

You know, every time in the past, things either get so hot there's a lot of inflation, and then you have to break the inflation, and that brings on a recession—or the economic expansion just runs out of gas. So we have to find a way not to run out of gas and to keep going without inflation.

Obviously, if you bring opportunity to people and places that haven't had it, if there are new businesses, new workers, new consumers, you can have growth without inflation. So we are here today—what this new markets name means is that if Englewood still has a poverty rate more than 2½ times the rate of Chicago, if the median household income in this community is barely more than half of Chicago, if there are still boarded-up brownstones and shutup storefronts, that means this is not just a problem, this is an opportunity. This is a new market, and everybody in America ought to care

about it and be committed to it and do what can be done to advance it.

You have proved, by these announcements here and more, that there is more than poverty here; there is enormous promise. Look at these kids. Look at this school. Get the idea, the feeling, the pride, the accomplishment here. This is a place of promise. Later I will meet with some of the members of the women's self-employment project, which has given—listen to this—more than 7,000 women the tools to create their own businesses and shape their own futures. I'm going to go visit Franz Print Shop, which is a small business making large strides in your community. You have more partnerships to build, more success stories to write with government and business working together. That's what we're here to celebrate.

We have seen it here in Englewood, thanks to the announcements that Congressman Rush made and all the work he did to lay the foundation for our business here today; thanks to the work of the mayor, who has committed over $250 million in public and private investment for this neighborhood in the next 4 years; thanks to the efforts of Reverend Jackson, who launched not only a Wall Street project but a LaSalle Street project to bring private capital to our poorest neighborhoods.

This can work. It can work here; it can work all across America. It is already working in many places across America in the empowerment zones, in the enterprise communities we have been establishing since 1993 under the strong leadership of Vice President Gore. But Government can't do it alone.

One of the most important things that we have to do is to make sure we have genuine partnerships. And this ought to be an American idea. I mean, when you go into the bank and you deposit money or borrow money, your party doesn't make any difference. When you go into the restaurant and you spend money, nobody asks you before they take the money or the credit card whether you're a Republican or a Democrat. Nobody has a vested interest in anybody who wants to work staying unemployed. No one in America has a vested interest in anybody with a good idea for a new business not being able to act on that idea and bring their creative genius and their hard work to the arena of enterprise that has given our country all these blessings we enjoy today.

And I said in January, when I proposed this new markets effort, that I wanted it to be a bipartisan effort, indeed an American effort, above politics, because we all have a stake in this. I want to compliment Danny Davis for recognizing this and working with two Republican Members of the House of Representatives, Congressman Watts and Congressman Talent, to come up with an ''American Community Renewal Act,'' which has a lot of the same goals of our empowerment zone effort and our new markets initiative.

Now, this is something we ought to do together. I'm amazed we got any press about this at all today—Mr. Hastert got a lot of press coming all the way from Washington to be with us—and I think it's because they're used to writing in Washington about how we all fight about everything. So we had two choices here. We can say, well, they've got an idea; we've got an idea; let's have a fight. Or we can do what the Speaker and I and the others here have decided to do. In Reverend Jackson's famous words, we have decided to seek common ground and higher ground because it's the right ground for these children's futures to stand on.

Today the Speaker and I—I'll let him speak for himself—but basically we're here to commit to you, and to the American people, to work in good faith, to merge our proposals into a historic bipartisan effort to renew our communities, to open new markets and new doors of opportunity. If we work together in this way, Mr. Speaker, we can ensure that every hard-working family has a share of the prosperity and a stake in the future that our country plainly has before it.

We have a lot that we can do. We just worked together on a historic bill to modernize and broaden the reach of the financial institutions of this country. But we did it by keeping and broadening the reach of the Community Reinvestment Act, which has been responsible for about $88 billion in investment into our communities in the last year alone. This is the kind of thing we can do together.

And we know that all we can do, really, is to set up a framework. My new markets idea is that we ought to give Americans with money to invest the same incentives to invest in poor areas of America we give them to invest in poor areas of Latin America or Africa or Asia. And I think all of you know that, for me, that's not an either/or choice. I'm glad when we have Americans try to help people in Africa or Latin America or Asia have a better future, because I think as they do, they make more responsible citizens and they make war less likely and they make cooperation and shared prosperity more likely. But we clearly have the highest obligations to our own people and we cannot, in good conscience, not give people the same incentives to Americans a chance to make a living, to start a business, and to build a future.

I also want to reiterate, nothing we do will work without the commitment of the private business sector. You've already heard about the vital commitments that SB Partners has made today. I'm also pleased to note that Allstate Insurance will invest $5 million in the Illinois Facilities Fund to go toward education and child care here in Englewood. That's very important—if you want to have jobs, you've got to have the child care support for parents. And I thank Ed Liddy* for joining us today. The Community Investment Corporation will expand its efforts here into Englewood and into the enterprize zone that is nearby.

And as part of the welfare-to-work partnership, Alliance Relocation Services is teaming up with Allied and DePaul University to launch a new job training program. McDonald's, represented here by its CEO, Jack Greenberg, which has a huge, long history of investing in America's untapped potential, is working to encourage mentoring relationships between large companies and small ones, through our BusinessLINC initiative. The idea is that big, successful companies can help small, emerging ones in neighborhoods like this succeed if they just know more about the basic things they have to do to get started and to keep going in the early periods of the business. This is a huge deal, pioneered by business leaders and the Vice President. And I want to thank you, sir, for doing this.

Well, I want to make room now for the Speaker and for Reverend Jackson, but I just want to close with this observation. For a long time, we were so used to some people being down and out that we acted like we believed it had to be that way. This is a big issue, because all the money in the world and all the good government action in the world can't overcome your lack of faith in yourselves. And for a long time, we just acted like it had to be that way.

The other night, Hillary sponsored a dinner at the White House, or an evening at the White House, to talk about the relationship of the revolution in computer technology to the revolution in the study of the human gene, and the whole gene structure, that's called the genome. And what the scientist and the computer genius said was, we could never unlock the mysteries of the human gene unless we had this remarkable revolution in computers, which can literally allow us to map these microscopic things that make up our body.

Here's the point I want to make to all of you here in Englewood—the most important thing that was said all night long. This big professor from Harvard who understands things about the human gene structure that I couldn't even describe said something I'll remember for the rest of my life. He said all human beings, genetically—all human beings—are 99.9 percent the same. And then he said, if you took any given racial or ethnic group—let's say you took 100 people from west Africa and 100 Chinese and 100 people from Mexico and 100 people from India and 100 people from Ireland, the genetic differences of the individuals within each group would be significantly greater than the genetic differences from group to group—that is, between any group of Irish and group of Chinese or group of Africans or group of Mexicans. You remember that.

You've got to believe. Just look at this high school. Look at the alumni of this high school. This high school's produced poets, Cabinet secretaries, the first African-American astronaut; Lorraine Hansberry, the playwright of the wonderful play, "A Raisin in the Sun."

---

*White House correction.

Now—you're going to hear from a young man later who will do this better than me, but one of the greatest lines in ''A Raisin in the Sun''—you ought to go back and read it—is, a character says, ''All God's children got wings.'' That's another way of saying, genetically, we're 99.9 percent the same.

Do you believe that? Do you believe that all God's children got wings? Then you have to believe that all God's children can fly.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:45 p.m. in the gymnasium at Englewood High School. In his remarks, he referred to Illinois State Treasurer Judy Baar Topinka; Samuel Williams, principal, Englewood High School; David Shryock, partner, SB Partners LP; Jack Greenberg, chief executive officer, McDonald's Corp.; civil rights activist Jesse Jackson; National Football League Hall of Fame member Walter Payton, who died of cancer on November 1; Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago; and Edward M. Liddy, chief executive officer, Allstate Insurance Co. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement on Senate Ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor

November 5, 1999

I am pleased that the Senate has given its consent to ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor. In June I traveled to Geneva for the annual meeting of the International Labor Organization (ILO), where the business, labor, and government representatives to the ILO from countries around the world unanimously adopted this historic convention.

With this action, the Senate has declared on behalf of the American people that we simply will not tolerate the worst forms of child labor: child slavery, the sale or trafficking of children, child prostitution or pornography, forced or compulsory child labor, and hazardous work that harms the health, safety, and morals of children. With this action, the United States continues as world leader in the fight to eliminate exploitative and abusive child labor. This also is another important step forward in our continuing efforts to put a human face on the global economy.

I am particularly gratified by the bipartisan unanimity that carried this convention through the Senate from introduction to final approval. For this, I offer my sincere thanks to Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms, Ranking Member Joe Biden, and especially Senator Tom Harkin, who has been America's leading advocate for the world's laboring children. I also want to make note of the special efforts of the U.S. representatives to the ILO: John Sweeney of the AFL–CIO, Thomas Niles of the United States Council for International Business, and Labor Secretary Alexis Herman. They worked as a superb team in negotiating a convention that should be widely ratified throughout the world. Such bipartisan support and the coordinated efforts of labor, business, and government are key to building a new consensus on our approach to international economic policy.

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

Interview With Maria Elvira Salazar of Telemundo Noticiero in Hartford, Connecticut

November 4, 1999

Enforcement of Gun Control Laws

Ms. Salazar. Before we talk about your visit here to Hartford, the head of the NRA, Charlton Heston, said that the White House and the Justice Department lack the spine to enforce the existing gun control laws. How do you respond to this?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say what the substance of his claim is. They say that we are bringing fewer criminal prosecutions in the Federal courts for violations of the gun laws than were being brought a few years ago. The truth is that prosecutions for violations of the gun laws are increasing in America. But we have a partnership between the Federal prosecutors and the State prosecutors. And more of the minor cases are being brought at the State level now, and the major multistate cases are being brought at the Federal level. So it is simply not true that the gun laws are not being enforced.

But let me say, the more important thing is—why is Charlton Heston saying this? Because he doesn't want us to do background checks when people buy guns at gun shows or at urban flea markets. He didn't want us to do background checks when people bought handguns in gun stores, and they said it wouldn't do any good. But we know that 400,000 people, because of a criminal background, couldn't buy guns under the Brady bill. We know we've got the lowest crime rate and the lowest murder rate in 30 years. So he's just wrong about it.

We also know that America is still a country that's too dangerous, because we're the only country in the world that still doesn't have enough sensible restraints on keeping guns out of the hands of criminals and children. So I disagree.

New Markets Initiative

Ms. Salazar. Okay. Let's talk about, now, your visit to Hartford. Tell us why this new markets initiative is so important to you.

The President. It's important to me because even though we have the longest peacetime economic expansion in history, over 19 million new jobs, highest homeownership ever, lowest unemployment rate in 29 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 30 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, the lowest Hispanic- and African-American unemployment rates we have ever recorded—in spite of all that, there are still all these people and places that have not felt this recovery, that need investments and businesses and jobs and hope. And I believe that we need to convince the American business community that these are markets to invest in. And I think we ought to give them the same incentives to invest in poor areas in America we give them to invest in poor areas in Latin America or Africa or Asia. That's the whole deal, and I think it will work.

Ms. Salazar. And what incentives can you offer them that are not in place right now?

The President. We can offer them tax credits, and we can offer them loan guarantees. And we can offer them modest expenditures of public funds to support these kinds of investments. They will make a big difference.

For example, if—let's just take a poor neighborhood in Houston or San Antonio or even here in Hartford, where there's a very large Hispanic population. Let's suppose that we wanted to have a $150 million investment. Under this proposal, if my bills were to become law, they could put $50 million in equity, and they would get a 25 percent tax credit. They could borrow $100 million and have it under a Federal loan guarantee, which would dramatically lower the interest rate. So you would say, okay, you're taking a little bit of a risk investing in a poor area, but we will cut the risk way, way down.

Plight of Hispanic-Americans

Ms. Salazar. Beautiful. There are 30 million Hispanics in the United States and counting. Yet a disproportionate number live in poverty, do not have health care, and can't get a job. Why has the American dream eluded them?

The President. Well, let me start with the positives. We also have more successful Hispanics in America than ever before—more people like you and the people that work for Telemundo. We have the lowest unemployment rate we have ever recorded, and we started keeping separate Latino unemployment rates in the early seventies.

Now, why is it still a problem? Number one, a lot of the Hispanic population of America are recent immigrants. Recent immigrants always have more problems with health insurance and with employment. They haven't very often mastered English; they often don't have the right contacts. So part of that's inevitable.

But there are some other things that I'd like to point out. Because of the family traditions that have been so strong in Hispanic families, very often the children would leave school early to go to work. And that worked, for generation upon generation of Hispanic families, the people that had been here for 50, 60, 80 years. It doesn't work anymore because if you drop out of high school, your chances of getting a good job with a growing income are very, very small.

And the biggest separate social problem we have with Hispanics in America today is the dropout rate from school is way too high.

Last year, for the first time ever, the graduation rates of non-Hispanic whites and African-Americans was almost identical. So the black—you know, the message is there. Hispanics are still dropping out at a very rapid rate.

So we have started this Hispanic education initiative to try to overcome that. But a lot of it is culture. We must get the message out that this doesn't work anymore. It worked a long time; it won't work anymore. You can't do it. You've got to stay in school. And we have to try to get more Hispanic young people to go on to college.

So I think that's very, very important. I think that is—there are a lot of other things, but that's—the single most significant thing that we can do something about is getting people to stay in high school. The fact that we have so many immigrants, they'll always have more problems in the beginning, and we just have to integrate them as quickly as we can.

Ms. Salazar. I think you have answered my next question, but I want to ask you anyway, and it has to do with youth. In the barrio in New York City, or in any barrio in the United States, there is a 12-year-old boy whose name is Juan Gonzalez, let's say. His parents struggle to make a living and provide him with a decent education. What message do you have for him, a kid that was born in the United States?

The President. My message to him is, if you stay in school and you learn your lessons, no matter how difficult your economic circumstances, you can now go on to college in America.

We have changed the rules in the last 6 years. If your parents come up with some money, they can get a tax credit back for it. We have more generous scholarships. We have more other funds for you to go. You must stay in school. You can go to college if you stay in school. And if you do, you can make the life that you dream of.

Cuba

Ms. Salazar. Let's talk a little bit about Cuba. The democratically elected leaders of 17 Spanish-speaking nations will gather in Havana in the next couple of weeks. Are you concerned that they are legitimizing Castro's government?

The President. I'm a little concerned about it. I think the important thing is, when they go there, I hope that they will reaffirm their support for democracy and for human rights and for a transition to democracy and to an open economy in Cuba.

As you know, most countries don't agree with our policy on Cuba. They think that it hurts the Cuban people, that it hurts the American business community, and that it doesn't speed the transition away from Castro because they think we give him an excuse for the failures of the Cuban society—that he can blame everything on us instead of having to take responsibility for himself. And, you know, this argument is now occurring more and more among Cuban-Americans of all age groups. And so it's a debate we ought to continue to have.

The most important thing for me, though, is, I have—every time I have reached out to Cuba—and I have tried to increase contacts, to make it easier for people in America to send money home, to have direct telephone service, to have more trips to Cuba more accessible for people—and, you know, something happens. He puts journalists in jail, or shot the Brothers to the Rescue people out of the air. And they were—those people were murdered. It was illegal for them to be shot. I don't care—even if they had been inside the territorial waters of Cuba, which they weren't, there is a convention which binds the United States and Cuba which would not have permitted them to be shot down, because they did not present a threat. So all my efforts to change things have been met with a rebuff. And it makes me wonder whether he really wants this to change, because he can always use us as an excuse.

But if the countries want to go there and meet, I understand that. If they differ with us on their policy, I respect their right to differ. But I hope when they're in Cuba, they will make it clear that they're for democracy and human rights.

Ms. Salazar. Have you expressed this to any of the Presidents?

The President. Absolutely. Yes, I have. I have said that to every one of them that I

have seen since they made the decision to go down there.

Ms. Salazar. And do you ever foresee normalized relations with Castro and the United States?

The President. I think it would be difficult for relations to be completely normal. I think we could certainly do a lot more for food, for medicine, in other ways, if the circumstances were right. And I think that if there were a clear commitment to a transition to democracy and human rights, which were clear and verifiable, I think that you could see some really dramatic changes. I think—you know, if we could just have a commitment to have no more shootings, like the shootings of the airplanes, and to have no more clear oppressings of human rights, it would be easier.

I think the American people would like to be reconciled with the Cuban people. And I think we are—it is painful. It's painful most of all, I think, for the Cuban-Americans.

Mr. Salazar. Definitely. I come from that group. They tell me two more questions. I need to do Colombia, and I need to do Vieques. I need to do two more.

The President. Yes, you do them. You do need to do those.

Colombia

Ms. Salazar. Okay. Yes, I do. Colombia—Washington is debating billions of dollars in aid to that country. Serious problem. Do you foresee, or could the United States be dragged into the civil war that they are living?

The President. Well, first of all, let me say we already give a lot of aid to Colombia. They are—after Israel and Egypt, Colombia is the third-biggest recipient of American aid.

I am very concerned about the combination of the narcotraffickers and the people that have been engaged in the civil war down there totally destabilizing Colombia. They've already hurt the economy. They've divided the society. They've weakened the country and its government. And it is a big, big country, with enormous significance for all of Latin America. If you look at the Venezuelan border, the trouble we've seen there, if you look at all the problems that could be presented with Panama, with the canal going back there, and if you look at all the countries to the south, if you look at Bolivia, Peru, the problems they've had there, the future of Colombia is very, very important. And Colombia borders Amazonia, and all the problems that could be created there. So we should be working with them, and we should help them.

But, you know, if you look at the whole—also the history of America's involvement in Latin America, if we were to become directly involved, I think it would ensure a disastrous result for the Colombian Government, and people would accuse us of being imperialists in some way. I have worked very hard to reach out to Latin America in a way that no other American President has, at least since President Kennedy, to be a friend, to be a partner, to be supportive, and not to be a dictator, not to be an imperialist, not to be abusive in our relationship.

So I'm going to keep trying to help Colombia. But I don't think we should be drawn directly into their conflict, because I think it would boomerang. I don't think it would work, and I think it would actually hurt the cause of freedom and the integrity of governments in Latin America.

Vieques Island

Ms. Salazar. Vieques, sir. The U.S.S. *Eisenhower* is scheduled to begin exercises December 1st off the coast of Puerto Rico in Vieques. Will you approve the use of live fire?

The President. Before that happens, I hope and believe there's a chance that we will reach an accommodation between the Navy and the Government and the representatives of Puerto Rico.

Let me say, as I've said before, I think the fact that there was an agreement made back in 1983, that then the Navy and the Defense Department regularly and flagrantly ignored, treating Puerto Rico as if it were still a colony, is really at the root of all this.

I think that, as you know, that the Pentagon has a point, in the sense that if you look at what we had to do in Kosovo, for example, or what we had to do earlier in Bosnia, they need to be able to train. They have to be able to do live-fire training somewhere. They need to be able to fly over water. We also have to do landings. You know, when

we restored the democratically elected government of Haiti, thank God there was no violence, but there could have been. And we have to practice, you know, how do we approach on the shore?

On the other hand, we don't want to be in a position of jamming down the throat of Puerto Rico, and the people and the elected officials of Puerto Rico, one bad memory after another of a longstanding relationship where we didn't honor our commitments.

So what Secretary Cohen has tried to do is take the security report he got saying, you know, we need to use Vieques for 5 more years—and the reality of the feelings of the people of Puerto Rico and the positions of the leaders—and we're trying hard to work through both of those in a way that there can be an agreement.

I think the most important thing is we get out of this treating Puerto Rico as if it were literally, for these purposes, a colony of the United States. It is not a colony. And if—you know, I think the Congress should give them an authoritative vote on whether they want to be a State or continue commonwealth status. I mean, the last vote they had was very close, narrowly for commonwealth, but it wasn't a sanctioned vote by the Congress.

So I have done as much as I could to try to restore the integrity of the relationship between the people and the Government of Puerto Rico and the United States. And so for me, because I'm the Commander in Chief, and I also have heavy responsibilities to ensure the preparedness and the integrity of our Armed Forces—there's a reason we lost no pilots on Kosovo. It's because they train hard, and they're careful. And we try to save lives.

So this is a very difficult decision. But I believe there is an agreement which can be made here, which respects the legitimate interests both of the people of Puerto Rico, particularly those that live on Vieques, and the national security interests of the Navy. And so they're trying to get there. And before I answer the specific questions, I'm going to give them a chance to get there. We've got about a month, and we're going to work hard at it.

Immigration Policy

Ms. Salazar. Two weeks, sir. One more, on immigration. Immigration laws have disrupted the lives, or many people think that they have disrupted the lives of thousands of Hispanic families, or they consider that's the way. Will the issue be resolved before you leave office?

The President. Well, many of the difficulties have been resolved. We have repealed almost 100 percent of the cuts that were imposed in the welfare reform law. And we have tried to alleviate some of the very harsh impacts of the law which would require the return of people who have been here for a long time.

Ms. Salazar. Who have children who were born here.

The President. That's right. And I am now trying—and also, by Executive order—everything I could do without an act of Congress, I believe I have done. So the specific answer to your question is, we've done a lot. There are still some important things to do. And I will do my best. I can't say whether it will be done or not, because some of the things that have to be done require an act of Congress. And the Congress has actually been pretty helpful to me in this since '96, in putting the pieces back together. And I'm doing my best to stop any more family disruption.

Ms. Salazar. And you are aware of the disruptions and the problems?

The President. Oh, absolutely. It's been terrible problems. And I have tried to minimize them, and I will continue to work on it.

New York Senate Race

Ms. Salazar. Well, I was going to ask you about who you were going to vote for in Senate, State Senate of New York, but they won't let me.

The President. I think you know. I will authorize you——

Ms. Salazar. You live in New York now, sir, right?

The President. I will authorize you to tell the people who I'll vote for for Senator in New York.

NOTE: The interview was taped at 7:20 p.m. on November 4 in the Performance Studio at the Artists Collective for later broadcast. The transcript was embargoed for release by the Office of the Press Secretary until 6 p.m. on November 5. In his remarks, the President referred to actor Charlton Heston, president, National Rifle Association; and President Fidel Castro of Cuba. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

November 6, 1999

Good morning. Today I want to talk to you about new steps we're taking to make America safer for consumers, particularly for older Americans.

For 7 years now, we've worked hard to build safer streets and stronger communities, and our strategy is working. We have the lowest crime rate in 30 years. Our Nation is safer. But no one really believes America is as safe as it can be. We have to fight all kinds of crime at every level.

To many of our most vulnerable citizens, especially our seniors, the greatest threat may not come from a criminal on the street, but from a scam artist on the phone. Every year, illegal telemarketers bilk the American people of an estimated $40 billion, and more than half the victims are over 50 years of age.

Telemarketing thieves are stealing more than money; they're stealing people's hopes and dreams and their security. In far too many cases, victims have been robbed of savings they've spent a whole lifetime building up. Some have even lost their homes as a result.

Over the years, I've taken a number of steps to crack down on telemarketing fraud. I signed into law the toughest criminal penalties for telemarketing crimes in history. Our enforcement efforts have resulted in more than 300 convictions nationwide. But we have to do more.

Today I am announcing important new tools to help government, organizations, and consumers take action. And I'm directing the Attorney General to send me a plan to crack down on consumer fraud. Specifically, I'm calling on the Justice Department to strengthen prevention and enforcement and improve coordination among the Federal Government, State and local law enforcement officials, and our consumer groups.

Citizens also need new tools to take on telemarketing fraud and to find out where to go for help. According to a recent study, one out of four Americans said they wouldn't know where to turn if they were victimized by a telemarketing scam. This is an even greater concern as we enter the holiday season and the chance of becoming a victim of fraud rises.

That's why today we're launching a new nationwide campaign to help consumers fight telemarketing ripoffs. It's called Project kNOw Fraud, and it's led by the U.S. Postal Service, the American Association of Retired Persons, the Council of Better Business Bureaus, the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the National Association of Attorneys General, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

This campaign will give consumers new resources to slam the phone on telemarketing scams. Beginning November 15th, every household in America will receive an easy to read postcard with commonsense tips and practical guidelines to prevent telemarketing fraud. This is the largest consumer protection mailing in our history. It will provide information you can keep by the phone to help you distinguish between fraudulent and legitimate telemarketers. The bottom line is this: You must familiarize yourself with the telltale signs of fraud, and don't give out important personal financial information to an unknown caller.

We're also establishing a new toll free number that will soon be up and running to help people who believe they've been the victims of telemarketing fraud. It will provide links to law enforcement officials who will be able to share information and track down patterns of fraud. As many as 1½ million callers are expected to utilize this new service every year. We've also created a new website for consumers to receive fraud prevention information and even file a complaint on-line. It can be found at www.consumer.gov.

With our actions today we're sending a clear message to fraudulent telemarketers: We've got your number, and we won't let you off the hook.

As we close out the budget season in Washington, I urge Congress to send the same message, to reject arbitrary, across-the-board cuts that will undermine our law enforcement efforts and instead send me a budget that will protect our families and our communities and advance our values.

Let's all answer the call of the American people, put partisanship aside, and finish the work we've been sent here to do.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 7:15 p.m. on November 5 in the Room 137 at Englewood High School in Chicago, IL, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on November 6. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 5 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast.

Memorandum on Protecting Consumers From Fraud

November 6, 1999

Memorandum for the Attorney General

Subject: Protecting Consumers from Fraud

My Administration has taken unprecedented steps to safeguard consumers through vigorous law enforcement and prevention, but we must continue to do more. For example, we have announced new initiatives on Internet fraud and identity theft that call on law enforcement to step up their efforts on behalf of consumers. In addition, as part of my 21st Century Crime bill, I announced several new measures that will help protect elderly Americans from fraudulent activities. My crime bill will give the Department of Justice new authority to block and terminate telephone service to illegal telemarketers. In addition, it will give Federal prosecutors new tools to protect nursing home residents from abuse and neglect; to fight health care fraud; and to safeguard retirement and pension plans.

Consumers are often unaware of where to receive assistance. A recent Postal Inspection Service survey found that 12 percent of respondents admitted to being a victim of fraud, but that 25 percent of all respondents did not know where to go for help if they were the victim of telemarketing or mail fraud.

Today I announced the "kNOw Fraud" project, which is a public-private partnership of the United States Postal Service, the American Association of Retired Persons, the Council of Better Business Bureaus, the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), the National Association of Attorneys General, and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Even though violent crime rates are at record lows, illegal telemarketing fraud costs Americans an estimated $40 billion every year. Project "kNOw Fraud" will help arm consumers with needed information so that they can protect themselves from telemarketing fraud. This initiative shows how Government can serve the public when working in close coordination to vigorously enforce consumer protection laws and keep the public informed about new scams and how to avoid them.

Federal agencies such as the FTC and the SEC also have initiated important consumer protection initiatives in order to thwart fraudulent activities. The FTC's Consumer Response Center takes consumer complaints and inputs them into a centralized database, the Consumer Sentinel, which is available for use by Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies across the country and in Canada. Since its launch, Consumer Sentinel counts some 214 partner organizations that have contributed an estimated 200,000 complaints to the database, allowing law enforcement officials to ascertain whether a complaint is an isolated incident or part of a wider pattern of activity. Last year, the SEC's Office of Investor Education and Assistance handled more than 60,000 consumer complaints and inquiries, many of which dealt with telemarketing or online fraud. In addition, the SEC's website warns the public about fast-breaking scams and tells consumers how to investigate investment opportunities.

Recognizing the need for closer coordination, earlier this year you directed the Council on White Collar Crime to coordinate and bolster the consumer protection activities of the Department of Justice, the FTC, the SEC, the Postal Inspection Service, and others. To further these efforts, I direct you to report back to me within 6 months with a plan (1) to better prevent consumer fraud

activities and (2) improve coordination among the Federal Government's consumer protection activities to ensure that each agency's expertise is considered. In creating this plan, you should consult with all interested parties, including other Federal agencies and offices, including the FTC and SEC; State and local law enforcement; and consumer agencies and consumers. This plan also should build on efforts of the private sector, including nonprofits, to protect consumers.

These steps, taken together, will help to protect consumers from fraud and also help to save consumers millions of dollars in the next millennium.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 5 but was embargoed for release until 10:06 a.m. on November 6. An original was not available for verification of the content of this memorandum.

Statement on the Death of Joseph Serna, Jr.

November 7, 1999

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the death of Mayor Joe Serna earlier today. Joe was an extraordinary public servant, educator, father, husband, and friend. He was a great leader of Sacramento and a source of inspiration to the Hispanic community and all Americans. Our Nation has lost a remarkable man. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family.

Notice—Continuation of Iran Emergency

November 5, 1999

On November 14, 1979, by Executive Order 12170, the President declared a national emergency to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States constituted by the situation in Iran. Notices of the continuation of this national emergency have been transmitted annually by the President to the Congress and the *Federal Register*. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on November 12, 1998. Because our relations with Iran have not yet returned to normal, and the process of implementing the January 19, 1981, agreements with Iran is still underway, the national emergency declared on November 14, 1979, must continue in effect beyond November 14, 1999. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency with respect to Iran. This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 5, 1999.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., November 9, 1999]

NOTE: This notice was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 8, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on November 10.

Message to the Congress on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Iran

November 5, 1999

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency declared in 1979 is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 1999, to the *Federal Register* for publication. Similar notices have been sent annually to the Congress and published in the *Federal Register* since November 12, 1980. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on November 12, 1998. This emergency is separate from that declared with respect to Iran on March 15, 1995, in Executive Order 12957.

The crisis between the United States and Iran that began in 1979 has not been fully resolved. The international tribunal established to adjudicate claims of the United States and U.S. nationals against Iran and of the Iranian government and Iranian nationals against the United States continues to function, and normalization of commercial and diplomatic relations between the United States and Iran has not been achieved. On March 15, 1995, I declared a separate national emergency with respect to Iran pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and imposed separate sanctions. By Executive Order 12959 of May 6, 1995, these sanctions were significantly augmented, and by Executive Order 13059 of August 19, 1997, the sanctions imposed in 1995 were further clarified. In these circumstances, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities that are in place by virtue of the November 14, 1979, declaration of emergency, including the authority to block certain property of the Government of Iran, and which are needed in the process of implementing the January 1981 agreements with Iran.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 5, 1999.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 8. An original was not available for verification of the content of this message.

Message to the Congress Transmitting a Report on the National Emergency With Respect to Sudan

November 5, 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 (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 5, 1999.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 8.

Remarks on Departure for Georgetown University and an Exchange With Reporters

November 8, 1999

Budget Negotiations

The President. Good afternoon. Over the weekend, we made some progress toward creating a budget that reflects the values of the American people, respects the need for our Government to live within its means, and looks to our future. I believe we can finish our work by Wednesday if we put partisanship aside and focus instead on achieving goals that the vast majority of the American people want us to achieve: a better education for our children, safer streets, a clean environment, more Americans brought into the circle of our growing prosperity.

Improving education is perhaps the greatest domestic challenge our Nation faces. Education is at the heart of this budget debate. Last fall we took an important step to improve learning in the classroom. We reached an agreement with Congress to help States and school districts begin hiring 100,000 new, highly trained teachers to reduce class size in the early grades.

The need was obvious. School enrollments are exploding. Record numbers of teachers are or will soon be at retirement. And the research is clear that students do learn more in smaller classes with quality teachers.

Last week we learned from a new survey of the Nation's largest school districts that our class size reduction initiative so far has done precisely what it was intended to do. It has put more teachers in the classroom and increased training for those already there with a minimum of redtape and bureaucracy. Now we have even more new evidence that our class size reduction is working.

Today I am releasing a new report from the Department of Education. It's called ''Local Success Stories: Reducing Class Size.'' It shows that in just one year, schools across America have actually hired over 29,000 new, highly trained teachers, thanks to our class size reduction initiative. The report also shows that in the early grades in those schools, class size has been reduced by an average of five students per class. Over 1.7 million students are now directly benefiting from this class size initiative.

It shows we are headed in the right direction, and that's the good news. But we must remember, only a fraction of America's students have been reached. So we must continue down that path, not abandon it. I am committed to providing more teachers and better teachers for all our schools. I want to make sure every young student in America receives the benefits of more individual attention and a more disciplined learning environment in a smaller class size setting.

Now, last fall congressional Republicans agreed to support this initiative. Indeed, it was election season, and they even went home and campaigned on it. It was a good idea then, and it's still a good idea. But suddenly the Republican majority has mysteriously changed its mind. Instead of keeping their commitment to hire more teachers and reduce class size—again I say, something they bragged on and ran on last year—now they want an open-ended block grant which could even be used for vouchers for private schools. I think that is wrong.

Nine out of 10 students in our country attend public schools. The percentage of the funding coming from the Federal Government is already too meager, in my judgment. Therefore, our taxpayer money should go for more teachers and smaller classes in our public schools, not for vouchers for private schools.

I am absolutely committed to keeping the promise that I made, and the promise that Congress made, to reduce class size with more quality teachers in the early grades. We need to work together to find a way to keep that promise.

We also must demand more accountability for results, so I call on Congress to pass our plan to help States and schools districts turn around failing schools or shut them down. Working together we can find a way to deliver a budget that meets our values.

We also value the safety of our families, so we must extent our successful COPS program, which has given us already the lowest crime rate in 30 years, and now put up to 50,000 new community police officers in our neighborhoods with the modern equipment they need to keep the crime rate coming down.

We must support our lands legacy initiative because we value the environment, to set aside precious natural areas for future generations and reject special interest riders that would endanger our environment.

Because we value one America with justice for all, we must pass strong hate crimes legislation. And I would like to say that I want to express my personal appreciation to the parents of Matthew Shepard and to the police officers who have come with them here today and have gone to Capitol Hill to lobby for the hate crimes legislation.

We value our national security and our leadership in the world. Therefore, we have to pay our dues to the United Nations. We value equal opportunity. And so before Congress leaves we should tackle one more urgent priority: We ought to raise the minimum wage so that more people will participate in our prosperity. And we ought to raise the minimum wage without holding it hostage to special interest tax cuts that are not paid for and don't address national needs.

We can do all this, and we can do it and pay for it, not spend the Social Security Trust Fund and continue to pay down the debt so that in 15 years we'll be debt-free for the first time since 1835. I urge Congress to continue to work with me in a bipartisan fashion to finish the job the American people sent us here to do.

Thank you.

Reduction of Class Size

Q. Mr. President, on the issue of funding for teachers, sir, you resent it when Congress tells you to spend money in ways in which you do not deem appropriate. Why should a State Governor, who would like to spend that money differently, feel any differently?

The President. Well, because it's not their money. If they don't want the money, they don't have to take it. If they're offended by it, they can give it to other States and other school districts.

Look, we have—the difference is, we are acting on evidence, based on what the local school districts tell us and what we know. We have a record number of schoolchildren; we have a record number of teachers starting to retire. We have mountain upon mountain of evidence that smaller classes in the early grades lead to permanent learning gains if the teachers are well-qualified.

And Congress agreed with that last year. I'd like to see them answer instead why they're ready so—excuse me, so willing to abandon something they campaigned on and asked people to vote for them for doing just a year ago.

This is the right thing to do. It's good educational policy. And let me remind you that the teachers have supported this; the educators have supported this; and the evidence supports this. That's why I'm for it.

Q. Mr. President, do you expect China to get into the——

Q. The Department of Labor——

The President. One at a time, sorry.

Unemployment Insurance

Q. The Department of Labor, at your direction, is drafting regulations to change the use of unemployment insurance so that it could be used for family leave purposes. Opponents of this idea say you don't have the authority to do this, that any such change should be done by Federal legislation. How do you respond to that?

The President. Well, I was informed that we did have the authority to do it in the narrow way that we're doing it. And I think if you want more information on what the arguments are, you will have to talk to either the Labor Department Counsel or the appropriate people at the White House. But I obviously would not have done it if I hadn't been told that we had the authority to do it.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

China and the World Trade Organization

Q. Mr. President, do you expect China to get into the World Trade Organization this time around?

The President. I don't know, but I hope so. Ambassador Barshefsky and Mr. Sperling have gone over there to work on it, and we're doing our best.

Q. Are things looking better?

The President. Well, I don't know yet. Let's not characterize the in-between until we see whether we can produce the product.

Budget Negotiations

Q. Mr. President,—[*inaudible*]—real sticking point——

The President. Obviously, we have a big difference of opinion on education, and I feel very strongly about it. The education community and the country feel strongly about it. And the Democrats in Congress feel strongly about it. And the Republicans felt strongly about it when they were facing an election, and I think it's wrong for them to abandon a commitment the next year that they were proud of in an election year. So I hope we can work that out.

But the other issues I mentioned are all important to me, as well. Can we do it all by Wednesday? In a heartbeat, if we decide to get together. We resolved very quickly many of our differences over the foreign operations bill, and we can do that on these other bills if we really work at it.

Mexican Presidential Primary

Q. Mr. President, Mexico has held its first Presidential primary. The PRI has governed Mexico for over 70 years. What do you think about it, the primary yesterday?

The President. I think it's a good thing that they held a primary, and I think the more democracy they embrace, the better. So I would applaud them and congratulate them for having done so. And particularly, I would like to congratulate President Zedillo, who took the initiative to promote this primary and to open up the political process in his country.

Situation in Pakistan

Q. Mr. President, how would you characterize the situation in Pakistan differently than George W. Bush did this last week?

The President. Oh, I—look. I don't want to get into that. You all can handle the Presidential campaign without me. You know that I'm very concerned about the interruption of civilian leadership in Pakistan. We would like to see a stronger democratic system there, not the abandonment of the system that they did have. And we are—we have communicated that to General Musharraf and to the others, and we will continue to work with them and hope that we can achieve some progress there.

And I also want to encourage them to continue to work to diminish tensions with India and to resolve matters in Kashmir, not to continue to use that, as has been done in times past, to inflame tension on both sides of the line of control, and in both countries. Those countries need to be working on their long-term challenges and their common interests. And so I will continue to push for that as well.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:30 p.m. on the South Grounds at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to murder victim Matthew Shepard's parents, Dennis and Judy; President Ernesto Zedillo of Mexico; and Gen. Pervaiz Musharraf, head of the Pakistani Armed Forces, who led a military coup d'etat in Pakistan on October 14.

Remarks at Georgetown University

November 8, 1999

Thank you very much, Secretary Albright, for your introduction and your leadership. From the reception you just received, I would say you can come home at any time. But I hope you'll wait a while longer.

Thank you, Father O'Donovan, for welcoming me back to Georgetown. Dean Gallucci, thank you. Mrs. Quandt, thank you so much for this lecture. And to the representatives of BMW, members of the diplomatic community, the many distinguished citizens who are here, and to Mr. Billington, Mrs. Graham, and others, and to all the young students who are here—in many ways, this day is especially for you.

I too want to say a special word of thanks to Prime Minister Zeman of the Czech Republic and Prime Minister Dzurinda of Slovakia. They have come a long way to be with us today. They have come a long way with their people in the last decade, from dictatorship to democracy, from command and control to market economies, from isolation to integration with Europe and the rest of the world. It has been a remarkable journey. You and your people have made the most of the triumph of freedom after the cold war. We thank you for your example and for your leadership and your friendship, and we welcome you. Thank you.

Today we celebrate one of history's most remarkable triumphs of human freedom, the anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, surely one of the happiest and most important days of the 20th century.

For the young people, the undergraduates who are here who were, at that time, 9 or 10 years old, it must be hard to sense the depth of oppression of the communist system, the sense of danger that gripped America and the world. I still remember all of our air-raid drills when I was in grade school, preparing for the nuclear war as if we got in some basement it would be all right. [*Laughter*] It, therefore, may be hard to imagine the true sense of exuberance and pride that the free world felt a decade ago.

So, today, I say to you, it is important to recall the major events of that period, to remember the role America was privileged to play in the victory of freedom in Europe, to review what we have done since, to realize the promise of that victory, and most important of all, to reaffirm our determination to finish the job, to complete a Europe whole, free, democratic, and at peace, for the first time in all of history.

Let's start by looking back a decade ago at Berlin. If the Soviet empire was a prison, then Berlin was the place where everyone could see the bars and look behind them. On one side of the wall lived a free people, shaping their destiny in the image of their dreams. On the other lived a people who desperately wanted to be free, that had found themselves trapped beyond a wall of deadly

uniformity and daily indignities, in an empire that, indeed, could only exist behind a wall, for, ever if an opening appeared, letting ideas in and people out, the whole structure surely would collapse.

In the end, that is exactly what happened in the fall of 1989. Poland and Hungary already were on the road to democracy. President Gorbachev of the Soviet Union had made clear that Soviet forces would not stand in their way. Then Hungary opened its borders to the West, allowing East Germans to escape. Then the dam broke. Berliners took to the street, shouting, ''We are one people.'' And on November 9th, a decade ago, the wall was breached. Two weeks later, the Velvet Revolution swept Czechoslovakia, started by university students, just like the undergraduates here, marching through Prague, singing the Czech version of ''We Shall Overcome.'' Then, in Romania, the dictator Ceausescu, fell in the bloody uprising. A little more than a year later, the Soviet Union itself was no more. A democratic Russia was born.

Those events transformed our world and changed our lives and shaped the future of the young people in this grand room today. Yes, the students of our era will still grow to live in a world full of danger, but probably, and hopefully, they will not have to live in fear of a total war in which millions could be killed in a single deadly exchange. Yes, America will still bear global responsibilities, but we will be able to invest more of our wealth in the welfare of our children and more of our energy in peaceful pursuits.

You will compete in a global marketplace, travel to more places than any generation before you, share ideas and experiences with people from every culture, more and more of whom have embraced and will continue to embrace both democracy and free markets.

How did all this happen? Well, mostly it happened because, from the very beginning, oppressed people refused to accept their fate; not in Poland in 1981, when Lech Walesa jumped over the wall at the Gdansk Shipyard and Solidarity first went on strike, or in Czechoslovakia, during the Prague Spring of 1968. I was there a year and a half later as a young student, and I never will forget the look in the eyes of the university students then and their determination eventually to be free.

They did not accept their fate in Hungary in 1956, or even in St. Petersburg way back in 1920, when the sailors who had led the Soviet revolution first rose against their new oppressors. They did not accept their fate in any Soviet home where the practice of religion was preserved, though it was suppressed by the state, or in countless acts of resistance we have never heard of, committed by heroes whose names we will never know.

The amazing fact is that all those years of repression simply failed to crush people's spirits or their hunger for freedom. Years of lies just made them want the truth that much more. Years of violence just made them want peaceful struggle and peaceful politics that much more. Though denied every opportunity to express themselves, when they were finally able to do it, they did a remarkable job of saying quite clearly what they believed and what they wanted: democratic citizenship and the blessings of ordinary life.

Of course, their victory also would not have been possible without the perseverance of the United States and our allies, standing firm against the Iron Curtain and standing firm with the friends of freedom behind it. Fifty years ago, when all this began, it was far from certain that we would do that. It took determination: the determination of President Truman to break the blockade of the Soviet Union of Berlin, to send aid to Greece and Turkey, to meet aggression in Korea. It took the determination of all his successors to ensure that Soviet expansion went not further than it did.

It took vision: the vision of American leaders who launched the Marshall Plan and brought Germany into NATO, not just to feed Europe or to defend it but to unify it as never before, around freedom and democracy. It took persistence: the persistence of every President, from Eisenhower to Kennedy to Bush, to pursue policies for four decades until they bore fruit.

It took resources to bolster our friends and build a military that adversaries ultimately knew they could not match. It took faith to believe that we could prevail while avoiding both appeasement and war; that our open

society would in time prove stronger than any closed and fearful society.

It took conviction: the conviction of President Reagan, who said so plainly what many people on the other side of the Wall had trouble understanding, that the Soviet empire was evil and the wall should be torn down; the conviction of President Carter, who put us on the side of dissidents and kept them alive to fight another day.

And it took leadership in building alliances and keeping them united in crisis after crisis and, finally, under President Bush, in managing skillfully the fall of the Soviet empire and the unification of Germany and setting the stage for a Europe whole and free.

This was the situation, the remarkable situation that I inherited when I took office in 1993. The cold war had been won. But in many ways, Europe was still divided, between the haves and have-nots, between the secure and insecure, between members of NATO and the EU and those who were not members of either body and felt left out in the cold, between those who had reconciled themselves with people of different racial and religious and ethnic groups within their borders and those who were still torn apart by those differences.

And so we set out to do for the Eastern half of Europe what we helped to do for the Western half after World War II: to provide investment and aid, to tear down trade barriers so new democracies could stand on their feet economically; to help them overcome tensions that had festered under communism; and to stand up to the forces of aggression and hate, as we did in the Balkans; to expand our institutions, beginning with NATO, so that a Europe of shared values could become a Europe of shared responsibilities and benefits.

Since then, there have unquestionably been some setbacks, some small and some great. Under communism, most everyone was equally poor. Now, some people race ahead while others lag far behind. Former dissidents who once struggled for freedom are now politicians trying to create jobs, to fight corruption and crime, to provide basic security for people who are simply tired of having to struggle.

Most terrible of all have been the wars in the former Yugoslavia, which claimed a quarter-million lives and pushed millions from their homes. But still, 10 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, most of Europe is unquestionably better off, as these two leaders so clearly demonstrate.

Democracy has taken root, from Estonia in the north to Bulgaria in the south. Some of the most vibrant economies in the world now lie east of the old Iron Curtain. Russia has withdrawn its troops from Central Europe and the Baltics, accepted the independence of its neighbors and, for all its own problems, has not wavered from the path of democracy.

The armed forces of most every country, from Ukraine to Romania all the way to Central Asia, now actually train with NATO. NATO has three new allies, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, three strong democracies that have stood with us in every crisis, from Iraq to Bosnia to Kosovo. Other new democracies are eager to join us as well, including Slovakia, and they know our alliance is open to all who are ready to meet its obligations. Eleven countries are beginning a process that will lead them to membership in the European Union.

And just as important, because we and our allies stood up to ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and Kosovo, the century is not ending on a note of despair with the knowledge that innocent men, women, and children on the doorstep of NATO can be expelled and killed simply because of their ethnic heritage and the way they worship their God. Instead, it ends with a ringing affirmation of the inherent human dignity of every individual, with our alliance of 19 democracies strong and united, working with partners across the continent, including Russia, to keep the peace in the Balkans, with new hope for a Europe that can be, for the first time in history, undivided, democratic, and at peace. I hope all of you will be proud of what your country and its allies have achieved, but I hope you will be even more determined to finish the job, for there is still much to be done.

On Friday, I will leave on a trip to Greece and Turkey, Italy and Bulgaria. This trip is about reinforcing ties with some of our oldest

allies, and completing the unfinished business of building that stable, unified, and democratic Europe. I believe there are three principal remaining challenges to that vision that we must meet across the Atlantic, and I might say one great challenge we must meet at home.

The first is the challenge of building the right kind of partnership with Russia, a Russia that is stable, democratic, and cooperatively engaged with the West. That is difficult to do because Russia is struggling economically. It has tens of thousands of weapons scientists—listen to this—it has tens of thousands of weapons scientists making an average of $100 a month, struggling to maintain the security of a giant nuclear arsenal. It has mired itself again in a cruel cycle of violence in Chechnya that is claiming many innocent lives.

We should protect our interests with Russia and speak plainly about actions we believe are wrong. But we should also remember what Russia is struggling to overcome and the legacy with which it must deal. Less than a generation ago, the Russians were living in a society that had no rule of law, no private initiative, no truth-telling, no chance for individuals to shape their own destiny. Now they live in a country with a free press, with almost a million small businesses, a country that should experience next year its first democratic transfer of power in a thousand years.

Russia's transformation has just begun. It is incomplete. It is awkward. Sometimes it is not pretty, but we have a profound stake in its success. Years from now, I don't think we will be criticized, any of us, for doing too much to help. But we can certainly be criticized if we do too little.

A second challenge will be to implement, with our allies, a plan for stability in the Balkans, so that region's bitter ethnic problems can no longer be exploited by dictators and Americans do not have to cross the Atlantic again to fight in another war. We will do that by strengthening democracies in the region, promoting investment and trade, bringing nations steadily into Western institutions, so they feel a unifying magnet that is more powerful than the internal forces that divide them.

I want to say that again—I am convinced that the only way to avoid future Balkan wars is to integrate the countries of Southeastern Europe more with each other and then more with the rest of Europe. We have to create positive forces that pull the people toward unity, which are stronger than the forces of history pulling them toward division, hatred, and death.

We must also push for a democratic transition in Serbia. Mr. Milosevic is the last living relic of the age of European dictators of the Communist era. That era came crashing down with the Wall. He sought to preserve his dictatorship by substituting Communist totalitarianism with ethnic hatred and the kind of mindless unity that follows if you are bound together by your hatred of people who are different from you. The consequences have been disastrous—not only for the Bosnians and the Kosovars but for the Serbs as well.

If we are going to make democracy and tolerance the order of the day in the Balkans, so that they, too, can tap into their innate intelligence and ingenuity and enjoy prosperity and freedom, there can be no future for him and his policy of manipulating human differences for inhuman ends.

A third challenge is perhaps the oldest of them all, and in some ways, perhaps the hardest: to build a lasting peace in the Aegean Sea region, to achieve a true reconciliation between Greece and Turkey, and bridge the gulf between Europe and the Islamic world.

When I am in Greece, I'm going to speak about the vital role Greece is playing and can play in Europe. The world's oldest democracy is a model to the younger democracies of the Balkans, a gateway to their markets, a force for stability in the region. The one thing standing between Greece and its true potential is the tension in its relationship with Turkey.

Greece and Turkey, ironically, are both our NATO Allies, and each other's NATO Allies. They have served together with distinction in the Balkans. Their people helped each other with great humanity when the terrible earthquakes struck both lands earlier this year. This is a problem that can be solved. Eventually, it will be solved. And I

intend to see that the United States does everything we possibly can to be of help. When I go to Turkey, I will point out that much of the history of the 20th century, for better or worse, was shaped by the way the old Ottoman Empire collapsed before and after World War I, and the decisions that the European powers made in the aftermath.

I believe the coming century will be shaped in good measure by the way in which Turkey, itself, defines its future and its role today and tomorrow, for Turkey is a country at the crossroads of Europe, the Middle East, and Central Asia. The future can be shaped for the better if Turkey can become fully a part of Europe, as a stable, democratic, secular, Islamic nation.

This too can happen if there is progress in overcoming differences with Greece, especially over Cyprus, if Turkey continues to strengthen respect for human rights, and if there is a real vision on the part of our European allies, who must be willing to reach out and to believe that it is at Turkey where Europe and the Muslim world can meet in peace and harmony, to give us a chance to have the future of our dreams in that part of the world in the new millennium.

Now the last challenge is one we can only meet here at home. We have to decide, quite simply, to maintain the tradition of American leadership and engagement in the world that played such a critical role in winning the cold war and in helping us to win the peace over this last decade.

Think about it: We spent trillions of dollars in the cold war to defeat a single threat to our way of life. Now we are at the height of our power and prosperity. Let me just ask you to focus on this and measure where we are as against what has been happening in the debate about maintaining our leadership. We have the lowest unemployment rate in this country in 30 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 30 years, the lowest crime rates in 30 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years, and the smallest Federal Government in 37 years. In my lifetime, we have never had—ever—as a people, the opportunity we now have to build the future of our dreams for our children.

In the early 1960's, we had an economy that closely approximated this, but we had to deal with the challenge of civil rights at home and also the Vietnam war abroad. Today, we are not burdened by crisis at home or crisis abroad, and the world is out there, looking to see what we are going to do with the blessings God has bestowed upon us at this moment in time.

Everything else I said will either happen or not happen without American involvement unless we make up our minds that we are going to stay with the approach to the world that has brought us to this happy point in human history. That is the most important decision of all.

Now, what are we doing? Well, first, our military budget is growing again to meet new demands. That has to happen. But I want to point out to all of you, it is still, in real terms, $110 billion less than it was when the Berlin Wall fell. Everyone agrees that most of that money should be reinvested here at home. But don't you think just a small part of the peace dividend should be invested in maintaining the peace we secured and meeting the unmet challenges of the 21st century?

Look at all the money we spent at such great cost over the last 50 years. The amazing fact is we are not spending a penny more today to advance our interest in the spread of peace, democracy, and free markets than we did during the 1980's. Indeed, we are spending $4 billion less each year.

I think it's worth devoting some small fraction of this Nation's great wealth and power to help build a Europe where wars don't happen, where our allies can do their share and we help them to do so; to seize this historic opportunity for peace between Arabs and Israelis in the Middle East; to make sure that nuclear weapons from the former Soviet Union don't fall into the wrong hands; to make sure that the nuclear scientists have enough money to live on and to feed their families by doing constructive, positive things so they're not vulnerable to the entreaties of the remaining forces of destruction in the world; to relieve the debts of the most impoverished countries on Earth, so they can grow their economies, build their democracies, and be good, positive partners with us in the new century; and to meet our obligations to

and through the United Nations, so that we can share the burden of leadership with others, when it obviously has such good results.

I think most Americans agree with this. But some disagree, and it appears they are disproportionately represented—[*laughter*]—in the deciding body. Some believe America can and should go it alone, either withdrawing from the world and relying primarily on our military strength or by seeking to impose our will when things are happening that don't suit us.

Well, I have taken the stand for a different sort of approach—for a foreign affairs budget that will permit us to advance our most critical priorities around the world. That's why I vetoed the first bill that reached my desk, why I'm pleased that Democrats and Republicans in Congress worked together last week on a strong compromise that meets many of our goals. But we're not finished yet. We still must work to get funding for our United Nations obligations and authorization to allow the use of IMF resources for debt relief.

This is a big issue. It has captured public attention as never before. I mean, just think about it: This initiative for debt relief for the millennium is being headlined by the Pope and Bono, the lead singer for U2. [*Laughter*] That is a very broad base of support for this initiative. [*Laughter*] Most of the rest of us can be found somewhere in between that—our pole-star leaders there.

But it's not just a political issue. It is the smart thing to do. If you go to Africa, you see what competent countries can do to get the AIDS rate down, to build democratic structures, to build successful economies and grow. But we have to give them a chance. And the same is true in Latin America, in the Caribbean, in other places. This is a big issue.

I hope the bipartisan agreement we reached over the weekend on the foreign affairs budget is a good sign that we are now moving to reestablish and preserve the bipartisan center that believes in America's role in the new post-cold-war world.

In the coming year, we have an ambitious agenda that also deserves bipartisan support. We have about 100 days to meet the ambitious timetable the leaders of the Middle East have set for themselves to achieve a framework agreement. We have to secure the peace in the Balkans. We have to ease tensions between India and Pakistan. We have to help Russia to stabilize its economy, resolve the conflict in Chechnya, and cheer them on as they have their first democratic transfer of power, ever.

We have to bring China into the World Trade Organization, while continuing to speak plainly about human rights and religious freedom. We have to launch a new global trade round, enact the African and Caribbean trade bills, press ahead with debt relief, support the hopeful transitions to democracy in Nigeria and Indonesia, help Colombia defeat the narcotraffickers, contain Iraq, and restrain North Korea's missile program. We have to continue to do more to fight terrorism around the world. And we must do what is necessary—and for the young people here, I predict for 20 years this will become a national security issue—we have to do more to reverse the very real phenomenon of global warming and climate change.

To meet those challenges and more, we simply must hold on to the qualities that sustained us throughout the long cold war, the wisdom to see that America benefits when the rest of the world is moving toward freedom and prosperity, to recognize that if we wait until problems come home to America before we act, they will come home to America.

We need the determination to stand up to the enemies of peace, whether tyrants like Milosevic or terrorists like those who attacked our Embassies in Africa. We need faith in our own capacity to do what is right, even when it's hard, whether that means building peace in the Middle East or democracy in Russia or a constructive partnership with China. We need the patience to stick with those efforts for as long as it takes and the resources to see them through. And most of all, we need to maintain the will to lead, to provide the kind of American leadership that for 50 years has brought friends and allies to our side, while moving mountains around the world.

Years from now, I want people to say those were the qualities of this generation of Americans. I want them to say that when the cold

war ended, we refused to settle for the easy satisfaction of victory, to walk home and let our European friends go it alone. We did not allow the larger prize of a safer, better world to slip through our fingers. We stood and supported the Germans as they bravely reunified, and supported the Europeans as they built a true union and expanded it. We stood against ethnic slaughter and ethnic cleansing. We stood for the right kind of partnership with Russia. We acted to try to help Christian and Jewish and Muslim people reconcile themselves in the Middle East, and in the bridge represented by Turkey's outreach to Europe. I want them to say that America followed through, so that we would not have to fight again.

A few months ago, my family and I went to a refugee camp full of children from Kosovo. They were chanting their appreciation to the United States, thanking America for giving them a chance to reclaim their lives. It was an incredibly moving event, with children who have been traumatized far beyond their ability even to understand what has happened to them but who know they have been given a chance to go home now.

Years from now, I believe the young people in this audience will have a chance to go to Europe time and time again, and you will, doubtless, meet some of those children or maybe some of the young people who actually tore down the Berlin Wall or marched in the Velvet Revolution. They will be older then. I hope they will say, ''When I was young I sang America's praises with my voice, but I still carry them in my heart.'' I think that will be true if America stays true. That is what we ought to resolve to do on the anniversary of this marvelous triumph of freedom.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:27 p.m. in Gaston Hall at Georgetown University, as part of the Herbert Quandt Distinguished Lecture series. In his remarks, he referred to Father Leo J. O'Donovan, president, and Robert L. Gallucci, dean, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University; Johanna Quandt, widow of Herbert Quandt; James H. Billington, Librarian of Congress; Katherine Graham, chairman of the executive committee, the Washington Post; Prime Minister Milos Zeman of the Czech Republic; Prime Minister Mikulas Dzurinda of Slovakia; and President Slobodan Milosevic of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

Proclamation 7248—Veterans Day, 1999

November 8, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Throughout U.S. history, Americans have kept a special place of honor in their hearts for our veterans; and for more than 70 years, we have set aside each November 11 to recognize the men and women who have so valiantly served America. On this day, we remember and pay tribute to the millions of patriots whose courage and sacrifice have secured our freedom—from those who suffered through the harsh winter at Valley Forge to those who preserved our Union on the battlefields of Gettysburg to those who turned back the tide of tyranny and hatred on the beaches of Normandy to those who have kept the peace and defended our values around the globe.

Since the first days of our independence, brave Americans have stepped forward to protect our country and promote our ideals. Some 48 million men and women from every corner of our country and from every walk of life have served in our Nation's Armed Forces, and 41 million of them have done so under hostile conditions. Their service often put them in harm's way, far from home and family, and too often it cost them their lives.

Time and again, America has called on her men and women in uniform to protect our national security, to advance our national interests, and to preserve our rights and freedoms. And time and again, our Armed Forces have responded by overcoming daunting challenges to achieve hard-fought victories. In battles that would determine our Nation's destiny, in wars that would decide the fate of the free world, in peacekeeping missions that would change forever the lives and futures of peoples fighting oppression, they have persevered in the face of adversity and have prevailed.

Such victories do not come easily. They exact a heavy toll in lives cut short, in families bereft, in human potential unfulfilled. It is a toll paid by the 25 million veterans still living among us, who every day carry with them the indelible memories of sacrifices made, battles fought, and comrades lost.

To pay tribute to those who have served in our Armed Forces, the Congress has provided (5 U.S.C. 6103(a)) that November 11 of each year shall be set aside as a legal public holiday to honor America's veterans. For all their sacrifices and for the peace, prosperity, and liberty their service has secured for us, our Nation owes our veterans a profound debt of gratitude. In commemorating this solemn day, we express our deep appreciation for the duties they have discharged.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Thursday, November 11, 1999, as Veterans Day. I urge all Americans to honor our veterans through appropriate public ceremonies and private prayers. I call upon Federal, State, and local government officials to display the flag of the United States and to encourage and participate in patriotic activities in their communities. I invite civic and fraternal organizations, places of worship, schools, businesses, unions, and the media to support this national observance with suitable commemorative expressions and programs.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eighth day of November, 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., November 10, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on November 12.

Remarks in an On-Line Townhall Meeting

November 8, 1999

The President. More than 60 years ago, at the dawn of another era of great change, President Franklin Roosevelt told our Nation, ''new conditions impose new requirements on Government and those who conduct Government.'' From that simple proposition, Roosevelt shaped the New Deal, which helped to restore our Nation to prosperity and to define the relationship between the American people and their Government for 50 years.

Now, as we move into the information age, we have reclaimed that true legacy of Franklin Roosevelt by making a real commitment to bold experimentation, to the idea that new times demand new approaches and a different kind of Government.

This evening is a perfect example. As Al said, like FDR's fireside chats and President Kennedy's live press conferences on television, the first Presidential townhall meeting on the Internet taps the most modern technology for old-fashioned communication between the American people and their President.

Tonight's event is exciting not only because of the technology involved in its execution but, on a larger scale, for the unbridled potential it represents. You know, when I became President, in January of 1993, the Internet was the province of scientists funded by Government research projects. Back then, there were only 130 sites on the Web, only 1.3 million computers connected to the Internet. Today, over 56 million computers are connected to the Internet, and there are 3.6 million websites. And we're adding new pages at the rate of over 100,000 an hour.

Since 1993, our administration has worked hard to unleash the power of information technology and to bridge the digital divide. Vice President Gore and I set a goal of connecting every classroom and library to the Internet, and we've come a long way. The number of classrooms connected to the Internet has increased from 4 percent in 1994 to 51 percent in 1998 with the E-rate providing over $2 billion to help connect all our schools and libraries to the Internet. That's just the kind of thing Vice President Gore and I came to office to do, to replace outmoded and failed ideas of the past with a new vision for the role of Government in the 21st century.

In the early 1990's, long-neglected economic and social problems had piled up. Unemployment and welfare were high. Crime was spiraling; virtually no one believed it could be stopped. Poverty was growing. The real wages of working families were steadily falling. There were deficits as far as the eye could see. Our debt had quadrupled in just 12 years, and some experts were telling us that we couldn't really solve our problems, that Government at best was useless and at worst was the source of all of our problems.

Now, for too long, I felt that both our parties had put ideology above ideas that actually worked. And the American people too often were presented by Washington with false choices, choosing between work and family, between growing the economy and cleaning up the environment, between helping business and helping working people, between being safer or maintaining freedom, between what makes us different as a people and what makes us equal before the law and in the eyes of God. For too long Government seemed to either try to solve all of our problems or to use the failures of Government as an excuse to do nothing at all.

Now, it was in this environment that the New Democratic movement, which had been developing for nearly a decade by 1992, or what has now become known as the Third Way, began in earnest. We believe, like Franklin Roosevelt and Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson and Abraham Lincoln before him, that new conditions demand a new approach to Government. We said, in 1992, we want opportunity for all, but we also want responsibility from all our citizens, in a community of all Americans.

It was clear to Vice President Gore and to me that we couldn't meet the challenges of our new century by returning to the past but that we also had to overcome the great neglect of the 1980's. We also knew that we needed a new kind of Government which focused not on neglect or solving all the problems, but instead on giving our citizens the tools and conditions they needed to make the most of their own lives. And at the same time we had to challenge our own citizens to take a far more active role by serving in our communities and shaping our Nation's future.

Because of our commitment to Third Way principles and the hard work of the American people, our country has made a dramatic transformation. Over the last 6½ years, the American people have created almost 20 million new jobs with rising wages, the longest peacetime expansion in history, the highest homeownership ever, a 30-year low in unemployment, a 32-year low in welfare, a 30-year low in the crime rate, the first back-to-back balanced budgets in 42 years with growing projected surpluses for years to come. And all of this while we were shrinking and reinventing the Government so that it is now the smallest it's been since John Kennedy was here in the White House in 1962.

And I'm trying to continue that process by passing a budget that honors our values and our commitment in the future, with 100,000 new teachers for smaller classes, 50,000 new community police officers to keep the crime rate coming down, stronger efforts to protect and preserve our environment and to meet our responsibilities abroad.

The world is starting to take notice of what's happening here and where we're headed. Now Third Way ideas are influencing governance in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Brazil, to name just a few.

In closing, let me say that now we have to use the progress we've made and the new tools of Government and technology at our fingertips to meet the big challenges of the 21st century: the aging of America; the largest and most diverse group of schoolchildren we've ever known; extending our prosperity to people in places who haven't felt it yet; genuinely meeting the challenges of the new environment; making the most of biotechnology; getting this country out of debt for the first time since 1835; and continuing to be the world's major force for peace and freedom and against technology that proliferates nuclear weapons and biological and chemical weapons and against terrorism.

But more important than any of that, we have to find a way in this most modern of worlds to use our new knowledge and our new technology as forces for unity, not division. We have to usher in a new age of genuine enlightenment where we are coming together as a people across all the lines that

divide us. That's why I've worked for things like the ''Employment Non-Discrimination Act'' and the hate crimes legislation; why I've done as much as I could to end wars and killing and conflict based on religious or racial or ethnic hatred around the world, from the Balkans to the Middle East to Northern Ireland to Africa.

We believe that this can be a unifying age. We can celebrate our diversity, all the differences. We can respect those genuine differences of opinion as long as we understand that what unites us, our common humanity, is the most important thing of all.

Now I'd like to turn it back to Al and get on with the questions.

[*Al From, president, Democratic Leadership Council, and host, began the townhall discussion.*]

Prescription Medication

Q. My wife and I are both disabled, with two teenaged children. Our medication expenses take a very large amount of our monthly Social Security income. Will Medicare ever pay for medications?

The President. Well, the answer to that is, I certainly hope so, and I have proposed it.

As a part of our reform of the Medicare system, to deal with the fact that we're going to double the number of people over 65 within 30 years and increasing numbers of people with disabilities will have access to Medicare, I recommended a lot of changes that will actually save some money in the system but also providing a prescription drug option which would be completely voluntary.

Three-quarters of the disabled and seniors on Medicare don't have access to an affordable, adequate prescription drug program. If we were designing the program again today, given the role that prescription medication has in our lives now, as compared with 34 years ago when Medicare was established, we would certainly not even set it up without prescription medication.

We should do it. We should do it as quickly as possible. And we can afford to do it in the budget that I presented and still get the country out of debt in 15 years.

So I hope that next year—Congress is—the Republican majority has refused to deal with it this year. I certainly hope they'll deal with it next year. And maybe the fact it's an election year will make them more interested in doing so.

Health Care Reform

Q. What else can you do in your Presidential term to help the common people to have health care reform before you leave office?

The President. Well, let me just mention two things very quickly. First, we ought to pass the Patients' Bill of Rights to protect people who are in HMO's with the quality of their health care, the right to see a specialist, the right to the nearest emergency room. And we ought to have privacy in medical records. We ought to have a requirement that—and I think we'll get this, by the way—that people who are disabled who get Medicaid can go to work and not lose their Government health insurance. And we now have the funds available to sign up 5 million or more children of lower income working people, working families, on health care. We ought to try to do that.

Now one other thing we can do is to get more States to try to let more and more working families buy into the Medicaid system. Tennessee was the first State to do this, and they immediately got up over 90 percent of their people with health insurance. And we're working to try to persuade more States to do this. Then we can provide the Medicaid money, and you can work out, State-by-State, how much people pay for the premiums.

Those are just some of the things that I think we can do in my term. Now in the coming election season, I hope all the candidates will be required to talk about this because, as you know, I think it's terrible that America has so many people without health insurance who are working for a living. And I said back in '94 that if we didn't do something about it, the number would only increase, and that's exactly what's happened.

So there are some things we can do now. Some things you'll probably have to debate in the 2000 election.

Funding Higher Education

Q. How do you feel about the need for less expensive higher education?

The President. Well, you've got to be for that. I mean, everybody's for less expensive higher education. But what I'd like to emphasize is what we have done, because I think that a lot of Americans do not know that in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, we created something called the HOPE scholarship, which is a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college. We also have more generous Pell grants; we have better student loan programs. You can now borrow money through a Government loan program and pay it back at lower interest rates and as a percentage of your income, no matter how much you borrow.

So college is, as a practical matter, less expensive than it has been in many, many years because of the assistance programs that are out there. And I would urge you to look and make sure you know about every single one for which you might be eligible.

[*The discussion continued.*]

Gun Control Legislation

Q. What kind of laws would you like to see Congress pass concerning gun control?

The President. Well, first, Greg, let me say that one of the first laws I signed in 1993 was the Brady law, which requires background checks for people who buy guns in gun stores. The NRA and the others who opposed this said it wouldn't do any good, but now, in 1999, we've had 400,000 people who haven't been able to get guns because of their criminal records or other problems. And the murder rate's at a 31-year low.

So what else would I like to see? I would like to see us close the loophole in the background check law by saying there will also be background checks for guns sold at gun shows and at flea markets. I would like to see more done to limit the importation of big ammunition clips, because we banned assault weapons, but there are still loopholes in that law. I think the Brady law ought to be extended to juveniles who commit serious offenses. I don't think they ought to be able to get handguns. And I think these are very important.

Now, you may know that in the Presidential election, I think both the Democratic Presidential candidates, Vice President Gore and Senator Bradley, have recommended that people who buy handguns, at least, have to get a license like you get a driver's license, to show that you know how to use the gun safely and that your background's been checked. And I think there's some real merit to that, and that's something the American people are going to have a chance to be heard on.

But we've got the lowest crime rate in 30 years. But we ought not to quit until we're the safest big country in the world. And we won't be until we have reasonable restrictions to keep guns out of the wrong hands. They don't interfere with hunting or sport shooting. And there's more we can do. I'm strongly committed to it, and I hope you will be, too.

Funding for Research and Development

Q. Where do you see the Federal Government's role heading in funding non-defense research in science and technology?

The President. Well, most of that is done at the National Institutes of Health, at the Energy Department. It's done in universities through Federal grants. And I believe we ought to see a dramatic increase of that.

Essentially, if you look at the last few years, Congress has been good about increasing funding for NIH, not so good about increasing funding for environmental research and other non-defense areas. So good on the health care, not so good on the rest. We need more on the rest.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The Digital Divide

Q. As Government makes it services available via the Internet, how will this affect people who are not computer literate or connected? Will the non-techies be accommodated?

The President. First of all, this is a good question because this illustrates the problem of the so-called digital divide. And the answer to your question is: Number one, we will continue to provide services in non-computer options; and number two, we'll continue to do things to bridge the digital divide. We're trying to hook up all the classrooms and libraries to the Internet by the year 2000. We have community computer centers that we are establishing around the country, where

we're trying to make access to computers more universal.

But I will say this: I think we should also be trying to get people who aren't computer literate to be computer literate and then to have access to the technology, because I believe if we have the same density of computer and Internet access that we have of telephone access, that would dramatically improve the economic prospects for a lot of Americans and, I might add, a lot of people around the world.

So we have to keep providing the services in non-Internet, non-computer ways. But I think we also ought to try to get more people hooked up. And we're doing both.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. Let me just make one other point before we go on to another question, to go back to my point that we ought to try not only to provide the services for people who aren't computer literate or connected in ways they can access—of course, we have to do that—but why we should try to get more people connected and more people computer literate.

I was out in Silicon Valley in the last few weeks where the number of people from eBay, which all of you know is a remarkable trading company—I learned that in addition to the employees of eBay, some 20,000 people now make a living on eBay just trading. That's the way they make a living. And a lot of them used to be on welfare. So this technology is getting more and more user-friendly. And I think that if we continue to work toward making it more and more universal, you will create lots of more economic opportunities which will be good for the overall economy and good for people who, today, are kind of non-techies, to use your word.

Class Size

Q. Mr. President, how are you going to decrease the class sizes with the vast shortage of teachers?

The President. I think the most important thing that the Federal Government can do is to give the States the money to continue our class size initiative. Last year the Congress approved a proposal of mine to make a downpayment on putting 100,000 more teachers in our schools, concentrated on reducing class size in the early grades, because we know from lots of research that that increases educational achievement long term. This year Congress is seeking to reverse that commitment, for reasons I do not entirely understand. And I am fighting to keep it, along with the Democrats in our caucus in the House and Senate. I'm hoping that we'll have a successful resolution of this.

But you should know that—maybe you do know, since you asked the question—We have the largest number of schoolchildren in our history, the first group bigger than the baby boomers, over the last 2 years. It's the most diverse group in our history. And about 2 million teachers are going to retire over the next few years. So it's important right now to get these teachers in there that are well-trained and to get them in the early grades.

Now there's a lot of flexibility in this program. So, if class size is already small, this money can be used to retrain teachers, to upgrade their skills, and other things. But the most important thing that we can do to reduce class size is to put 100,000 more teachers in the classroom. That's the main thing I'm fighting for in the remaining budget struggles here in Washington.

That's a good question.

Tax Relief

Q. I would like to know what programs are going to be cut to provide for some of the much-needed tax relief, starting with the marriage penalty.

The President. Well, what you have to do basically to provide tax relief under our system, the rules that we operate up here, is to figure out what it costs over 10 years and then to slow the rate of growth of other programs. Now, what I did was to present a budget to the Congress which would allocate, as I recall, about $250 billion to tax relief over a decade. And we slowed the rate of growth of everything else to accommodate that, including defense, where we still were going to have real increases.

Congress passed a $792 billion tax program, and I vetoed that because I said we couldn't pay for it. And then they proceeded to spend more money than I recommended

in this year's budget—in different ways but more money.

So the truth is, you don't have to have any big cuts to pay for, let's say, marriage penalty relief or something like that, that is clearly affordable. All you have to do is to make a decision now that you will manage the rate of growth of all the other expenditures to accommodate the tax relief.

And I still think we ought to have modest tax relief package. I will try again next to pass one, and I will be flexible in working with the Congress on what the contents of the package are. But we just have to make sure that it's something we can afford and still pay down the debt, save Social Security and Medicare, and continue to invest in education and the environment and in research and technology.

Young People and Politics

Q. Mr. President, what would you recommend to high school students who want to get involved in the political process?

The President. Well, I think I would recommend two or three things. First of all, I would recommend that you get involved in the 2000 election. You know, with all the technology and all the television ads and all the money that's raised and spent in elections, candidates still need volunteers. And I think you ought to pick someone who is running, either for President or Governor or Senator or maybe a local office, maybe mayor in your hometown, that you believe in and show up and volunteer and learn everything you can about how the electoral process works, what the issues are, and you'll also learn about different kinds of people and human nature. Secondly, I think you ought to pick an issue you care about in your school and get involved in that. And then the third thing that I would strongly recommend is that you try to make sure you're as well-informed as possible, by accessing information on the Internet or your local newspaper or however else you want to do it.

But I think that those three things, together, will give you a chance to really get started. And it's not too soon for you to get started, to start working in politics. And I thank you for your interest.

[*The discussion continued.*]

Livability Agenda

The President. If I could just say, Al, the mayor said a lot of good things, but one of the things he said that I'd like to highlight is that they're using computer technology to help manage traffic patterns and alleviate congestion. That is one of the elements in Vice President Gore's livability agenda we're trying to pass through Congress, not just preserving more green space in urban areas but actually using the most up-to-date technology to give people some freedom, give them back some of their time by minimizing traffic congestion and waiting.

I mean, it's becoming a bigger and bigger issue for Americans both in their cars on the street and, unfortunately, in their airports and in their airplanes. So I think anything we can do to give people back time is enhancing their freedom dramatically. And I think that more and more public officials will have to focus on this.

Y2K Readiness

Q. Mr. President, if you were an ordinary citizen, would you save a little food for Y2K? [*Laughter*]

The President. You know, we've had so many jokes about that, about taking our pickups to Arizona and all. The answer is, no. America is—[*laughter*]—I wouldn't, because I think America is in good shape. We have worked very, very hard on this. I want to thank the Vice President and John Koskinen, who's helped us. I want to thank all the big—the financial institutions, the utilities, the other big sectors in our economy that have gotten Y2K-ready.

The only problems left in the United States that we're aware of are with some of our small businesses who basically haven't yet made sure that they're Y2K compliant. But the United States is doing fine, and I wouldn't hoard food, and I wouldn't hide. I would be trusting, because I think we're going to make it fine.

Internet and E-Commerce

Q. How can citizens be assured that the Internet will not become another political ploy that is harmed rather than helped by politicians?

The President. It's a good question. What we're trying to do, I can tell you, is to protect E-commerce, because it's growing so fast. And I signed legislation that would prohibit taxation on Internet transactions for several years. And I think we need to continue to work. So the first thing you can do as a citizen is to try to protect E-commerce, to let it grow, to let it flourish, to let all the jobs be created, the businesses be created, because of this incredible thing.

Then I think, in terms of objectionable material on the Internet, how do you keep the freedom and the creativity of the Internet without having children too exposed? I think the answer to that is to support the efforts that are being made by many in the industry now to give parents appropriate screening and other technologies, so that you continue to have creativity and growth on the Internet and parents can still do their jobs. I think those are the two most important things.

[*The discussion continued.*]

Presidential Term Limits

Q. Mr. President, would you like to serve another term in office, like you can in the U.K.? Maybe you ought to talk to Tony Blair about that. [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, I love the job, and I would continue to do it if I could. But we've had a two-term system here ever since President Truman's time, and I respect it, and I honor it. And so I'll try to find some way to be useful to my country and to the causes I believe in around the world when I leave the White House. But I love it, and I would not willingly give up any day of the opportunity to serve as President.

AmeriCorps

Q. Will future administrations be able to continue the support for the AmeriCorps program?

The President. You know, for people who are on this hookup who don't know what AmeriCorps is, we ought to say first what it is. It is a national service program of local community efforts so that young people—and sometimes not-so-young people—of all ages can give a year and with the option of giving the second year of community service in an AmeriCorps-affiliated program. And we have community groups; we have church groups and other religious groups; we have all kinds of groups who are doing good things in their community. And in the process, they earn credit for college tuition.

So many young people actually do it and use the funds they get from working in AmeriCorps over and above their living stipend to go on to school. And we've had 150,000 young Americans serve in 6 years. To give you some basis for comparison, it took the Peace Corps 20 years to get 100,000 volunteers.

So AmeriCorps is changing America for the better. I believe it has broad bipartisan support and, therefore, I think future administrations will be able to continue to support it. I would like to see us get up to where we have at least 250,000 people a year in it, because I think you could get that many people who want to serve. But at least insofar as funding become available, I'd like to see it continue to expand. It's a wonderful, wonderful thing.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. Before we go on, I'd just like to reiterate for the people who are interested in this subject, that thanks to Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, Maryland is the only State in America which presently requires young people to engage in community service as a part of their course study. In order to get a high school diploma, you've got to do some community service. Now, some of us know of specific schools that require that, but Maryland is the only State that requires it.

Twelve years ago the former Republican Governor of New Jersey, Tom Kean, and I were on a middle school study task force for the Carnegie Corporation, and we recommended that—that community service ought to be a requirement, an academic requirement. It's part of learning to be a good citizen. It's part of an education. And I'd like to see most States follow Maryland's lead.

[*The discussion continued.*]

School Safety and Youth Violence

Q. I attend a public high school. Considering the events of the past few years, how can you ensure my safety at school?

The President. Well, first of all, I understand why you're concerned about it. We've had all these terrible incidents of school shootings. But I think you should know that, on balance, we have the lowest murder rate in our country in 31 years and that schools are the safest places kids can be.

Now what we have to do to ensure that all our schools are safe, are, number one, have a strict, zero tolerance for weapons in schools. I've announced a zero tolerance for guns policy several years ago out in California. We're trying to get every school to adopt it. We had several thousand young people who were sent home last year and expelled because they brought guns to school.

Number two, we need a system in every school that identifies kids who are troubled, who might cause trouble and get some help before they commit violent acts, whether they're being reported to the authorities, part of a peer mediation group, getting mental health or other counseling. I think you have to have a system in which all the kids are involved in trying to identify people who might be disturbed and might cause these kinds of problems.

And I think, number three, we have to try to make sure that the schools that are in high-crime areas, that there is adequate security there.

So there are lots of things that can be done, but on balance you should not believe that you're in more trouble at school than you are someplace else, because for almost all of our children, they're safer at school than they would be on their streets or in their neighborhood.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. If I could just say one other thing to Joshua, who asked this question, and to others who—particularly young people who might be listening, there. I had a White House Conference on Youth Violence, and then we set up a national effort on youth violence. If you or anybody else that's part of this press conference tonight have any ideas, I want you to send them in. And I can assure you that we will carefully review them. We will do our best to see whether, if they're working in someplace, they can be made to work everywhere. If you have some new ideas, send them to us, because there is hardly anything more important in the whole country than giving our children the safety and security that they and their families need.

So please, we're still working on this. We have a highly concentrated effort, and we'd like to have your ideas.

[*The discussion continued.*]

Post-Presidential Plans

Q. Mr. President, what are your plans after you leave the White House, beside supporting the First Lady for a possible Senate run?

The President. Well, I will certainly support her in any way that I can, and I'm looking forward to that. But I want to build my library and my public policy center at home in Arkansas. And then I want to be a useful citizen. I'll do what I can to support other people, if they ask me to, who are running for office or when they're in office. But I want to use that public policy center and the educational programs there to bring in people who are interested in public service and to advance a lot of these issues I'm interested in, that I think will have great significance in the future.

For example, how can you maximize the use of technology to bring educational opportunities to poor people in poor areas in America and around the world? How can you grow the economy and improve the environment? How can you use new technologies to prove that we can clean up the environment, reduce greenhouse gases, and create more jobs? How can we minimize racial and religious and ethnic and other tensions, both in our society and around the world?

These things, these big issues I've worked on as President, I want to find a way to continue to work on at my library and center in a way that doesn't get in the way of the next President. I don't want to do that, but I do think I can be a good citizen and help solve a lot of these problems and continue to move us forward.

Mr. From. Mr. President, do you think the people who are sending these questions think we're humorless? Because they have

a line on here that says, ''Laughing is permitted.''

The President. I don't know what that means, but I've already been laughing, so thank you for permission. I never knew we had to give people permission to laugh, but I'm glad to have it. [*Laughter*]

Child Care

Q. What are you going to do about the rising cost of child care?

The President. Let me say, this is a huge issue. If you want to balance work and family in America, you have to have adequate family leave laws, and then affordable quality child care. And given the fact that most parents work and the percentage will go up, one of the most significant issues we have to resolve as a people is how to make people successful at the same time at home and at work because if you have to choose between one or the other, the country's going to be badly hurt.

We had a question earlier about an affordable tax cut. One of the things that I asked the Congress to do was to increase the tax credit for child care so that we could embrace more people. I've also asked the Congress to appropriate more money, because right now, we only serve with Federal subsidies about 10 percent of the working parents who are eligible for child care help.

So the answer to your question is, we have—at the national level and at the State level, we ought to be doing more with both tax credits and with direct subsidies to child care centers to help lower income and middle income people who otherwise can't find affordable quality child care. It's a huge issue out there that I don't believe has gotten the attention it deserves yet. I hope this, too, we'll make progress on, both next year in Congress and in the Presidential election. I'd like to see it heavily debated.

[*The discussion continued.*]

On-Line Townhall Meeting

Q. I commend you, Mr. President, for using the available new technology to stay in touch with the people. It gives anyone the chance to speak to the President, truly a shining example of freedom.

[*The discussion continued.*]

Class Size

Q. What do you think about the fact that in other countries, classrooms have many more children per teacher, yet they are ranked higher than the U.S. in education?

The President. Well, I think you have to, first of all, look at what the differences in those countries and the United States are. Let me also say the United States is doing better in these international exams. And among the schools that have set high standards and measure in tests for them, they're doing quite well, indeed.

But if you look at the countries which can have larger classes and have higher achievement levels in the early grades, what you will find is two things. You will find that they are not as diverse as we are, racially and ethnically and linguistically. And secondly, you will find that they don't have the same income and other social variations that you have in American classrooms.

So there is no country in the world with anything like the kind of diversity we have in the classroom, that has much bigger class sizes and higher performance. If the kids are more similar, obviously they would tend to have more similar learning patterns, and you can do things that sort of routinize the educational system more in the early grades. If the kids are vastly dissimilar, in terms of family circumstances and, literally, even language, you need more individual attention in the early grades.

And all I can say to you is that—the American context, we have lots and lots and lots of research that well-trained teachers and smaller classes give not only immediate but permanent learning gains. And that's why I favor doing that.

[*The discussion continued.*]

Staying in Touch With the People

The President. Mayor, I want to thank you for that. You know, when I came here in 1993, one of the things that I promised myself I would do is to try to keep in touch with the American people, to try to avoid getting out of touch. And I now, having been President for nearly 7 years, I understand why Presidents get out of touch, how easy

it is to happen. And I do think that this technology will help more and more Presidents to kind of be accountable to the American people, stay in touch with them, even in those weeks—and sometimes months—when they can't be out of Washington in the States and communities very much because of the workload here. So this is very, very hopeful, and I appreciate what you said.

Free and Fair Trade

Q. Do you believe in more open trade between our two countries,* or are you and your party committed to protectionism more than open trade?

The President. Well, the short answer is, I believe in more open trade between our two countries. Our two countries have a huge bilateral trading relationship—the biggest in the world, and it's benefited Canada; it's benefited the United States. Both of us have among the highest growth rates in the developed world now. We're both doing real well.

I would say two things about the trade issue. First of all, it is true that there are still some people in the Democratic Party who do not believe that we grow the economy and benefit people through expanding trade. And that is a difference of opinion we're still having. I will say this: There is a new Democratic majority, a big one, for almost every other issue on how to manage the economy, the importance of paying off the debt, what our education policy ought to be, what our crime policy ought to be, what our welfare policy ought to be. We don't have, in my judgment, the right consensus on trade yet, but we're moving in the right direction. And let me just give you two examples, if I might, of what we are concerned about with trade.

First of all, the United States, even though we've got a budget surplus and we're paying down our debt, has, by far, the biggest trade deficit in the world, because we've tried to keep our markets open. We think they help us to maintain low inflation and to be sharp and to be competitive. But if the competition is unfair, if countries can do things in our markets we can't do in theirs, then we're going to have a distortion of the trading system, and Americans who shouldn't lose their jobs will do so. I don't think that's right.

And so, I believe in open trade, but it ought to be fair. I'll give you just one example. We've won two cases in the World Trade Organization against the Europeans, one on beef and one on bananas, and we still can't get any satisfaction. We won the banana case three times. So it's going to be impossible to sustain support for an open trading system if the rules and the rulings are ignored.

Now, the second point I want to make is that we have got to put a human face on the global economy. As we expand trade, ordinary people have to benefit and they have to believe we're not destroying the environment. So I have concluded that we should do more to open up the trading system to labor and environmental groups, let them be a part of the development of trading rules and regulations, and have certain standards for the environment and for labor in these trade agreements. I think in the end, that's the best way to do it.

We've got to succeed in putting a human face on the global economy if you want to have broadbased support for it.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. Let me just follow up on that. When the Asian financial crisis hit in 1997, we had been increasing our manufacturing employment, including in steel. But in the 1980's and early nineties, we lost 60 percent of our employment in steel. Then we modernized, and we were competitive globally. And other countries started dumping steel on our markets and throwing people out of work who were competitive on the global economy. In other words, they weren't playing by the rules.

So we had anti-dumping actions, and we worked hard to reverse that and to restore the imports back to their pre-crisis levels. That doesn't mean I'm against free trade, but I had to fight for those jobs. And I can tell you, there are a lot of people out there who don't think we did enough to do that.

So there will always be difficult questions. But, on balance, America has 4 percent of the world's people, with 22 percent of the world's income; we've got to sell something to the other 96 percent of the world. And

* Canada and the United States.

you don't have to be a mathematical genius to figure out, therefore, we should be in favor of expanding trade.

[*The discussion continued.*]

Seattle WTO Summit and the Environment

Q. During the WTO summit in Seattle this month, will President Clinton propose to strengthen environmental safeguards?

The President. Yes. Yes, and in addition to that, the involvement of environmental groups in the whole World Trade Organization process. We've got to open this process up.

One of the reasons you're going to have thousands of demonstrators in Seattle—telling everybody that this world trading system is some sort of dark conspiracy to destroy the environment and keep down ordinary working families—is that they use funny language, and they have big, secret rules, and they meet too much in secret in Switzerland. And I think we've got to open this process up. This is not complicated. If some people produce some things better than others and the more we can work together and lift the fortunes of people everywhere, the better wealthier countries will do. This is not complicated.

But I think it's very—I'm actually kind of glad all these demonstrators are coming to Seattle, even though it may be kind of messy, because we ought to have a big global debate on this. And the people who feel like they've been shut out ought to be brought in and listened to, not just the environmentalists but the others as well.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. What do you feel are the chances that there will be any real progress in the talks between the Palestinians and the Israelis before you leave office?

The President. Oh, I think they're quite good. For one thing, there already has been real progress. Keep in mind, it was back in 1993 that we signed the Israel-PLO accord. We now have the Palestinians with their land in the West Bank and in Gaza. There's a high level of security cooperation between the two. And Prime Minister Barak and Chairman Arafat reaffirmed their commitment to the peace process in Oslo when we went last week to honor the late Prime Minister Rabin. And they are now on, literally, about a 100-day timetable to finish a final framework agreement.

Now I don't want to kid you. The issues are very, very tough. But I think the chances of success are better than 50–50. And with a lot of prayers and a lot of pushing, maybe we'll make it. I feel hopeful.

Education On-Line

Q. How does the President feel about supporting on-line education to serve the increasing number of students?

The President. I'd be for that. And we'll have more of that anyway. That's going to happen.

You want to take these two and then come back? [*Laughter*] At my age, I'm just glad I can read that.

National Defense in the New Millennium

Q. Taking into consideration the fact that the Chinese have developed an ICBM capable of reaching American shores, what is your position on a missile defense system for the United States?

The President. Well, if we can develop a missile defense that will actually work to block incoming missiles that could have nuclear, chemical, or biological warheads, it would be irresponsible not to develop it, assuming we can do so consistent with our obligations under treaty.

However, I don't think the Chinese will be the biggest problem. China does have 20 such missiles; we have 6,000 such missiles. I think the real problem is the danger that in the future, rogue states and terrorist groups might, themselves, get missile technology that could pierce America's traditional defenses. So we're working on missile defense, and we're also working with the Russians to see if we can agree to make some amendments to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty so that we can put the missile defense up if we can develop it, and they can share the benefits of it.

Now, let me also say to all of you, not to be unnecessarily alarmist, but I think we need to be realistic here. I think in the future, future Presidents will have to tell you

that we'll also have to worry about defenses from miniaturized nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons in the hands of terrorists who won't need missiles to try to deliver them.

So it will be a whole new world out there, and there's a lot of blessings from the end of the cold war, but we'll have to deal with more and different threats. And I would favor doing whatever is responsible to enhance the national security of the United States, including deploying the right kind of missile defense system.

Federal Involvement in Education

Q. Can you explain to me why you feel the Federal Government needs to get involved in education and why this can't be left to State and local government?

The President. Well, yes I can. First of all, the Federal Government has been involved in education for over 30 years, now, and in very discrete ways—in higher education, to help more people afford the costs of college, because that's something most States don't have massive resources to do; in preschool education like Head Start, to help more poor children get started. In public schools, the Federal Government's role traditionally has—first of all, it's always been less than 10 percent of the total budget of the public schools. It's basically designed to give poor children or children whose first language is not English or children with special education needs the access to the best possible education they can have, and then designed to meet discrete needs, like after *Sputnik* we spent more money to train teachers in math and science.

So what I have proposed is consistent with our historic mission: 100,000 teachers, because we have more kids and more teachers retiring, and we now have evidence that smaller classes work; a policy to end social promotion but to dramatically increase the number of after-school and summer school programs and funds to help failing schools turn around or shut down; and then a big VIP favorite, more charter schools. When I became President, we had one; there are now 1,700. We want 3,000 of these schools that are set up and chartered by teachers with parents; that are free of a lot of the redtape of local school districts and are judged and stay in business only on their results.

These, I think, are appropriate roles for the Federal Government. They are limited. We don't tell the States how to achieve excellence in education. We tell them there ought to be standards; here are things that work. If you want to do these things, we'll help you fund them.

President's Legacy

Q. Mr. President, what kind of legacy do you think the American people will remember about your administration?

The President. I think they will see it as a time of dramatic transformation and change; where we restored economic prosperity; where we widened the circle of opportunity to include people who'd been left out; where we deepened the bonds of freedom and community in this country, by helping to solve social problems and bridge a lot of the divisions in our society; and when we essentially assumed the leadership of the post-cold-war world, whether it's in expanding NATO or fighting against ethnic cleansing in the Balkans or working to deal with the challenges of terrorism in the 21st century. So I think it will be seen as a time of transformation, of hope, of genuine opportunity, and genuine community in America.

So I'm very grateful for the chance I've had to serve. And I'm very grateful for the results that the approach that Al From and I have been working on for 15 years now has had in the lives of the American people. I think it's, by and large, a tribute to the public and the citizens of this country. But whatever role I've been able to play, I am profoundly grateful. And I believe that the legacy will be transformation, movement, the restoration of prosperity and hope.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. Let me say, first of all, I want to thank you, Al, again for giving us all this opportunity and for always being a visionary and thinking about the future. I want to thank the other elected officials who have shared this press conference with me tonight, and commend you and those like you who have taken our new Democratic ideas

and actually used them to change the lives of our people for the better.

And finally, let me say to all the people who have been a part of this, I'm not running for anything anymore. I'm doing this because I believe in the enterprise of Government and in the work and impact of citizenship. And if we can use technology to chip away at cynicism and increase participation and give—empower citizens to feel that they're holding their elected officials accountable and they're helping them to do their jobs, that will be a very great thing, indeed.

So I would urge you to keep the E-mails coming into the White House, keep the E-mails coming into the DLC. If you have questions that weren't answered or ideas you want to share, keep pouring them in there.

But let me tell you something. There's a reason this country's been around here for more than 200 years, and there's a reason we're enjoying this enormous level of economic prosperity with our social conditions improving and our leadership in the world unquestioned. America is a great country founded on a great set of ideas, capable of permanent renewal. And the technology of the moment has made it more exciting than ever before. But it still requires, more than anything else, even more than good leaders, good citizens.

Those of you who have been part of this tonight have been good citizens. I thank you, and I want to urge you on because our country's best days lie ahead in the new century.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:14 p.m. in the Marvin Center Auditorium at George Washington University. In his remarks, he referred to John A. Koskinen, Chairman, President's Council on Year 2000 Conversion; Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel; and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority. In addition to the President, the Democratic Leadership Council-sponsored discussion included the following participants: Marc Andreessen, founder, Netscape; Gov. Jeanne Shaheen of New Hampshire; Mayor Donald Cunningham, Jr., of Bethlehem, PA; Lt. Gov. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend of Maryland; and Wisconsin State Assemblyman Antonio Riley, chairman, Democratic Leadership Council State Legislative Advisory Board. On-line participants used first names only. A portion of this discussion could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Statement on Signing Legislation To Locate and Secure the Return of Zachary Baumel, a United States Citizen, and Other Israeli Soldiers Missing in Action

November 8, 1999

Today I have signed into law H.R. 1175, ''An Act to locate and secure the return of Zachary Baumel, a United States citizen, and other Israeli soldiers missing in action.'' I deeply sympathize with the families of the missing soldiers and have made the resolution of these cases a priority throughout my Administration. The United States remains determined to pursue every concrete lead to ascertain their fate. We will continue to consult closely with the families and the Government of Israel in our long effort to resolve this important issue. We will also continue to raise this issue with other governments in our search for answers.

I believe that two sections of the bill must be carefully construed to avoid constitutional and practical problems. Specifically, section 2(a) of the bill states that ''the Secretary of State shall continue to raise the matter of Zachary Baumel, Yehuda Katz, and Zvi Feldman on an urgent basis with appropriate government officials'' of certain foreign governments. To the extent that this provision can be read to direct the Secretary of State to take certain positions in communications with foreign governments, it interferes with my sole constitutional authority over the conduct of diplomatic negotiations. Therefore, this provision will be treated as precatory.

In addition, section 3 of the bill would require the Secretary of State to report to the Congress on efforts taken with regard to section 2(a) and additional information obtained about the individuals named in section 2(a). I sign this bill with the understanding that this section does not detract from my constitutional authority to withhold information relating to diplomatic communications or other national security information.

Section 3(b) of the bill would require the Secretary of State to report to the Congress not later than 15 days after receiving ''any additional credible information'' relating to the missing servicemen. Because there could

well be a delay between the receipt of information and the determination that such information is ''credible'', I regard the 15-day period as commencing upon that determination.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 8, 1999.

NOTE: H.R. 1175, approved November 8, was assigned Public Law No. 106–89. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 9.

Remarks Prior to a Meeting With Cabinet Members and an Exchange With Reporters

November 9, 1999

Budget Negotiations

The President. Good morning. We're about to begin a Cabinet meeting that will be a briefing on the current state of the budget negotiations. As I think all of you know, our budget negotiators have been meeting with congressional leaders almost around the clock in an effort to complete our work and produce a budget that reflects the values of our people, lives within our means, and looks to the future.

We are seeing encouraging signs of real progress in our efforts to put 50,000 community police officers on our streets and keep the crime rate coming down, in our new markets initiative that seeks to bring investment to areas of our country that have not participated fully in our prosperity, in our efforts to preserve and protect our environment. We are even seeing the first signs of agreement.

But there's still a lot of work to be done, a number of critical priorities yet to be resolved. Most important is the commitment to a quality education and our agreement to hire 100,000 new highly qualified teachers to reduce class size in the early grades. We will keep working with Congress to keep the promise that both of us made to the people of America last year.

The Senate's voting on a minimum wage bill today. I urge them to pass a bill that helps more Americans into the circle of opportunity and to do it in a way that does not give unfair and excessive tax breaks to special interests. Congress also needs to pass a strong hate crimes bill to protect more of our citizens from violence and bigotry.

And I am hopeful that we can resolve these issues and the other remaining issues, especially the one involving United Nations dues, so that we can complete our work. It's still possible that we can complete our work in the next few days and get out of here. And we're working hard—Mr. Lew's working hard particularly, and Mr. Podesta and Mr. Ricchetti and others, and I thank them for their efforts. And I'm going to give the Cabinet an update.

Education Legislation

Q. Mr. President, on education, what is really wrong with the Republican idea of giving the money to the school districts and letting them decide whether to buy computers or hire new teachers?

The President. Well, first of all, we have done a great deal for the school districts on computers, and in 4 years we went from 4 of our school districts wired to 51 percent.

Secondly, there is flexibility—Secretary Riley might want to answer this—but there's flexibility in that bill if the schools get their classes down. But Secretary Riley brought that study with him today, we mentioned yesterday, that gives clear evidence that smaller classes in the early grades have permanent learning benefits. And I think that we need to stay with that.

We don't have enough money to spend, in my judgment, to risk wasting any of it. And when the educators and local school leaders and all the educational research agree that something needs to be done and we allocate the money for it, I don't think we should turn around and break the commitment and just say, ''We'll give you a blank check. We don't really care what happens to the money.'' We can't afford to waste a penny of the money we spend on education.

UnitedHealthcare

Q. Mr. President, what do you think of a major HMO deciding that doctors should say whether you're sick or well?

The President. Good for them. I applaud them. And they're large enough that they

might be really able to do it and have an impact on this.

You know—Secretary Shalala can maybe refresh my memory, but as I remember, when we outlined the principles for a Patients' Bill of Rights in the commission that Secretary Shalala, Secretary Herman headed, I think there were—I don't know—14 or 15 HMO's that agreed right then, but some of them were not big enough to basically withstand the economic competition if they did it and others didn't. So I think it's a wonderful thing they've done, and I hope it's the first step toward a resolution of this issue.

Situation in Chechnya

Q. Mr. President, on Russia and its actions in Chechnya, are you comfortable that they are responding to your appeals for humanitarian concerns, as far as civilian casualties, in that situation there?

The President. I don't think you can use the words "comfortable" and "Chechnya" in the same sentence, in any way. All I can tell you is that we will continue to press for a minimization of civilian casualties and a maximum use of negotiated options to settle this. I think in the end, there will have to be a political solution, and I hope that the end will come sooner rather than later, so fewer people will die.

Q. But are they responding to you, sir, when you ask them not——

The President. Well, I think the United States and the rest of the world, the more we ask, the more likely it is to occur at a sooner date. But I don't know—I think that if I—however I answer that minimizes the chances that we'll have any influence over the decisions, because I think no country wants to be seen as giving in to pressure from another country. But I think they are listening.

Press Secretary Joe Lockhart. Thank you, everybody.

President's Visit to Greece

Q. Are you confident there will be good security in Greece when you go there?

The President. Oh, I think so. You know, I know that Greece has a long and rich history of communists, anarchists, others on the left, demonstrating, and they all disagreed with my position in Kosovo, as you know. But the United States and Greece are allies not only in NATO but in many other important ways.

We want very badly to see a resolution of the tensions between Greece and Turkey in the Aegean and especially over Cyprus. And I think all Greeks share that hope without regard to their political views. So I expect the demonstrations, and I'm not troubled by them, and I think that the security issues will be fine.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:02 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on Presenting Congressional Gold Medals to the Little Rock Nine

November 9, 1999

The President. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Senator Daschle, Leader Gephardt, Senator Hutchison, Senator Lincoln, Members of Congress, Secretary Riley, and members of the Cabinet and administration; a special word of thanks to Congressman Thompson and to my good friend Senator Bumpers.

The great privilege of speaking last is that you get the last word. [*Laughter*] The great burden is that everything that needs to be said has been said. [*Laughter*]

I would like to begin by introducing some people who have not yet been introduced but whose presence here is altogether fitting. The story of the Little Rock Nine, in the end, is the story of the triumph of the rule of law and the American Constitution which was given expression not only by a decision of the United States Supreme Court but by a decision of a President determined to enforce the rule of law.

A couple of hours ago I had the great honor of signing legislation naming the Old Executive Office Building the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building. President Eisenhower's son, daughter-in-law, and granddaughter are here, and I would like to ask General John Eisenhower, Joanne, and

Susan to stand and be recognized and thank them for their presence here. [*Applause*]

I want to thank all the previous speakers for their very moving words. This is a special day for me, a happy day and a sad day, an emotional day. I thank all of you for what you said about Daisy Bates who, in my years of service in Arkansas, became a good friend to Hillary and to me. I was privileged to go to the Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, which is built around the Lorraine Motel, when we dedicated the exhibit on Central High School, with the statue of Governor Faubus on one side and Daisy on the other. [*Laughter*] And even though by then she had to get around in a wheelchair, she got a big laugh out of that. [*Laughter*] And what a wonderful laugh she had.

So I ask you all to remember her today, her smiling self, for that gave a lot of confidence to those whom we honor. Secretary Slater is representing the administration at her funeral today, and I thank him for that, because he would dearly love to be here with his friends.

I think it was Senator Hutchinson who first mentioned that we are celebrating the 10th anniversary of the Berlin Wall's fall today, and it is fitting that we, on this same day, recognize what these people did to make the walls of bigotry and prejudice fall in America. For when they marched up the steps to school, a simple act, they became foot soldiers for freedom, carrying America to higher ground.

You know, when Little Rock happened, I was 11 years old, living 50 miles away. Like every schoolchild in Arkansas, except those in Charleston—all six of them—[*laughter*]—I was—how I miss you. I miss doing this. [*Laughter*] When Little Rock happened, all the kids in Arkansas, white and black, we all went to segregated schools, with very few exceptions. And these people, they just burst in on our lives. And I feel like I've been walking along with them for 42 years now, because they forced everybody to think, you know? Before then, oh, why, you know, I was 11 years old, and my grandparents believed in school integration, and they taught me about that, and I though it was a great thing.

But the truth is nobody really thought about it very much because segregation was a way of life, and most people just got up and went through their lives, and nobody questioned it. Nobody challenged it. It was just the way things were. It was unfortunate, but that's the way things were.

And all of a sudden, they showed up, and it wasn't the way things were anymore. And then everyone had to decide—everyone. Everyone in everybody's little life—you had to decide: Where do you stand on this; what do you believe; how are we going to live? So these people, when they were young, they changed the way we were.

I would like to say to all of you that they paid a price for doing that. And they look real fine sitting up here today, and they have this vast array of family and supporters here, and they have lived good lives and accomplished remarkable things. But we're giving them this medal because they paid the price.

Daisy said what they endured was a volcano of hatred. And like Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, they walked out without being burned. But they have their scars. They taught us that you can turn your cheek from violence without averting your eyes to injustice, and they taught us that they could pay their price and go on.

On this journey that started 42 years ago, I could never have known that life would bring us in contact. But 12 years ago, on the 30th anniversary of the Central High incident, I invited them all to come to the Governor's Mansion. And I showed them around in the rooms where Governor Faubus plotted all the stratagems to keep them out of school. [*Laughter*] They got a kick out of that, and so did I. Ten years later, as President, I had the profound honor of going to Central High School to hold the doors open for them as they walked in, without incident. And it was great.

That school now has a very diverse student body, and a faculty, one of the best records of academic excellence in our home State. It had then an African-American student body president, which it frequently does, and in all the years I was Governor, it was the only high school in my State and one of the few in the country where you could still study Greek.

Now, we open the doors of this house. And I want to say a special word of thanks to the

Speaker and the other congressional leaders for allowing us to make this presentation—let's not forget, this is the Congressional Gold Medal—which the President always participates in, but usually we do it in their House—now, on Pennsylvania Avenue. But because of our relationship, Mr. Speaker and the other leaders have agreed for us to come here. And I thank them for that—for personal reasons, for our friends.

Today we celebrate the faiths of our Founders, the faith of parents in their children, the faith of children in their future. We celebrate it because we can, and we can because these nine people helped us to keep it alive and to redeem it. And now, as others have said, it is for us to take that faith into a new millennium, once again to redeem the promise of our country by giving all of our children a world-class education and all of our people a chance to be part of our prosperity and by giving all of our increasingly diverse citizens a chance to be a part of one America.

So in addition to giving them a medal, we ought to make that commitment, for like all people, we—and I certainly include myself in this—we all find it easy to condemn yesterday's wrongdoing. But these people stood up as children to condemn today's. And so let us learn from them and honor their example.

The Speaker joined me in Chicago the other day, in the common cause of giving economic opportunity to those who haven't had it in this most remarkable of economic recoveries. Many of you have committed yourselves to opening the doors of quality education to all of our children.

But the most important thing we have to do is to truly build one America in the 21st century. I want to read you something that Melba Pattillo Beals put in her book. ''If my Central High experience taught me one lesson,'' she wrote, ''it is that we are not separate. The effort to separate ourselves, whether by race, creed, color, religion, or status, is as costly to the separator as to those who would be separated. The task that remains is to see ourselves reflected in every other human being and to respect and honor our differences.''

A couple of months ago in this very room—or a couple of weeks ago, actually—Hillary hosted one of our Nation's top scientists and one of the founders of the Internet. And they discussed the remarkable convergence of the explosion in computer advances with the unlocking of the mysteries of the human gene and the gene structure, the so-called genome.

And the scientist said that if you put all the people together, and you had a genetic map of every individual on Earth, you would find that we are 99.9 percent the same genetically. Then, even more surprising perhaps, the scientist said, if you took a representative group of people of different races—if you took 100 African-Americans and 100 Chinese-Americans and 100 Hispanic-Americans and 100 Irish-Americans—and you put them in these little groups, you would find that the genetic differences within each group, from individual to individual, are greater than the genetic differences of one group to another. Now Melba knew that before the scientists found it out. [*Laughter*]

I say that to make this point: Every one of us, in some way or another, almost every day, is guilty in some way, large or small, of forgetting that we are 99.9 percent the same. Every person, every family, every group, every nation is guilty from time to time of trying to give meaning to life by denigrating someone else who is different in some way. Honest and real differences can only be explored, confronted, and worked through and diversity can only be celebrated when we recognize that the most important fact of life is our common humanity. They all knew that in some instinctive way.

The truth is almost all children know that. They have to be taught differently. Because so many were taught differently, it fell to these nine Americans when they were young, as children, to become our teachers. And because they taught us well, we are a better country. And we honor them today, but let us not forget to heed their lessons.

The Book of Job says, ''My foot has held fast. I have not turned aside. And when tried, I shall come forth as gold.'' For holding fast to their steps, for not turning aside, we now ask these nine humble children, grown into strong adults, to come forth for their gold.

Major, please read the resolution.

[*At this point, Maj. William Mullen III, USMC, Marine Corps Aide to the President, read the citations, and the President presented the medals.*]

The President. Now we have a special treat to cap off this event. But before I introduce the final presenter, I want to say again how much I appreciate the very large delegation from Congress from both parties who are here and particularly the fact that every Representative from our home State is here, Representative Hutchinson, Representative Dickey, Representative Berry, and Congressman Vic Snyder, the Congressman from Central High School. Thank you all for being here.

And I want to thank the really large number of people from our home State, from Arkansas, who are here, many who live in Washington, many who have come up here from Arkansas to be here, and thank all of you for coming.

And now I would like to ask Reverend Wintley Phipps to come forward to sing us on our way, a great gift to America. And thank you for sharing your time and your gift with us. God bless you, sir.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:55 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to gospel singer Rev. Wintley Phipps, and civil rights activists Daisy Bates, who died on November 4. The Congressional Gold Medals were presented to Ernest Green, Elizabeth Eckford, Jefferson Thomas, Dr. Terrence Roberts, Carlotta Walls Lanier, Minnijean Brown Trickey, Gloria Ray Karlmark, Thelma Mothershed-Wair, and Melba Pattillo Beals, collectively known as the Little Rock Nine.

Statement on Minimum Wage Legislation

November 9, 1999

The Senate Republican leadership made a serious mistake by insisting on using a minimum wage increase as a cynical tool to advance special interest tax breaks that aren't paid for and do little to help working families. I cannot let this bill become law in its current form. I once again call on Congress to give working American families the pay raise they deserve. Congress should pass clean legislation that boosts the minimum wage by one dollar over the next 2 years and simply restores the value of the minimum wage to what it was in 1982. American workers deserve no less.

Statement on the Resignation of Michel Camdessus as Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund

November 9, 1999

Today I want to express my appreciation to Michel Camdessus, who announced his intention to resign as Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, for his years of service. Mr. Camdessus exhibited strong leadership during his two-plus terms at the IMF. His tireless efforts helped contain the fallout from the East Asian economic crisis in 1997 and 1998, improve the global financial architecture, increase the transparency of the IMF itself, establish "good practices" for transparency of national governments, and create greater focus on debt relief for the world's poorest countries. I will greatly miss working with Mr. Camdessus in the international economic policy arena and wish him the best in his retirement.

Remarks to the Democratic National Committee Women's Leadership Forum Reception

November 9, 1999

Thank you. Well, Janice, thank you, and thanks for giving this group such a build-up when you said there were 300 here for Tipper and 250 for me. [*Laughter*] This is the first concrete manifestation I have had of the fact that I'm the only one in this crowd not running for anything anymore. [*Laughter*]

Let me first of all say, I'm delighted to be here. I got a good report from Hillary on her visit with you, and thank you for the good reception you gave her. I brought—I see Ann Lewis is here. I brought Minyon Moore, my political director, with me, and the new head of our women's outreach office,

who used to operate this wonderful organization, WLF, Lauren Supina, is here. So thank you very much for coming.

As all of you know, since Al and Tipper and Hillary and I moved to the White House, we have tried very hard to involve women to an unprecedented degree and to show a great sensitivity to interests of particular concern to women. And I'm sure that you've had that repeated over and over again.

But one of the things that I am proudest of is that we have really enabled women to share in the benefits of the work of this administration. You know, we have now the lowest unemployment in 30 years, but we have the lowest women's unemployment in 46 years. That's amazing. And when you consider how many fewer women were looking for work 46 years ago, those numbers are even more meaningful.

We've also tripled the number of SBA loans to women. We've worked very hard on issues—the family and medical leave, I don't have the newest numbers, but as of last year, 15 million people had taken advantage of it.

And as we look ahead, as I have said repeatedly, if you compare where we are now with where we were in 1992, we've gone from a period of economic distress, social division, political drift, and a complete discrediting of Government to the strongest economy in our history, welfare and crime rates at a 30-year low; we learned last week teen pregnancy is at a 30-year low; a country beginning to come to grips with its social problems and come together. We have a clear direction for the future, and no one's out there running against the Government anymore. We heard for 12 years that Government was the problem, and things got worse, including the deficit and the debt.

But that's the good news. The question that we have to face now is what's at stake ahead of us? What is still to be done?

And I just want to make two points very briefly. One is, we have the first chance in my lifetime—and I'm 53 years old—the first chance in my lifetime to really deal with the big challenges and opportunities out there facing our country, without the paralysis or the threat of an external crisis or an internal crisis. And I believe that imposes upon us a very heavy responsibility. And we ought to look at our country as a family would its children and its grandchildren. We have to deal with these big issues.

And I think that the women of America can make sure that's what the subject of the election is about, and the WLF can make sure that we involve lots of people who've never been involved before, who care deeply about this.

But if you look at—and I'll just mention two or three—if you look at the aging of America, that will affect more women than men, because you have a longer life expectancy. And as we talk about saving Social Security for the 21st century, one of the things we ought to be doing is making special provisions for women who could not pay into Social Security at the same amount men could and who therefore are much more likely to be living in poverty.

If you look at reforming Medicare and extending the life of it and providing affordable prescription drug coverage, that affects women disproportionately to men. But it's profoundly important.

If you look at the challenges we face with our children, the challenges we face in eradicating poverty and bringing prosperity to the people and places we haven't touched yet, of guaranteeing long-term economic health for our country by paying down the debt and getting out of debt for the first time, literally, in 165 years, these are things that I believe we ought to be taking to the American people.

We've proved you can grow the economy and improve the environment. In this period of economic growth, we have cleaner air, cleaner water, safer food. We set aside more land for protection than any administration, except those of Franklin and Theodore Roosevelt, in the history of the country. That will continue to be a major concern.

If you look at our responsibilities around the world, there's a big struggle I've been having here in Congress to adequately fund out foreign affairs budget. You know, one of the things that we do with that money, as I'm sure Hillary talked about today, is try to make sure that in developing countries around the world women have a chance to make a living by getting credit and girls have a chance to make a future by going to school

and being free for oppressive social practices. That's going to be a big issue in the future. Will we continue to do that? Will that continue to be part of America's role in the world?

And of course, in the next election one of the things that will clearly be up for grabs is somewhere between two and four seats on the United States Supreme Court and the question of whether we will revisit a whole raft of issues, the most obvious of which is the right to choose, but believe me, that's not the only one that is hanging in the balance of this election.

So I hope that you're all pumped up about what you've done. I'm particularly pleased, when Janice was giving the report, that you had so many people here today who had not previously been active. One of the things that I think is important for the Democrats to do is to recognize that there are literally thousands, even tens of thousands of people out there who have been directly benefited by the policies of his administration and the direction of the country, who have never participated in politics, that don't imagine that they have a contribution to make, because they have never been asked, and they've never been asked to do anything specific and given an opportunity to participate.

People now believe in the possibilities of our country and the possibilities of our political system again. And so if they don't participate but they could, it's our fault, not theirs, and we have to look at it that way.

And that's the last thing I would leave you with. You know, I'm fighting now for strengthening the equal pay law. I'm fighting now for adequate efforts at child care. We passed the family and medical leave law; 15 million people have taken advantage of it. I'd like to add 10 million more people to the coverage.

But you should know, for example, that today, under present Federal law, of those who are eligible to receive assistance from the Federal Government to help to provide for quality affordable child care, we have funding for only 10 percent—only 10 percent. And in spite of all that, we have the lowest unemployment rate in 46 years, but I promise you a lot of those women are going to work every day worried sick about their kids.

And that is not good for our country, because one of the big challenges we have to face that I didn't mention, and I want to mention in closing, is—I'm proud that the first bill I signed was the family and medical leave law, but we have come nowhere near where we need to be in terms of enabling people to succeed both in the workplace and at home. And I think that ought to be one of the major issues that we take into the 2000 elections, even as I continue to redouble my efforts to pass the child care initiative we have before the Congress, to pass the strengthening of equal pay initiative we have before the Congress, and to do many other things.

So I'm very grateful that I've had a chance to serve these last 7 years. I'm grateful for what we have done and what we still can do. But the decision we should be making as Democrats is that we are not going to let our children and our grandchildren down. We're going to use the—literally, it's the only opportunity we've had in my lifetime to have this level of prosperity, in the absence of domestic or foreign crisis, to shape the future of our dreams.

The only chance we have to do that is with the massive involvement and leadership of the women of this country. And you will be one of the most important engines of the victories that we have in the year 2000.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:39 p.m. in the Potomac Room at the St. Regis Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Janice Griffin, national chair, Women's Leadership Forum; and Lauren Supina, Director, White House Office for Women's Initiative and Outreach.

Remarks to a Democratic National Committee Hispanic Leadership Forum Dinner

November 9, 1999

Thank you very much. After that introduction, I am thinking many things. [*Laughter*] I'm thinking, I wonder how long it will be before Miguel will run for office. [*Laughter*] I'm thinking, it is much better to have such

a friend than an opponent. [*Laughter*] Thank you. Thank you for being my friend in ways that are personal as well as political. You may, however, have caused me quite a problem tonight, not over Vieques but over saying I have a Hispanic soul. Not very long ago the great African-American Nobel Prize winning author, Toni Morrison, said I was the first black President. [*Laughter*] And if I am the first black President and the first President to have a Hispanic soul, I'm afraid they'll never let me go home to Ireland. [*Laughter*] It might be worth it. [*Laughter*]

Loretta Sanchez, thank you very much for your leadership and standing up here tonight and performing in your usual, laid back, repressed fashion. [*Laughter*] What a joy it is to have somebody like you in Congress who's not ashamed to have a good time being in public life. We ought to all enjoy it and be honored.

You know, when I see people trudging around here all the time, complaining about how hard public life is and all the burdens, I say, ''You know, they're not giving these jobs away. Nobody made you come up here.'' [*Laughter*] People come to me all the time and say, ''Hasn't this been just awful for you?'' I say, no. [*Laughter*] It's actually been quite wonderful. You know, a few turns in the road one way or the other and I could be home doing deeds, wills, and divorces. [*Laughter*] I am grateful to be here, and I like it, every day of it. And Loretta likes it, and she's grateful to be here, and I appreciate that.

I want to thank the administration members who are here: Secretary Slater, who represented me at home today in Arkansas at the funeral of Daisy Bates, a great hero of the civil rights movement; Administrator Alvarez; Maria Echaveste; my former Secretary of Transportation and Energy, Federico Peña, who did a superb job in both places, it's nice to see you. I would also like to thank another former member of my administration who is here tonight, who is now working for Vice President Gore, Janet Murguia. Her brother was just confirmed as the first Hispanic Federal judge from Kansas, so we've got one of them on the payroll, anyway.

I want to thank all the people at my table and other places who had so much to do with the success of this evening, Joe and Alfie and Roger and Leo and all the others. Nelson, thank you very much for your leadership. Thank you, Joe Andrew and the others who are here from the DNC. Lottie Shackelford, Lydia Camarillo, thank you for your willingness to go run our convention. Make sure we all have a good time out there, will you? [*Laughter*]

And let me say one serious word before I go forward. There's one person I really wish were here tonight, who died a couple of days ago, the great mayor of Sacramento, California, Mayor Joe Serna. Mickey Ibarra would be here, but he's out there representing me at that service today. So I ask you all to remember Isabel Serna and the family in your prayers. They've been through a lot. He was a magnificent mayor and a great Democrat and a great friend of mine. He was one of those people who enjoyed public service, had a good time doing it, and was proud down to the last day—his health would no longer permit him to serve—and I ask you to remember.

I also would like to thank two people who aren't here tonight: one, Secretary Richardson, who is still in the administration; and the other whom I wish were here, Henry Cisneros, who has served us so ably and is such a great man. I thank him.

Now, as all of you know, we're trying to finish this year's budget, and we're trying to do a few other things before the Congress goes home. And I'd like to mention just a few of them because I think they relate particularly to the concerns of the Hispanic community. I want you to know what's still out there. We're fighting to get a reaffirmation of the commitment that Congress made last year, right before the election, that the majority, the Republican majority has voted to go back on. But I am determined that we will reinstate it, and that is to put 100,000 teachers out there in the early grades so we can lower class size and give our children a better education.

We are fighting to give our hardest pressed communities that still have a high crime rate 50,000 police officers on the street. We are fighting to raise the minimum wage, which I think is very, very important, especially for lower income workers, many of whom are

Hispanic. You know, we lifted over 1½ million Hispanics out of poverty by doubling the earned-income tax credit in 1993 and then by raising the minimum wage. And it's time to raise it again. And I hope we can prevail, and I hope you will help us.

We're trying to pass hate crimes legislation. We're trying to pass legislation that will enable disabled people to go into the work force and not lose their Medicaid health insurance. We're trying to pass the Caribbean Basin initiative and the African trade bill, which would open our markets to the Caribbean nations and African nations and open their markets more to us and put our Caribbean neighbors on a more equal footing with our Mexican neighbors in our trading relations.

All of those things can still be done before the Congress goes home. And insofar as any of you have influence with anyone, I hope you will get out there and help us with our agenda, because all these things reflect the deepest values of the Democratic Party and our commitment to the future.

I just want to make a couple of other points. I don't want to keep you late, and most of you have heard me give a lot of speeches. I had a very emotional day today. I was thinking about many things. I'm about to leave to go to Europe. Hillary and Chelsea just left to go to the Middle East to continue the work that I was doing last week in our hope that we can, over the next 100 days, actually get a framework for a final peace agreement between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Then I'm going to Turkey and to Greece, two great friends of America, in the hope I can help them resolve some of their difficulties over Cyprus and other issues before I leave office. And then I'm going on to Bulgaria, a great ally of ours, to try to keep pushing to make peace in the Balkans, where we have had to take up arms in Bosnia and Kosovo to stop ethnic cleansing and slaughter.

And today I had this incredible experience, which would have been wonderful for any President but was especially wonderful for me. I hosted in the White House about 30 members of the United States Congress, Republicans and Democrats, and a couple of hundred other people to give the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest award Congress can award, to the nine students who integrated Little Rock Central High School 42 years ago.

For those of you who are old enough to remember that or young enough to have studied it, you may know also that, in addition to the courage of the young children and the power of the Supreme Court's decisions and the court orders, the power of the Presidency was necessary for the integration of Little Rock Central High School when President Eisenhower sent in the 101st Airborne Division and later federalized the Arkansas National Guard to stop the obstruction.

Today I signed a bill naming the Old Executive Office Building after President Eisenhower because he worked there many years in the military. That building, until the Great Depression, housed all the offices of the executive branch, including all the offices of what was then called the War Department, except for the Treasury Building and the Office of the President. So Dwight Eisenhower actually worked in that building as long as he worked in the White House as President.

And his son, Gen. John Eisenhower, who is also a noted historian, and John's wife and their daughter were there, so I asked them to come. So Dwight Eisenhower's son and granddaughter were actually present as we recognized these nine students. And because Arkansas is my home, I have lived with the reality of these people all my life, since I was 11 years old.

And I said today that these nine students, in their simple desire to get a better education became, as children, our teachers. When I lived at home, literally 99 percent of all children in my State went to segregated schools. And we may have had an opinion one way or the other, but everybody more or less accepted it was the way it was.

But when they did what they did, then all of a sudden, they came crashing in our lives and everyone had to decide: Where do you stand; what do you believe; how will we live? Thirty years later, I hosted them in the Governor's Mansion for the 30th anniversary of Little Rock Central High. I brought them all in, and I showed them all the rooms where the then-Governor planned the obstruction

to keep them out the school. They got a big kick out of that.

And 40 years later, 2 years ago, I went home to Little Rock, to the steps of Little Rock Central High School—which in the 1920's was voted the most beautiful school building in America, and it's still a magnificent structure—and I held the doors open for them, with our Governor, as they walked freely through the front door, something they had not been able to do 40 years ago. And then 2 years later, they came to the White House, with all their myriad family, kinfolks, and friends, for a celebration that truly represented America at its best.

This has been a great day, a great day to be President and a great day to be an American. And to end it with you—you and all those you represent have been so good to me and to Hillary and to the Vice President and Mrs. Gore—is a great privilege.

I just want to leave you with a couple of thoughts. Number one, many of you helped me in 1992 because you knew we didn't want to keep on going the way we were going, because we had economic problems and social discord and political drift, and Government was discredited. So you knew what you were against, and you were willing to try something else. But I was just an argument for most of you. Most of you never met me before I started running for President, and you decided to give me a chance.

So the first thing I want to say to you is it is not an argument anymore. Together, we made a good decision, and we've changed America for the better. Seven years later, when you go home tomorrow and you go back across the country and people ask you why you were there, you can say, ''Well, we gave him a chance, and we tried it their way.'' And as has already been said, we not only have had the most diverse administration with the most diverse appointments, including the judicial appointments—more of whom I'm trying to get up for a vote by the way—in history, but we have the longest peacetime expansion in history, 19.8 million new jobs, the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 30 years, the lowest crime rates in 30 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, the lowest female unemployment rate in 46 years, the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years, with the smallest Federal Government in 37 years. It is not an argument anymore. It's working. It's the right direction for America.

So the second thing I want to say to you is, we've got to decide now, what are we going to do with this. Because even if I pass everything I'm trying to pass, if we get a good minimum wage bill and the 100,000 teachers and the 50,000 police and we get the anti-environmental riders off the bills and we pass the Caribbean Basin/Africa trade initiative, we do all the things I mentioned to you, there still will be a lot for America to do.

And of all Americans, Hispanics ought to be able to think about this, our country, as we would our family. I remember one of the nicest nights we ever shared at the White House, Federico and I, was when we previewed that wonderful movie, ''Mi Familia,'' at the White House.

In my lifetime, which is stretching on and on as the days go by, in my lifetime, this is the first chance America has had to have, on the one hand, the prosperity and confidence that we have and, on the other, to be unburdened by serious, wrenching foreign threats to our security or domestic crises. In the 1960's we had, for a brief period more or less, the best economy we'd ever had, with low unemployment, low inflation. But we had, first, the civil rights crisis to deal with and then the war in Vietnam.

Now what do you do, as a person, as a family, as a business, if things are better than they have ever been, but you can look ahead to the future and clearly see challenges and opportunities that will not be met or seized if you don't do certain things you're not doing now? What do you do? That is the great question before our people.

I can tell you—you know, I don't know about you, but I'll just use my own life—from the time I was a little boy, one of the—well, when I first ran for office, let me start with that. I asked an old sage in Arkansas politics, I said—I was running really well in this race for Governor. I said, ''What do you think I ought to really remember?'' He said, ''Bill, just remember this: In politics, you're always most vulnerable when you think you're invulnerable.''

How many times can you remember in your own life, when you broke your concentration, when you got divided, when you made a stupid mistake because you thought things were rocking along so well, nothing bad could happen? How many times has that happened to a family or to a business, where you just think things are going to roll on forever? It's never that way. Human nature is not that way. Human circumstances don't work that way. I'm telling you, this is a precious jewel we have been given, a gift we have been given as a country, to look ahead and say, ''Okay, what are the big challenges? What are the big opportunities?'' You ought to make your own lists. And ask yourself, in your lifetime, has there ever been an opportunity like this for America?

What are the challenges? I'll just give you a few. The number of people over 65 is going to double in 30 years. There will be two people working for every one person drawing Social Security. Medicare is supposed to run out of money in 15 years. Seventy-five percent of our seniors can't afford prescription drugs but need them to stay alive and maintain their quality of life. How are we going to deal with the aging of America?

We have the largest number of children in our schools in history, the first time more people than the baby boom, and by far more diverse. Loretta was talking about that Republican newsletter from northwest Arkansas. That's really true. Northwest Arkansas is one of the fastest growing areas of America, has been for 20 years, and one of the most racially and religiously homogeneous areas in the country. And all of a sudden, boom, they have this big infusion of Hispanics. The Catholic Church there now has a Spanish mass every Sunday and has had for the last several years. And that's nothing if you're from Orange County, but if you're from northwest Arkansas, that's a huge deal. [*Laughter*]

We also have a big influx of people in western Arkansas from Southeast Asia. But last year, our State ranked first or second—I'm not sure which, but I'm sure it's one of the two—in the percentage growth of Hispanic population. Joe Andrew didn't mention this, I don't think, but in addition to all the mayors we've celebrated, we've had a truly historic, breathtaking election in the State of Mississippi, where we won the governorship in a State where they didn't think a Democrat could be elected for love or money.

And part of it was the overwhelming African-American turnout. But there are also more Hispanics moving to Mississippi. All over the South, their voices are being heard. And we only won the election by about 6,000 votes, so everybody can take credit for the victory. [*Laughter*]

So we have to think about this. What are we going to do for all these children? They need a world-class education. If we do it right, the diversity of America will be a blessing in a global society. What are we going to do about the fact that this fabulous recovery has left people and places behind? Unemployment on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation is 73 percent. Upstate New York, outside of the suburbs in New York City, if it were a separate State, would rank 49th in job growth since I've been President. Hawaii, burdened by the collapse of the Asian economy, is the only State with no economic growth—the inner cities, the Mississippi Delta, Appalachia.

How are we going to bring prosperity to people and places left behind? Do we have the will to guarantee economic growth for a generation of Americans by taking America out of debt? I gave a budget to the Congress that will get us out of debt over the next 15 years, for the first time since 1835. And the progressive party, the Democrats, ought to be for that. It sounds like a conservative thing—it is—but it's the progressive thing to do in a global economy. Because if the government is not borrowing money, you can borrow it for less, and our trading partners can get more for less, and then they can be better partners with us, and they can lift their people out of poverty.

How are we going to grow the economy and meet our environmental responsibility? We've proved you could do it. Are we going to keep doing it? We've got the lowest crime rate in 30 years. Does anybody seriously think America is as safe as it ought to be? If you do, let me just give you one statistic. The accidental death rate of children from gun shots in the United States is 9 times the

rate of the next 25 biggest industrial economies combined.

I think we now know we can bring the crime rate down. Why don't we set a realistic goal—I mean, realistic in terms of our dreams. Why don't we say we won't quit until America is the safest big country in the world? And if we want that, how are we going to do it?

Last night, I appeared in the first-ever townhall meeting on the Internet, which was interesting for me, since one of the reasons I asked the Vice President to join the ticket is because I was so technologically challenged. [*Laughter*] It was quite a thrill for me to do that.

But there is a digital divide, and it can have huge consequences. I was in northern California the other night, meeting with people who work for eBay. Do you all ever use eBay? Buy anything on eBay? You want to hear something interesting? Over 20,000 Americans now make a living on eBay, not working for eBay, trading on eBay, many of them former welfare recipients. Think of what we could do in America to close the economic divide if we could close the digital divide, if usage and access to computers and connections to the Internet were as dense as telephone ownership and usage. Think of it. Now, these are the kind of things we ought to be thinking about.

What are the security threats of the 21st century? Well, I think one of them is we can start running away from each other because we've all of a sudden gotten afraid of trade. We need to keep expanding trade but work harder to put a human face on it, to take into account legitimate environmental issues and labor issues, but not to run away from the fact that with 4 percent of the world's people and 22 percent of the world's income if we want to continue to grow, we've got to sell something to the other 96 percent. And if we want to sell something to them, particularly since we're richer, we have to be willing to buy things. But this is a good thing.

What else? The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical, and biological, and the possibility that they can be made in smaller quantities, like everything else is smaller. We've got cell phones so small now my big old fingers won't even hit the numbers right. The miniaturization of all things technical will apply to weapons, as well, make no mistake about it. This is a serious challenge, the growth of terrorism around the world, the prospect that the terrorists, the drug runners, the organized criminals will all start working together, and the rampant threat of racial, ethnic, and religious wars—big challenges.

Which brings me to the last one. And it's what I've spent so much time on around the world and what I celebrated today with honoring the Little Rock Nine: Can we truly make our motto, *E Pluribus Unum*, real as we grow ever more diverse?

It requires, I would argue, three things. One is, we have to respect, not just tolerate—not just tolerate—but respect and celebrate our differences. You know, I don't have the same attitude as the people that put out that memo Loretta talked about. I think it's a lot more interesting in America as we grow more diverse.

I'll never forget the first Cinco de Mayo celebration I went to in San Francisco. I thought, "Where has this been all my life?" [*Laughter*] You know? I mean, what have we been doing here?

You know, I used to—when I was Governor of my home State, I used to go to a place called Little Italy to eat spaghetti in a town called Slovak, to meet with the farmers that came there in the 1848 revolution. And now we're just repeating our history in technicolor, times four. And I think it's fascinating.

But let's stop all this tolerance stuff. Tolerance is not good enough. We need respect and celebration of our differences, number one.

Number two, we need to recognize that, as we have from the beginning, we have genuine differences of opinion, which ought to be forthrightly and publicly argued. In that sense, and if that's all we're doing, partisanship is not necessarily a bad thing. When people say partisanship with a little negative edge, what they really mean is these people in Washington are fighting their partisan battles trying to increase their power without concern for the public interest. They think there's some game going on that's not real. But we will always have honest differences.

I know why I'm a Democrat in the year 1999. And I have friends in the Republican Party who know why they're Republicans. And we honestly see the world in different ways. We ought to create a safe and constructive way for people to feel free to think and argue.

But the third thing we have to do is to recognize that the differences we celebrate and the differences we fight over, neither one of them are nearly as important as our common humanity. And that is what the world keeps forgetting, at its peril.

Don't you think it's interesting that, at a time when we talk about the Internet—this and finding a cure for cancer, and last year we actually were able to transplant nerves into the spine of laboratory animals that had had their spines severed, and for the first time ever they have movement in their lower limbs. Two years ago we identified the two genes that are the biggest predictors of breast cancer for women. Within a couple of years, when mothers take their babies home from the hospital, we'll be able to give them a genetic map which will say, here are the things your child has a greater than normal propensity for, but if you do the following things, you can minimize them. A lot of people I know, experts in the field, actually believe within a very few years babies will be born with a life expectancy of nearly a century—within a very few years. Already today, if you live to be 65, your life expectancy is over 82 years.

Isn't it interesting, at this time, with all this marvelous stuff happening, not to mention all the techno-joys we can have, that the biggest problems we have in the world are rooted in the oldest failing of human society? We are afraid of people who are different from us. And when you're afraid of somebody who's different from you, it's easy to formalize that fear in dislike or hatred, and it's a short step to dehumanizing them, after which it's a short step to taking violent action against them and to thinking it really doesn't matter.

I'll never forget being in the airport at Kigali, Rwanda, talking to a woman who thought she had been killed, because she was cut up in one of the machete rampages in the Rwandan genocide, and she woke up to find her husband and her six children all slashed to death around her. She's the only surviving one, knowing that they had been betrayed by her neighbor, a person they lived with, lived next to her, in total peace for years, and boom, like that, they started the fight between the Hutus and Tutsis, and people turned on a dime, betrayed their neighbors-for-life, and let people be slaughtered.

Now there are lots of other stories that are heroic on the other side. But what happens to people? Why does that happen?

Why are the Catholics and the Protestants still fighting in Northern Ireland when the Irish Republic has got the fastest growing economy in Europe, and their common heritage is rich and fascinating and interesting, and they could be having arguments in bars or in Parliament and making money, instead, and educating their children?

What is it that's keeping the Israelis and the Palestinians from taking these last few steps, the Syrians from joining in? Why are there other terrorist and rejectionist groups that are prepared to go out and kill innocent civilians to keep the Israelis and the Palestinians and the Syrians from making their final peace agreement?

If you look at America, you look at the success of people from the Indian subcontinent in America—from India, from Pakistan, from Bangladesh—the phenomenal success, if you look at the fact that India will be bigger than China in 20 years, that they both have big scientific bases of expertise, why are they fighting over the line of control in Kashmir? Why can't they work that out? Why is that such a big problem that they keep spending money preparing to go to war with one another instead of educating their children and alleviating the abject poverty that is holding them down and keeping them from their full potential? I mean, I could go on and on and on. But you get the point.

Why did I have to go into Europe and bring the power of the American military to bear in Bosnia and Kosovo to keep people from slaughtering mostly Muslims, although others were involved too. What is the deal here? Same reason, in a more—thank God—mundane but still very cruel way people were spitting on and kicking and cursing those

nine kids when they tried to go to Little Rock Central High School 42 years ago.

One of the great human weaknesses is that when people get organized, they think that, in order for their tribe to matter, the other tribe has to matter less. In order for their lifestyle to be validated, somebody else's has to be invalidated, that every difference of opinion turns out to be a difference justifying the dehumanization of your opponent. This is a very dangerous thing, made more dangerous, not less, by the collision of societies and the close contact and the openness of borders.

So we need you for another reason. We need you in the Democratic Party. We need you as Americans. We need you to remind us of what the concept of family means to you. What are the obligations of people who are in your family? What do we owe to one another? If you're like me, once you get about 50, your family members, there are some you don't even like very much. But you are bound together. You are bound together.

I want you to think about that, so when you go out across the country, you go back home and people say, "Why are you here? What are you doing? Why are you a Democrat? Why are you helping who you're helping in 2000?" Say, "Well, number one, I tried him in '92 and it worked. We're in a lot better shape than we were then, and we're in a lot better shape than we've been in a long time. Number two, I'm doing it because I want to take on the big challenges of the future. And I'm really determined that we're not going to blow this responsibility to our children and grandchildren. And number three, because the Democrats represent the best hope for creating a family in America and a family in the world that doesn't minimize our differences; it celebrates them. It doesn't minimize our arguments; it respects them. But it recognizes that underneath it all is our common humanity. And without that, nothing else matters much. With it, there's nothing we can't do."

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:20 p.m. in the Crystal Ballroom at the St. Regis Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Miguel Lausell, chair, Hispanic Leadership Council; Representative Loretta Sanchez, general cochair, Democratic National Committee; and President Eisenhower's daughter-in-law Joanne and her daughter, Susan.

Remarks on Departure for York, Pennsylvania, and an Exchange With Reporters

November 10, 1999

Y2K Readiness

The President. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I want to thank John Koskinen and all the leadership that he and others have provided in helping to prepare America for Y2K.

We are releasing our fourth and final quarterly report on public and private efforts to address the Y2K computer problem. The report shows that our hard work in this country is paying off, and while there is more to do, I expect we will experience no major national breakdowns as a result of the year 2000 date change.

First, the report makes clear that the Federal Government is Y2K ready and leading by example. Thanks to the efforts of the Office of Management and Budget, we have completed work on more than 99 percent of all mission-critical computer systems, which means the American people can have full faith that everything from air traffic control systems to Social Security payment systems will continue to work exactly as they should.

Second, the report documents remarkable Y2K progress in all of America's critical infrastructure areas. When it comes to financial services, power, telecommunications, air and rail travel, leading organizations report they have completed or nearly completed all their Y2K work. I am confident the Y2K problem, therefore, will not put the savings or the safety of the American people at risk.

But in some areas we do continue to have concerns. Some small businesses, local governments and other organizations have been slower to address the Y2K challenge. So again I say to these groups, don't just sit back and wait for problems to occur. Call 1–888–USA–4Y2K, and we'll show you where to get help.

And while most of our large trading partners are in good shape, we still have concerns

about the Y2K preparations of some developing nations. The State Department will continue to update its country-by-country assessments and advisories as new information becomes available.

We have less than 2 months now until the year 2000. Even those groups that have already completed their Y2K work must now put great emphasis on creating and testing contingency plans, as the Federal Government has already done. Back in October, when the Government made the transition to fiscal year 2000, we did encounter some small date-related computer problems. But the overriding lesson of that experience was that alert organizations, armed with good contingency plans, can fix Y2K disruptions in short order.

Thanks to the hard work of John Koskinen and his staff and proactive leaders all across our Nation, America is well on its way to being Y2K ready.

Now, over the next 52 days, we must continue to reach out to smaller organizations and local governments whose preparations are lagging behind. If we work together and use this time well, we can ensure that this Y2K computer problem will be remembered as the last headache of the 20th century, not the first crisis of the 21st.

Budget Negotiations

Q. Mr. President, as the budget negotiations drag on, Members of Congress have indicated, of course, they want to get out of town tonight. You don't want to leave town until Sunday. I'm wondering if that is your personal deadline, and doesn't that give you a slight advantage over them?

The President. Well, I don't really have a personal deadline. I did have good talks, as recently as this morning, with Senator Lott and Speaker Hastert. And I've been in constant contact. I saw the Democratic leaders yesterday, and we visited briefly. I think we're making good progress. We made some real progress in putting 50,000 more police on our streets. We're making some progress in other areas. We still have to resolve our Nation's commitment to 100,000 teachers. We're still working on the United Nations arrears and a number of other environmental issues. But I think we're making good progress, and I'm hopeful.

And we should know—let me say, I know you have a lot of questions. But actually, you ought to know more by 12 or 1 o'clock today about how well we're doing. I think we'll know certainly by the middle of the afternoon if we're in any shape to finish more or less when the Congress would like to.

And let me also say, I'm still very hopeful that we can pass the Africa trade bill and the Caribbean Basin initiative. I'm still very hopeful we can pass this very important legislation to let people with disabilities to go into the work force and carry their Medicaid. That could be one of the most important social pieces of legislation we've passed in a long time.

So we've got a lot to do. But I think we can—if we just keep working, we'll get there.

Timing of President's Visit to Greece

Q. Sir, could you tell us about the Greek postponement, what precipitated it, your level of concern for security there?

The President. Oh, I'm not concerned at all. You know, if the Greek Government and the Secret Service aren't concerned, I'm not concerned.

I explained yesterday, the Greeks have a tradition of large demonstrations, and the communists, the anarchists, perhaps some others in Greece want to demonstrate, in large measure I understand, because they strongly disagreed with my policy in Kosovo and, presumably before that, in Bosnia. And you know, I think we were right, and I disagree with them. But the fact that they have the right to free speech doesn't concern me.

The Greek Government asked us to put the trip when we did, I think, largely for other reasons. I think they thought it would be better for them and that meetings we have might be more relevant if we did it after, rather than before, the OSCE meeting in Turkey. And so they asked to do it. Whether the demonstrations had anything to do with it, I don't know. But they might have. But I'm not bothered about it. You know, it's going to happen. And you all get to take pictures of it.

World Trade Organization Talks in China

Q. Mr. President, can you give us a readout on the WTO talks in China? Any progress there?

The President. No. I can't. All I know is that they are going on, and we're doing our best.

I've got to run to Pennsylvania.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:05 a.m. on the South Grounds at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to John A. Koskinen, Chairman, President's Council on Year 2000 Conversion.

Remarks in a Roundtable Discussion With Harley-Davidson Employees in York, Pennsylvania

November 10, 1999

The President. Let me just say first, I have had a great tour. I'm glad to be here. Thanks for the jacket. But thanks, most of all, for your wonderful job you do. And I'd like to just have some opening remarks from Jeff and Harry, and then maybe we'll do a little roundtable discussion.

As you know, as I said, I'm interested in two things today. One is, how has Harley done it; what are the major elements in your success at home and around the world? And secondly, how important is the global market to the profitability and long-term success of your company?

[*At this point, the roundtable discussion continued.*]

The President. Several years ago, you were subject to unfair competition in the American market, and it took some action to get that straightened out. But one of the reasons that I wanted to have this new trade meeting that we're going to have next month in Seattle—we're going to try to launch a new round of trade negotiations, and the main purpose, from our point of view, is lowering tariffs to American products, because there's a lot more, not just yours but a lot of other products where, even though we have a very successful economy and relatively high wages compared to most other countries, we are quite competitive in a whole range of areas if we can get these tariffs down. I think it's very important.

[*The roundtable discussion continued.*]

The President. You know, it's very interesting, I have tried to get the White House and the Government to operate more like you just described, and one of the real problems of doing it in politics is that if you make a mistake, it's big news. And if you don't, it's kind of like the dog that doesn't bark. I mean, it's not like—if you don't make a mistake, you sell a lot of motorcycles; the bottom line goes up. Sometimes if we don't make a mistake, you get your Social Security check.

And it's become—one of the things that Vice President Gore really tried to do with our reinventing Government initiative is to get decisions made more quickly by people that are closer to the decision point. And we tried to run the White House as a team and have people not be scared of their shadow when they come to work, to go ahead and make a decision and do things at work.

But it's very interesting to see what the problem in Government is, which is that—and I'm not blaming anybody and certainly not our friends in the press who are here covering this event—but it is—the pressures are great not to mess up, so that tends to set up systems that are too top-down, too rule-oriented. And we really tried to change that. And we've had pretty good success, I think.

But you've got to be willing—if you trust people to make decisions, you've got to be willing to make a mistake, because managers make mistakes, so workers are going to make mistakes. Everybody makes mistakes. I'd be curious to know how you handle that, how you deal with the inevitable occasional error.

[*The roundtable discussion continued.*]

The President. One of the things that will inevitably happen, and we deal with this in every trade negotiation, is you have more and more trade; you have to move toward greater uniformity; you have to respect other countries, their determination about what's safe and what's good. Sometimes a lot of these

standards are also a ruse to promote protectionism, and we've had a lot of problems with that, too, in addition to tariffs. We've had standards that—we used to have laughable standards with the Japanese, I remember, on things like importing skis and whether the skis were a quarter of an inch too wide or too narrow. So these things happen, and the only way you can change them is to enter into and do a negotiation and just keep trying to push through, push through. And then if the rules aren't followed once you've set up rules, as Tom pointed out, there have to be some consequences to them.

[*The roundtable discussion continued.*]

The President. That's a very important point. If people overseas aren't making any money, they can't buy whatever it is we're selling. But we have done that; the United States has maintained the most open market in the world. We've been fortunate enough to have low unemployment and low inflation for a long time, so it has benefited us as a whole. But it still puts enormous pressure on certain higher wage workers that are very competitive in a global economy if they have free access to markets.

So it's this constant balancing act for me, how to protect the overall health of the economy and still make sure that no sector is getting the shaft. But we do have an interest in other people making money. We ought to want our friends around the world to do well. That's the only way that we can—we have 4 percent of the world's people and 22 percent of the world's income. So you don't have to be an Einstein at math to figure out you've got to sell something to the other 96 percent, and they can only buy what they can afford to buy.

So to me, that's the ultimate logic of trade. But it's a constant fight to make sure the rules are fair.

[*The roundtable discussion continued.*]

The President. As I said, one of the major purposes of this new trade round we hope to start in Seattle next month is to get a comprehensive review of all the problems that are still out there and try to take them down. And I hope we can do it. I guess I ought to say this. In the first 5 years of my Presidency, through 1997, 4½ years, 30 percent of our growth came from expanded trade. Then since—in '98 and the first half of '99, a higher percentage has come generated from domestic economic growth because of the Asian financial—but as they come back, it will be 30 percent or more, particularly if the European economy grows and they're relatively open to our products and services. We'll do even better than 30 percent, starting in, I'd say, 2 years from now.

[*The roundtable discussion continued.*]

The President. We've just been learning how these great motorcycles are made and the teamwork between management and labor here and also how they're sold not only in the United States but around the world. And their message is that if they have fair access to markets, they can sell them everywhere. And I believe they can—and that the partnership and the trust that exists between the people who work here and the management is a major reason for the absolutely stunning success that this country has enjoyed in the last several years.

[*The roundtable discussion continued.*]

Mr. Harry Smith. I want to thank you also, Mr. President. I think you treated labor very fairly over the years, and I think you've done one hell of a job. And we thank you for coming.

The President. I'm not done yet. But when I am, I'm going to get on one of those motorcycles. [*Laughter*] Most Presidents get on Air Force One and ride off into the sunset. Maybe I'll just get on a Harley and ride off into the sunset. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Jeffrey Bleustein. You can get on Hog One. We'll make one of those. [*Laughter*]

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us why you think education and teachers are becoming the showdown issue on the budget this year?

The President. I don't know why, except that I have very strong feelings about it. And the Congress changed its position from last year to this year—the Republican majority in Congress changed its position. We had an agreement last year. And there is something to the argument, well, if schools already have small class sizes, they should be able to use

the money on other things, but we have agreed to that. I just don't believe we ought to give a block grant out there when we know we've got the largest school population in history, the most diverse in history, and the kids who have small classes have permanent learning gains. We've got all this research that shows that. We made a commitment last year; I think we ought to keep our commitment. And I think we're getting closer. It may or may not be the last unresolved issue by the close of business today. But we're working at it.

[*The roundtable discussion continued.*]

The President. The people who are here like working here. I shook hands with a lot of the workers here today. They like it. They're proud of it. And all they want is a fair chance to sell their products. And I told them that when we meet in Seattle in this meeting of the World Trade Organization, what our goal is to open a new trade round that will reduce the tariffs and the non-tariff barriers to American products and services and, in return, make sure that people have continued access to our markets.

But these people here and your company prove, and so many others prove that if we have open and fair trade, the United States can compete with anybody. And it's the only way we can continue to grow our economy at a rapid rate, and at the same time help the rest of the world do well.

[*The roundtable discussion continued.*]

The President. First of all, I want to thank you for being here together and for working together and for making America number one in telecommunications in so many, many ways. And I want to thank all the people at all the other sites for their support for America's role in the global economy and for expanding the opportunities for trade.

We're going to be working hard for it. I think we need to work hard to keep trying to build a consensus in our own country for the expansion of trade and for policies that will support benefits to all Americans who are out there working every day and deserve to be a part of this global economy. And we'll keep working on it. And I thank you very much.

And I'd be curious, before we close, to know, do you sell Harleys over the Internet? And can I order one over the Internet? If not, Armstrong will provide at a very reasonable price a comprehensive way to do that. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The roundtable began at 11:55 a.m. in the Conference Room at the Harley-Davidson Motor Co. plant. In his remarks, the President referred to Jeffrey Bleustein, chief executive officer, Harley-Davidson Motor Co.; Harry Smith, president, Local 175, International Union of Machinists; Thomas Buffenbarger, international president, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; and C. Michael Armstrong, chief executive officer, AT&T and chairman, President's Export Council, who led the final portion of the roundtable discussion via satellite teleconference to a trade dialogue with AT&T employees in Basking Ridge, New Jersey, as part of the National Dialogue on Trade. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to Harley-Davidson Employees in York

November 10, 1999

Thank you very much. Thank you. It's nice to be in a restrained, laid-back crowd like this. [*Laughter*] The truth is, it's wonderful to be in a place where people are happy, and they're not ashamed to be excited, and they're proud to go to work every day. Thank you very much for making me feel welcome here today.

Thank you, Jeff Bleustein; thank you, Bobby Ramsey. Old Bobby kind of hurt my feelings. You know, I went up to him and he said, "Well, you're not nearly as tall as I thought you were." [*Laughter*] He said, "When I saw you playing saxophone on Arsenio Hall, I thought you were a lot taller guy." [*Laughter*] And I said, "That's why I got elected President. I was 6′8″ back then." [*Laughter*] But I still think you did a good job, Bobby, and I thank you.

I want to thank Bill Dannehl. Thank you, Harry Smith. I enjoyed meeting Willie Davidson today. And I thank Tom Buffenbarger, the president of the International Association of Machinists, for being here and joining us today.

I want to thank Mayor Robertson for welcoming me to York and all the county commissioners and legislators and others who are here. And I want to say a special word of appreciation again, Jeffrey, to you, for making me feel so welcome here and for the nice things you said about Bill Daley, behind his back. Usually, when you talk behind somebody's back you're not saying nice things. [*Laughter*] So Daley is up here talking and Jeff is telling me what a good Secretary of Commerce he is. And I will say, Secretary Daley, you have been superb, and we're grateful for what you do for the United States.

Now, you may remember this, some of you, but after I was nominated for President, way back in the summer of 1992, Al and Tipper Gore and Hillary and I got on a bus, and we started this bus tour. Our very first overnight stop was in York, Pennsylvania. And I'm sure none of you were there when we got in. We got in about a quarter to one, but the crowd was about the size that it is today. And I looked at that crowd—it was in the middle of the night, you know, we'd been stopped everywhere along the way—and I decided I'd take a bus tour so I could go see normal people. We went out to all these little towns. And then we got to York, it was the middle of the night, and there was this huge throng there. And I popped out, and I looked at Hillary, I said, "You know, we might win this election"—[*laughter*]—"and we'd better not mess it up."

When I was here before, I didn't get to come and visit Harley-Davidson. And I wish I had, because since then—I had a beautiful Harley jacket before I came here, that I got in Milwaukee, but I gave it to a guy who worked for me because he thought he was going to ride to heaven on a Harley-Davidson motorcycle. So when he retired, the only thing I could think of to give him that really reflected the service he had given to our country and to me was my jacket, which I hated to part with. But the only gifts that really count are the ones that you'd like to keep yourself, I think sometimes. So today I got another one, and I thank you. I love it.

You know, Bill Daley was talking about being over in the United Arab Emirates and how they were dying to have more motorcycles and other paraphernalia to sell. And I told Jeff when he mentioned it, one of the great treasures of being the President is having the opportunity to meet people around the world you would never meet and make friends with them. A person who became a particular personal friend of mine and of my wife's was the late King Hussein of Jordan. And some of you may know, he was a very satisfied Harley customer.

When Hussein and his wife, Queen Noor, came to stay with us a few years ago and we became very good friends, he gave me a gift that I treasure that's still up in the White House today. It's a picture of himself and his wife in very casual clothes in the Jordanian desert, astride a Harley.

My best Harley story—I was just recently in Paris on my way to Sarajevo and Bosnia to try to settle the outstanding issues of all the Balkan wars in Bosnia and Kosovo. So I stopped in France to have a meeting with the President of France, and I went to the American Ambassador's residence in Paris. Now if you ever saw that house, you'd want to be Ambassador to France, too. [*Laughter*] It's a beautiful place, built in the 1700's—just takes your breath away to walk in, these grand gardens and this beautiful marble foyer when you walk in. In the beautiful marble foyer when you walk in now, replete with all the proper lighting, is a stunning, 1944 Harley-Davidson. [*Laughter*]

And the way it got there is that when your predecessors were making motorcycles for the war effort, some of them were sent in packages, to be assembled to our allies in Europe. And some of them went to Yugoslavia, where Mr. Tito was fighting the Nazis. Two of them were never opened, and the son of the American Ambassador actually came upon these 54-year-old boxes of unassembled 1944 Harleys last year. And he gave one to his daddy. And now, if you ever go to France, it's now the main tourist attraction of the American Embassy, is a 1944 Harley. It is so beautiful, and I know you'd be proud of it.

I came here today not just because I wanted to see you and not just because I wanted to come back to York to thank the people of this community and this State for being

so good for the last 7 years and through two elections to me and my wife and Vice President and Mrs. Gore. I came here because I want America to know exactly what you have done and how.

The recovery of this company since the 1980's has been truly remarkable. When you were down in the dumps, people were saying American industry was finished, that we couldn't compete in the global economy, that the next century would belong to other countries and other places. Today, you're not just surviving; you're flourishing, with record sales and earnings and one of the best managed companies in America, according to Industry Week. According to management and labor, one of the reasons you're the best managed company in America is that you have a genuine partnership between labor and management, where all employees are valuable and expected to make good decisions on their own for the benefit of the common enterprise. And I thank you for setting that example. I wish every manufacturer in America would model it.

I came here because I knew before I got here—although I had never quite experienced the full force of it until you were shouting and screaming and having such a good time—I knew that this was about more than making bikes for profit, more than selling attractive leather jackets. What we see here today is how people feel when they have got a job that they do well, that gives them not only a decent income but a full measure of dignity and pride.

I used to tell people all the time that politics is about a lot more than economics. But if you get the economics right, people figure out how to live and shape good lives and raise their children and build strong communities. And if you don't get the economics right, then you have to deal with a lot of the other values issues, extraordinary welfare rates and higher crime rates and all those other problems.

I want people to see that you have, yes, turned a company around—yes, you make an exciting product, and you sell it all around the world—but that you do it in the right way, a way that makes you proud to come to work every day. It puts a spring in your step and a shout in your voice and a light in your eyes. That is what I want for every American working family, and I hope that more people will follow your lead so that more people can stand up and shout every day just for the joy of going to work and being part of a common enterprise and doing something they can be profoundly proud of. Thank you, thank you, thank you for that example.

The second point I want to make is the point that Secretary Daley has already mentioned. To really do as well as you can, you have to sell these wonderful products not only around the country but around the world. And I think that's very important.

In 1973, when the first Harley rolled off the assembly line here, America exported only 6,300 motorcycles. By last year, that number had increased to 66,000. Today, you're selling about a quarter of your bikes around the world from Costa Rica to Korea, from central Europe to the Middle East. The global market for motorcycles, and for Harleys, is exploding. It's a big part of your future.

And in order for it to be a part of your future and our future, America has to continue to support expanding trade on fair terms to all, including Americans. Now, this is a big issue. And I want you to just give me a couple minutes of serious time here to talk about it.

When I got elected in 1992, I don't think there's any way in the world a Governor of a small southern State—in the affectionate terms that President Bush used then to describe me—would have been elected President if we hadn't had economic distress, social division, political drift, and a Government discredited. You all remember that. It was tough in this country. It was tough in this State.

And I had spent 12 years—at that time, not quite 12, a little over 10—working as Governor of my State, trying to figure out how this economy works, how the education system plays into the economy, how I could actually get up and go to work every day and create the conditions and give people the tools to make the life of their dreams. And I asked the American people, I said, "Look, give me a chance to put people back at the center of our politics, to create opportunity

for every responsible citizen, to create a community that every American has a chance to be a part of. And give me a chance to put in some new ideas. I believe we can grow the economy and protect the environment. I believe we can move people from welfare to work and still allow them to take care of their children. I believe we can be tough on crime and still do more to keep kids out of trouble in the first place. I believe we can do more to help people succeed at home and at work. I believe we can have a trading system that expands trade and still protects legitimate labor rights and our responsibilities to the environment. I believe we can have a community where all of us serves more and help one another reach our common dreams.'' Anyway, I said, ''The center of this has to be an economic strategy, and mine is very simple. I want to get rid of the deficit, but I want to find a way to invest more money in education, in technology, in training, and in research. And I want to expand trade.'' To me, it was simple math: we have 4 percent of the world's people with 22 percent of the world's income. You don't have to be a genius to figure out, if you want to keep 22 percent of the world's income with 4 percent of the world's people, you've got to sell something to the other 96 percent.

And yet, I knew people were afraid of that. They were afraid that if we opened our borders here, a lot of our lower wage workers would be put out of business by people who worked for even less money abroad, and they might not ever get another chance. They were afraid a lot of our well-paid workers would not do well, because we'd have markets opened to our competitors in those areas, but they wouldn't open their markets to ours. A lot of people were afraid we would see a big transfer of wealth to poor countries, but the money would stay in a few hands, and it wouldn't flow down to the workers there, and it would lead to a degradation of the environment in ways that could hurt us. That was especially an issue along the Rio Grande River when we were working out the trade agreement with Mexico. So there was all this fight about it.

Well, the results of the last 7 years are in, and it's not an argument anymore. We have the longest peacetime expansion in history, the highest homeownership in history, 19.8 million new jobs, the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years, the lowest welfare rolls in 30 years, the lowest poverty rates in 20 years, the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years, and the Federal Government is the smallest it's been in 37 years. The record is in.

Now I might add, there's a lot of women in this plant. Last month the female unemployment rate was the same as the overall unemployment rate, 4.1 percent. That was the lowest unemployment rate for women in 46 years. And from 1993 until the end of 1997, when the Asian economy collapsed and the Russian economy had such great difficulty, until that point, 30 percent of this growth came from exports. And an enormous amount of it came because of improvements and advances in technology, not just computers in Silicon Valley but the computer programs running all these machines I saw on the plant floor here today, a lot of them taking the most dangerous jobs, some of the jobs that caused people to have long-term injuries, away, so that you can work and make a contribution and make these motorcycles at some less risk and wear and tear to yourselves.

Thirty percent of our growth came from exports, until we had the Asian collapse. And they're coming back now. We've worked hard to help them. They're coming back now.

Now, in spite of these economic statistics—I mean, here's why we're here, apart from the fact that Bill Daley and I wanted to come here. And we're glad we got our jackets, and we really wish we were leaving with motorcycles. But I have to wait a year and a half, you know? I've got to wait a year and a half. I couldn't bear all the stories out here if I rode around on a motorcycle for a while.

But let me tell you, the reason we're here, to be fair, is that, ironically, in spite of all those economic numbers I just recited, there's actually more division and controversy over whether trade is or isn't good for us today in Washington than there was in 1993 and in 1994 when we joined the World Trade Organization and set off this explosion of economic activity.

And again I say, I think it's because people are afraid that Americans always get a raw deal. They see we have a big trade deficit—that's because we've got even more money than we produce for. We buy things from other countries, but we also sell a lot abroad. We keep setting records for our exports. And a lot of what we sell abroad supports higher wages in America. The average trade-related job pays almost 20 percent more than a job unrelated to trade, like yours do. You know that.

So we have to find a way not just for big business leaders and people like me who live in Washington, who, you know, get a job that lasts for a term of years, regardless. We have to find ways for people like you, that get up and go to work every day and will have a lot of job security when you're doing well, and people who aren't in unionized plants and who may be working for low wages and who feel more vulnerable. We have to find a way to build a consensus in America so that all Americans understand that if we want to keep growing this economy, raising wages, creating jobs, we've got to stick with what has brought us this far.

We've got to keep paying down this debt. We can make America debt-free in 15 years, for the first time since 1835, if we stay on the budget plan that I've laid out. And that will be great for you. Why should you care if we're debt-free? Because if the Government is out of debt, this business can borrow money at lower cost, and you will have lower home mortgage rates. You will have lower car payment rates. If you send your kids to college, the college loans will be lower. Just because of the amount we've reduced the deficit already, the average home mortgage costs the average American working family $2,000 a year less and the average car payment is $200 a year less and the average college loan is $200 a year less. We ought to keep going until we get America out of debt for the first time since 1835, so the money will be there at the lowest possible costs for the American enterprise system to create jobs and improve lives. That's important.

The second thing we ought to do is to find a way to continue to expand trade. You know, we just had a meeting, and I was told, well, just what you heard here in the speech: Thank you very much for helping us get into the Japanese market, and we're doing well there, but there are still some barriers there. I hear that everywhere. So next month in Seattle, we're going to have a chance to make the global trading system stronger, to tear down more tariffs, to deal with more nontariff barriers, to make it clear that if countries want access to our markets, we have to have access to theirs, but basically, to commit to expanding trade. Now that is what is in the interest of Harley Davidson, and that is what is in the interest of the 21st century American economy.

So I came here to say, we can have more companies like yours. We can have more success stories like yours. This company can have more employees like you. But if we're going to do it, we have to find a way to expand trade. There's 4 percent of us. We've got 22 percent of the income. We've got to sell something to the other 96 percent. It's just as simple as that. But we will never be able to do it unless working people believe that trade benefits ordinary American families.

You know, the politicians and the CEO's can talk until they're blue in the face. But we still have elections in this country, and in the end, you guys run the show. And it's a good thing. That's why we're still around here after 200 years. But if we can't convince people like you that we're right about this trade issue, then we are going to shrink America's future prospects. It's as simple as that.

You know, I want you all to watch Seattle when it rolls around. Every group in the world with an axe to grind is going to Seattle to demonstrate. I'll have more demonstrators against me than I've had in the whole 7 years I've been President. I'm kind of looking forward to it. [*Laughter*] I'll tell you why. I told them all I wanted them to come. I want all the consumer groups to come. I want all the environmental groups to come. I want everybody who thinks this is a bad deal to come. I want everybody to get all this out of their system and say their piece of mind. And I want us to have a huge debate about this.

But I'm telling you, I've worked really hard for you the last 7 years to turn this economy

around and to get it going in the right direction. I've worked hard to make sure other people play by the rules, not just in York, Pennsylvania, but in York, England, and in York, western Australia.

And now, as I look ahead to the last year and a couple of months of my term, I try to think of what things I can still do that will allow this prosperity to go on and on and that will embrace people who haven't yet been affected by it. We still have people in places who haven't been picked up by this recovery. And I want this to go on. It's already the longest peacetime expansion in history. In February it'll be the longest economic expansion, including those that embraced our World Wars. But we can keep it going. But only if we find more customers and more investment in a non-inflationary way. And there's only two places to find it. You've got to go to the places in America which have had no recovery and to the people who are still on welfare or otherwise left out, or you've got to sell more stuff overseas.

Therefore, I say to you—I don't think the trading system is perfect, by the way. I have argued until I'm blue in the face, and I will continue to argue that when we make these trade rules, we need to take the concerns of ordinary citizens into account. We should be growing the economy not just in America but everywhere and still improving the environment.

Let me tell you, compared to 7 years ago, with all these jobs, in America, the air is cleaner; the water is cleaner; the food is safer. We've set aside more land to protect it for sportspeople and for tourists and people that just want to be out in nature, than any administration in the history of this country, except those of Franklin and Theodore Roosevelt. You can improve the economy and improve the environment at the same time. People ought to have that everywhere. They ought to have that security everywhere.

Working people everywhere, even if they can't enjoy the same income you do, ought to have access to basic labor rights. We shouldn't be having child labor in some of these countries producing products to compete in our markets and exploit children when they ought to be in school. We ought to have basic, decent labor standards for people everywhere.

And I believe—that's why I'm glad the demonstrators are coming. I want us to try to find a way to build a consensus where we can expand trade and respect the rights of labor and the environment.

But let me tell you something, you know this, you think about your own life. If we have more trade and it's good for you and it's good for those countries, don't you think it's more likely that working people will be better off and their environment will be cleaner? I mean, the more money you've got, the more you can afford to give workers wages that are increased, and the more you can afford to clean up the environment. So I think all these things work together.

In Seattle, I'm going to ask the trade organization for the very first time to establish a working group on trade and labor, so we get working people and their concerns involved in the trade process before all the decisions are made. I have worked hard to make environment a part of this. I think it's important.

But I came here for this simple reason. This is a great company. You've got a great union. You've found a successful way to compete in the world. You represent the future of the American economy. But if I cannot convince the decisionmakers in Washington and ordinary people like you all across America that a key part of the economic success we've enjoyed in the last 7 years and the economic success America can enjoy in the years ahead requires us to continue to break down barriers to trade, then in the future, when I'm not around anymore, you won't have the economic prosperity that I think you deserve.

So I ask you to think about this. I thank you for being so quiet and listening to this. I wouldn't be for this if I didn't think it was right for you, if I didn't think it was good for ordinary Americans. But I'll leave you with this thought: We live in a world that is smaller and smaller, and that is either going to make us more prosperous and more secure or more vulnerable and more insecure. If we don't trade with other people and help them to get involved in a cycle of growth with us and you have more and more people that are poor, with open borders, you're

going to have more drug trafficking, more organized crime, more political terrorism, and more headaches. And everybody everywhere will be more vulnerable to it.

On the other hand, if we make a living by selling more of our things overseas and the price of that is to let people sell more of their things to us and they do better and their children do better, you will have more cooperation and a far more interesting world for your children to live in.

I believe the best days of this country are still ahead. I believe the life our kids and grandkids are going to have will be truly amazing. Within 10 years, children might actually be born with a life expectancy of a hundred years. Their mothers will take home with them from the hospital a map of the children's genetic system, which will say, your child has the following strengths and the following problems, but if you do these 10 things in the child's upbringing you will dramatically reduce the fact that your little girl will get breast cancer or your little boy will develop colon cancer. It will be an amazing future.

But we have to do the big things right. That's what you do here. You do the big things right. And you know a lot of little mistakes will be made. You know even you aren't perfect. You know mistakes will be made, but if you get the big things right, you know it's going to come out all right.

What I'm trying to do, with this new trade round in Seattle, Washington, and with these speeches across the country, is to make sure as Americans, we get the big things right. Should we fight for fair trade? You bet. Did we get a lot of steel dumped on us when the Asian and the Russian economies went down, and was it unfair, and did I have to push hard to get it out? You bet. Did you deserve trade protection several years ago when you got it? Absolutely you did.

Do we have to make the system work right? Yes. That's true. You've got to make the system work right. But let's not lose the big point: if we want to continue to grow, have high incomes, low unemployment—the lowest minority unemployment in the history of the country, lowest women's unemployment in 46 years, the lowest overall unemployment in 30 years—if we want that, if we want a country growing together, a part of our strategy has got to be to sell more, not just Harleys, but everything we can possibly sell, around the world.

So I ask you, don't let this trade debate be the province of politicians and CEO's. You embrace it. It's your future, and your children's future. And every company can be like Harley. But we have to embrace the world and say, "We are not afraid. We can get the big things right."

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1 p.m. in a tent at the Harley-Davidson Plant. In his remarks, he referred to Jeffrey Bleustein, chief executive officer, and Willie G. Davidson, vice president of Styling, Harley-Davidson Motor Co.; Bobby Ramsey, chief shop steward, and William Dannehl, general manager York facility, Harley-Davidson Motor Co.; Harry Smith, president, Local 175, International Union of Machinists; and Mayor Charles Robertson of York.

Statement on Senate Confirmation of Carol Moseley-Braun To Be Ambassador to New Zealand

November 10, 1999

I am very pleased that the Senate has confirmed Carol Moseley-Braun to be our Nation's Ambassador to New Zealand. The Senate's overwhelming bipartisan vote is a strong endorsement of her outstanding experience and credentials for this position. I appreciate her willingness to take on this responsibility, and I expect her to do a superior job representing our country's interests in New Zealand.

Statement on Funding To Assist Colombia in Fighting Drug Production and Trafficking

November 10, 1999

Fourteen months ago, the inauguration of President Andres Pastrana brought to Colombia a new spirit of hope—for deeper democracy, for broader prosperity, for an end to that country's long civil conflict. President Pastrana has put forth a bold agenda—Plan Colombia—to address his nation's toughest

challenges. But the obstacles to a better future for Colombia are substantial. In particular, continued drug production and trafficking puts Colombia's progress in peril. It also fuels addiction and violence in other countries, including ours.

Therefore, I am pleased that the current foreign operations bill, which I hope the Congress will approve, provides our full $78 million request for programs to help President Pastrana fight the drug trade in Colombia. It provides a total of $305 million for global counter-drug efforts, which could allow additional spending focused on Colombia. My overall FY 2000 budget request funds other efforts to assist in this fight—such as asset forfeiture, military assistance and training—totaling more than $70 million. Earlier this fall, we approved a further $58 million in drawdown funds for counter-drug efforts in Colombia. And we anticipate providing additional help, including DEA assistance, alternative development, and potential additional drawdown authority.

While we will continue to move forward to aid Plan Colombia with currently available funds, more funding is needed if we are to gain the upper hand in the fight against drugs and help Colombia on the path to stable democracy. I have asked my senior advisers to work with Congress, following completion of the current budget process, to enhance our bilateral assistance programs—for counter-drug efforts and for other programs to help President Pastrana deepen democracy and promote prosperity. We will also continue to encourage our allies and the international institutions to assist Colombia in implementing President Pastrana's strategy.

Strengthening stability and democracy in Colombia, and fighting the drug trade there, is the right thing to do, and it is very much in America's own national interest. So, with President Pastrana and with our Congress, we must and we will intensify this vital work.

Notice—Continuation of Emergency Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction

November 10, 1999

On November 14, 1994, by Executive Order 12938, I declared a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons ("weapons of mass destruction") and the means of delivering such weapons. Because the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, the national emergency first declared on November 14, 1994, and extended on November 14, 1995, November 12, 1996, November 13, 1997, and November 12, 1998, must continue in effect beyond November 14, 1999. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12938.

This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 10, 1999.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:15 p.m., November 10, 1999]

NOTE: This notice was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 10, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on November 12.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction

November 10, 1999

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 14, 1994, in light of the dangers of the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons (''weapons of mass destruction''—WMD) and of the means of delivering such weapons, I issued Executive Order 12938, and declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.). Under section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), the national emergency terminates on the anniversary date of its declaration unless, within the 90-day period prior to each anniversary date, I publish in the *Federal Register* and transmit to the Congress a notice stating that such emergency is to continue in effect. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. I am, therefore, advising the Congress that the national emergency declared on November 14, 1994, and extended on November 14, 1995, November 12, 1996, November 13, 1997, and November 12, 1998, must continue in effect beyond November 14, 1999. Accordingly, I have extended the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12938, as amended.

The following report is made pursuant to section 204(a) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), regarding activities taken and money spent pursuant to the emergency declaration. Additional information on nuclear, missile, and/or chemical and biological weapons (CBW) nonproliferation efforts is contained in the most recent annual Report on the Proliferation of Missiles and Essential Components of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Weapons, provided to the Congress pursuant to section 1097 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190), also known as the ''Nonproliferation Report,'' and the most recent annual report provided to the Congress pursuant to section 308 of the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–182), also known as the ''CBW Report.''

On July 28, 1998, in Executive Order 13094, I amended section 4 of Executive Order 12938 so that the United States Government could more effectively respond to the worldwide threat of weapons of mass destruction proliferation activities. The amendment of section 4 strengthens Executive Order 12938 in several significant ways. The amendment broadens the type of proliferation activity that can subject entities to potential penalties under the Executive order. The original Executive order provided for penalties for contributions to the efforts of any foreign country, project or entity to use, acquire, design, produce, or stockpile chemical or biological weapons; the amended Executive order also covers contributions to foreign programs for nuclear weapons and for missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, the amendment expands the original Executive order to include attempts to contribute to foreign proliferation activities, as well as actual contributions, and broadens the range of potential penalties to expressly include the prohibition of U.S. Government assistance to foreign persons, and the prohibition of imports into the United States and U.S. Government procurement. In sum, the amendment gives the United States Government greater flexibility and discretion in deciding how and to what extent to impose measures against foreign persons that assist proliferation programs.

Nuclear Weapons

In May 1998, India and Pakistan each conducted a series of nuclear tests. World reaction included nearly universal condemnation across a broad range of international fora and multilateral support for a broad range of sanctions, including new restrictions on lending by international financial institutions unrelated to basic human needs and on aid from the G–8 and other countries.

Since the mandatory imposition of U.S. statutory sanctions, we have worked unilaterally, with other P–5 and G–8 members, and through the United Nations, to dissuade

India and Pakistan from taking further steps toward developing nuclear weapons. We have urged them to join multilateral arms control efforts and to conform to the standards of nonproliferation regimes, to prevent a regional arms race and build confidence by practicing restraint, and to resume efforts to resolve their differences through dialogue. The P–5, G–8, and U.N. Security Council have called on India and Pakistan to take a broad range of concrete actions. The United States has focused most intensely on several objectives that can be met over the short and medium term: an end to nuclear testing and prompt, unconditional ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT); engagement in productive negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) and, pending their conclusion, a moratorium on production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices; restraint in development and deployment of nuclear-capable missiles and aircraft; and adoption of controls meeting international standards on exports of sensitive materials and technology.

Against this backdrop of international pressure on India and Pakistan, high-level U.S. dialogues with Indian and Pakistani officials have yielded little progress. In September 1998, Indian and Pakistani leaders had expressed a willingness to sign the CTBT. Both governments, having already declared testing moratoria, had indicated they were prepared to sign the CTBT by September 1999 under certain conditions. These declarations were made prior to the collapse of Prime Minister Vajpayee's Indian government in April 1999, a development that has delayed consideration of CTBT signature in India. The Indian election, the Kargil conflict, and the October political coup in Pakistan have further complicated the issue, although neither country has renounced its commitment. Pakistan has said that it will not sign the Treaty until India does. Additionally, Pakistan's Foreign Minister stated publicly on September 12, 1999, that Pakistan would not consider signing the CTBT until sanctions are removed.

India and Pakistan both withdrew their opposition to negotiations on an FMCT in Geneva at the end of the 1998 Conference on Disarmament session. However, these negotiations were unable to resume in 1999 and we have no indications that India or Pakistan played helpful "behind the scenes" roles. They also pledged to institute strict controls that meet internationally accepted standards on sensitive exports, and have begun expert discussions with the United States and others on this subject. In addition, India and Pakistan resumed their bilateral dialogue on outstanding disputes, including Kashmir, at the Foreign Secretary level. The Kargil conflict this summer complicated efforts to continue this bilateral dialogue, although both sides have expressed interest in resuming the discussions at some future point. We will continue discussions with both governments at the senior and expert levels, and our diplomatic efforts in concert with the P–5, G–8, and in international fora. Efforts may be further complicated by India's release in August 1999 of a draft of its nuclear doctrine, which, although its timing may have been politically motivated, suggests that India intends to make nuclear weapons an integral part of the national defense.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK or North Korea) continues to maintain a freeze on its nuclear facilities consistent with the 1994 U.S.-DPRK Agreed Framework, which calls for the immediate freezing and eventual dismantling of the DPRK's graphite-moderated reactors and reprocessing plant at Yongbyon and Taechon. The United States has raised its concerns with the DPRK about a suspect underground site under construction, possibly intended to support nuclear activities contrary to the Agreed Framework. In March 1999, the United States reached agreement with the DPRK for visits by a team of U.S. experts to the facility. In May 1999, a Department of State team visited the underground facility at Kumchang-ni. The team was permitted to conduct all activities previously agreed to help remove suspicions about the site. Based on the data gathered by the U.S. delegation and the subsequent technical review, the United States has concluded that, at present, the underground site does not violate the 1994 U.S.-DPRK Agreed Framework.

The Agreed Framework requires the DPRK to come into full compliance with its

NPT and IAEA obligations as a part of a process that also includes the supply of two light water reactors to North Korea. United States experts remain on-site in North Korea working to complete clean-up operations after largely finishing the canning of spent fuel from the North's 5-megawatt nuclear reactor.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is the cornerstone on the global nuclear nonproliferation regime. In May 1999, NPT Parties met in New York to complete preparations for the 2000 NPT Review Conference. The United States is working with others to ensure that the 2000 NPT Review Conference is a success that reaffirms the NPT as a strong and viable part of the global security system.

The United States signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty on September 24, 1996. So far, 154 countries have signed and 51 have ratified the CTBT. During 1999, CTBT signatories conducted numerous meetings of the Preparatory Commission (PrepCom) in Vienna, seeking to promote rapid completion of the International Monitoring System (IMS) established by the Treaty. In October 1999, a conference was held pursuant to Article XIV of the CTBT, to discuss ways to accelerate the entry into force of the Treaty. The United States attended that conference as an observer.

On September 22, 1997, I transmitted the CTBT to the Senate, requesting prompt advice and consent to ratification. I deeply regret the Senate's decision on October 13, 1999, to refuse its consent to ratify the CTBT. The CTBT will serve several U.S. national security interests by prohibiting all nuclear explosions. It will constrain the development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons; end the development of advanced new types of weapons; contribute to the prevention of nuclear proliferation and the process of nuclear disarmament; and strengthen international peace and security. The CTBT marks a historic milestone in our drive to reduce the nuclear threat and to build a safer world. For these reasons, we hope that at an appropriate time, the Senate will reconsider this treaty in a manner that will ensure a fair and thorough hearing process and will allow for more thoughtful debate.

With 35 member states, the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) is a widely accepted, mature, and effective export-control arrangement. At its May 1999 Plenary and related meetings in Florence, Italy, the NSG considered new members (although none were accepted at that meeting), reviewed efforts to enhance transparency, and pursued efforts to streamline procedures and update control lists. The NSG created an Implementation Working Group, chaired by the UK, to consider changes to the guidelines, membership issues, the relationship with the NPT Exporters (Zangger) Committee, and controls on brokering. The Transparency Working Group was tasked with preparing a report on NSG activities for presentation at the 2000 NPT Review Conference by the Italian chair. The French will host the Plenary and assume the NSG Chair in 2000 and the United States will host and chair in 2001.

The NSG is currently considering membership requests from Turkey and Belarus. Turkey's membership is pending only agreement by Russia to join the intercessional consensus of all other NSG members. The United States believes it would be appropriate to confirm intercessional consensus in support of Turkey's membership before considering other candidates. Belarus has been in consultation with the NSG Chair and other members including Russia and the United States regarding its interest in membership and the status of its implementation of export controls to meet NSG Guideline standards. The United States will not block intercessional consensus of NSG members in support of NSG membership for Belarus, provided that consensus for Turkey's membership precedes it. Cyprus and Kazakhstan have also expressed interest in membership and are in consultation with the NSG Chair and other members regarding the status of their export control systems. China is the only major nuclear supplier that is not a member of the NSG, primarily because it has not accepted the NSG policy of requiring full-scope safeguards as a condition for supply of nuclear trigger list items to nonnuclear weapon states. However, China has taken major steps toward harmonization of its export control

system with the NSG Guidelines by the implementation of controls over nuclear-related dual-use equipment and technology.

During the last 6-months, we reviewed intelligence and other reports of trade in nuclear-related material and technology that might be relevant to nuclear-related sanctions provisions in the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992, as amended; the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; and the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994. No statutory sanctions determinations were reached during this reporting period. The administrative measures imposed against ten Russian entities for their nuclear- and/or missile-related cooperation with Iran remain in effect.

Chemical and Biological Weapons

The export control regulations issued under the Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative (EPCI) remain fully in force and continue to be applied by the Department of Commerce, in consultation with other agencies, in order to control the export of items with potential use in chemical or biological weapons or unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction.

Chemical weapons (CW) continue to pose a very serious threat to our security and that of our allies. On April 29, 1997, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (the Chemical Weapons Convention or CWC) entered into force with 87 of the CWC's 165 States Signatories as original States Parties. The United States was among their number, having ratified the CWC on April 25, 1997. Russia ratified the CWC on November 5, 1997, and became a State Party on December 8, 1997. To date, 126 countries (including China, Iran, India, Pakistan, and Ukraine) have become States Parties.

The implementing body for the CWC—the Organization For the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW)—was established at entry-into-force (EIF) of the Convention on April 29, 1997. The OPCW, located in The Hague, has primary responsibility (along with States Parties) for implementing the CWC. It consists of the Conference of the States Parties, the Executive Council (EC), and the Technical Secretariat (TS). The TS carries out the verification provisions of the CWC, and presently has a staff of approximately 500, including about 200 inspectors trained and equipped to inspect military and industrial facilities throughout the world. To date, the OPCW has conducted over 500 routine inspections in some 29 countries. No challenge inspections have yet taken place. To date, nearly 170 inspections have been conducted at military facilities in the United States. The OPCW maintains a permanent inspector presence at operational U.S. CW destruction facilities in Utah and Johnston Island.

The United States is determined to seek full implementation of the concrete measures in the CWC designed to raise the costs and risks for any state or terrorist attempting to engage in chemical weapons-related activities. The CWC's declaration requirements improve our knowledge of possible chemical weapons activities. Its inspection provisions provide for access to declared and undeclared facilities and locations, thus making clandestine chemical weapons production and stockpiling more difficult, more risky, and more expensive.

The Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act of 1998 was enacted into U.S. law in October 1998, as part of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–277). My Administration published an Executive order on June 25, 1999, to facilitate implementation of the Act and is working to publish regulations regarding industrial declarations and inspections of industrial facilities. Submission of these declarations to the OPCW, and subsequent inspections, will enable the United States to be fully compliant with the CWC. United States noncompliance to date has, among other things, undermined U.S. leadership in the organization as well as our ability to encourage other States Parties to make complete, accurate, and timely declarations.

Countries that refuse to join the CWC will be politically isolated and prohibited by the CWC from trading with States Parties in certain key chemicals. The relevant treaty provisions are specifically designed to penalize countries that refuse to join the rest of the

world in eliminating the threat of chemical weapons.

The United States also continues to play a leading role in the international effort to reduce the threat from biological weapons (BW). We participate actively in the Ad Hoc Group (AHG) of States Parties striving to complete a legally binding protocol to strengthen and enhance compliance with the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (the Biological Weapons Convention or BWC). This Ad Hoc Group was mandated by the September 1994 BWC Special Conference. The Fourth BWC Review Conference, held in November/December 1996, urged the AHG to complete the protocol as soon as possible but not later than the next Review Conference to be held in 2001. Work is progressing on a draft rolling text through insertion of national views and clarification of existing text. Five AHG negotiating sessions were scheduled for 1999. The United States is working toward completion of the substance of a strong Protocol next year.

On January 27, 1998, during the State of the Union address, I announced that the United States would take a leading role in the effort to erect stronger international barriers against the proliferation and use of BW by strengthening the BWC with a new international system to detect and deter cheating. The United States is working closely with U.S. industry representatives to obtain technical input relevant to the development of U.S. negotiating positions and then to reach international agreement on data declarations and on-site investigations.

The United States continues to be a leading participant in the 30-member Australia Group (AG) chemical and biological weapons nonproliferation regime. The United States attended the most recent annual AG Plenary Session from October 4–8, 1999, during which the Group reaffirmed the members' continued collective belief in the Group's viability, importance, and compatibility with the CWC and BWC. Members continue to agree that full adherence to the CWC and BWC by all governments will be the only way to achieve a permanent global ban on chemical and biological weapons, and that all states adhering to these Conventions must take steps to ensure that their national activities support these goals. At the 1999 Plenary, the Group continued to focus on strengthening AG export controls and sharing information to address the threat of CBW terrorism. The AG also reaffirmed its commitment to continue its active outreach program of briefings for non-AG countries, and to promote regional consultations on export controls and nonproliferation to further awareness and understanding of national policies in these areas. The AG discussed ways to be more proactive in stemming attacks on the AG in the CWC and BWC contexts.

During the last 6 months, we continued to examine closely intelligence and other reports of trade in CBW-related material and technology that might be relevant to sanctions provisions under the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991. No new sanctions determinations were reached during this reporting period. The United States also continues to cooperate with its AG partners and other countries in stopping shipments of proliferation concern.

Missiles for Delivery of Weapons of Mass Destruction

The United States continues carefully to control exports that could contribute to unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction, and closely to monitor activities of potential missile proliferation concern. We also continued to implement U.S. missile sanctions laws. In March 1999, we imposed missile sanctions against three Middle Eastern entities for transfers involving Category II Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) Annex items. Category I missile sanctions imposed in April 1998 against North Korean and Pakistani entities for the transfer from North Korea to Pakistan of equipment and technology related to the Ghauri missile remain in effect.

During this reporting period, MTCR Partners continued to share information about proliferation problems with each other and with other potential supplier, consumer, and

transshipment states. Partners also emphasized the need for implementing effective export control systems. This cooperation has resulted in the interdiction of missile-related materials intended for use in missile programs of concern.

In June the United States participated in the MTCR's Reinforced Point of Contact Meeting (RPOC). At the RPOC, MTCR Partners held in-depth discussions of regional missile proliferation concerns, focusing in particular on Iran, North Korea, and South Asia. They also discussed steps Partners can take to further increase outreach to nonmembers. The Partners agreed to continue their discussion of this important topic at the October 1999 Noordwijk MTCR Plenary.

Also in June, the United States participated in a German-hosted MTCR workshop at which Partners and non-Partners discussed ways to address the proliferation potential inherent in intangible technology transfers. The seminar helped participants to develop a greater understanding of the intangible technology issue (i.e., how proliferators misuse the internet, scientific conferences, plant visits, student exchange programs, and higher education to acquire sensitive technology), and to begin to identify steps governments can take to address this problem.

In July 1999, the Partners completed a reformatting of the MTCR Annex. The newly reformatted Annex is intended to improve clarity and uniformity of implementation of MTCR controls while maintaining the coverage of the previous version of the MTCR Annex.

The MTCR held its Fourteenth Plenary Meeting in Noordwijk, The Netherlands, on October 11–15. At the Plenary, the Partners shared information about activities of missile proliferation concern worldwide. They focussed in particular on the threat to international security and stability posed by missile proliferation in key regions and considered what practical steps they could take, individually and collectively, to address ongoing missile-related activities of concern. During their discussions, Partners gave special attention to DPRK missile activities and also discussed the threat posed by missile-related activities in South and North East Asia and the Middle East.

During this reporting period, the United States continued to work unilaterally and in coordination with its MTCR Partners to combat missile proliferation and to encourage nonmembers to export responsibly and to adhere to the MTCR Guidelines. To encourage international focus on missile proliferation issues, the USG also placed the issue on the agenda for the G8 Cologne Summit, resulting in an undertaking to examine further individual and collective means of addressing this problem and reaffirming commitment to the objectives of the MTCR. Since my last report, we continued our missile nonproliferation dialogues with China (interrupted after the accidental bombing of China's Belgrade Embassy), India, the Republic of Korea (ROK), North Korea (DPRK), and Pakistan. In the course of normal diplomatic relations we also have pursued such discussions with other countries in Central Europe, South Asia, and the Middle East.

In March 1999, the United States and the DPRK held a fourth round of missile talks to underscore our strong opposition to North Korea's destabilizing missile development and export activities and press for tight constraints on DPRK missile development, testing, and exports. We also affirmed that the United States viewed further launches of long-range missiles and transfers of long-range missiles or technology for such missiles as direct threats to U.S. allies and ultimately to the United States itself. We subsequently have reiterated that message at every available opportunity. In particular, we have reminded the DPRK of the consequences of another rocket launch and encouraged it not to take such action. We also have urged the DPRK to take steps toward building a constructive bilateral relationship with the United States.

These efforts have resulted in an important first step. Since September 1999, it has been our understanding that the DPRK will refrain from testing long-range missiles of any kind during our discussions to improve relations. In recognition of this DPRK step, the United States has announced the easing of certain sanctions related to the import and export of many consumer goods.

In response to reports of continuing Iranian efforts to acquire sensitive items from Russian entities for use in Iran's missile and nuclear development programs, the United States continued its high-level dialogue with Russia aimed at finding ways the United States and Russia can work together to cut off the flow of sensitive goods to Iran's ballistic missile development program. During this reporting period, Russia's government created institutional foundations to implement a newly enacted nonproliferation policy and passed laws to punish wrongdoers. It also passed new export control legislation to tighten government control over sensitive technologies and began working with the United States to strengthen export control practices at Russian aerospace firms. However, despite the Russian government's nonproliferation and export control efforts, some Russian entities continued to cooperate with Iran's ballistic missile program and to engage in nuclear cooperation with Iran beyond the Bushehr reactor project. The administrative measures imposed on ten Russian entities for their missile- and nuclear-related cooperation with Iran remain in effect.

Value of Nonproliferation Export Controls

United States national export controls—both those implemented pursuant to multilateral nonproliferation regimes and those implemented unilaterally—play an important part in impeding the proliferation of WMD and missiles. (As used here, ''export controls'' refer to requirements for case-by-case review of certain exports, or limitations on exports of particular items of proliferation concern to certain destinations, rather than broad embargoes or economic sanctions that also affect trade.) As noted in this report, however, export controls are only one of a number of tools the United States uses to achieve its nonproliferation objectives. Global nonproliferation norms, informal multilateral nonproliferation regimes, interdicting shipments of proliferation concern, sanctions, export control assistance, redirection and elimination efforts, and robust U.S. military, intelligence, and diplomatic capabilities all work in conjunction with export controls as part of our overall nonproliferation strategy.

Export controls are a critical part of nonproliferation because every proliferant WMD/missile program seeks equipment and technology from other countries. Proliferators look overseas because needed items are unavailable elsewhere, because indigenously produced items are of insufficient quality or quantity, and/or because imported items can be obtained more quickly and cheaply than producing them at home. It is important to note that proliferators seek for their programs both items on multilateral lists (like gyroscopes controlled on the MTCR Annex and nerve gas ingredients on the Australia Group list) and unlisted items (like lower-level machine tools and very basic chemicals). In addition, many of the items of interest to proliferators are inherently dual-use. For example, key ingredients and technologies used in the production of fertilizers and pesticides also can be used to make chemical weapons; vaccine production technology (albeit not the vaccines themselves) can assist in the production of biological weapons.

The most obvious value of export controls is in impeding or even denying proliferators access to key pieces of equipment or technology for use in their WMD/missile programs. In large part, U.S. national export controls—and similar controls of our partners in the Australia Group, Missile Technology Control Regime, and Nuclear Suppliers Group—have denied proliferators access to the largest sources of the best equipment and technology. Proliferators have mostly been forced to seek less capable items from nonregime suppliers. Moreover, in many instances, U.S. and regime controls and associated efforts have forced proliferators to engage in complex clandestine procurements even from nonmember suppliers, taking time and money away from proliferant programs.

United States national export controls and those of our regime partners also have played an important leadership role, increasing over time the critical mass of countries applying nonproliferation export controls. For example, none of the following progress would have been possible without the leadership shown by U.S. willingness to be the first to apply controls: the seven-member MTCR of

1987 has grown to 32 member countries; several nonmember countries have been persuaded to apply export controls consistent with one or more of the regimes unilaterally; and most of the members of the nonproliferation regimes have applied national ''catch-all'' controls similar to those under the U.S. Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative. (Export controls normally are tied to a specific list of items, such as the MTCR Annex. ''Catch-all'' controls provide a legal basis to control exports of items not on a list, when those items are destined for WMD/missile programs.)

United States export controls, especially ''catch-all'' controls, also make important political and moral contributions to the nonproliferation effort. They uphold the broad legal obligations the United States has undertaken in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (Article I), Biological Weapons Convention (Article III), and Chemical Weapons Convention (Article I) not to assist anyone in proscribed WMD activities. They endeavor to assure there are no U.S. ''fingerprints'' on WMD and missiles that threaten U.S. citizens and territory and our friends and interests overseas. They place the United States squarely and unambiguously against WMD/missile proliferation, even against the prospect of inadvertent proliferation from the United States itself.

Finally, export controls play an important role in enabling and enhancing legitimate trade. They provide a means to permit dual-use export to proceed under circumstances where, without export control scrutiny, the only prudent course would be to prohibit them. They help build confidence between countries applying similar controls that, in turn, results in increased trade. Each of the WMD nonproliferation regimes, for example, has a ''no undercut'' policy committing each member not to make an export that another has denied for nonproliferation reasons and notified to the rest—unless it first consults with the original denying country. Not only does this policy make it more difficult for proliferators to get items from regime members, it establishes a ''level playing field'' for exporters.

Threat Reduction

The potential for proliferation of WMD and delivery system expertise has increased in part as a consequence of the economic crisis in Russia and other Newly Independent States, causing concern. My Administration gives high priority to controlling the human dimension of proliferation through programs that support the transition of former Soviet weapons scientists to civilian research and technology development activities. I have proposed an additional $4.5 billion for programs embodied in the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative that would support activities in four areas: nuclear security; nonnuclear WMD; science and technology nonproliferation; and military relocation, stabilization and other security cooperation programs. Congressional support for this initiative would enable the engagement of a broad range of programs under the Departments of State, Energy, and Defense.

Expenses

Pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641 (c)), I report that there were no specific expenses directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency in Executive Order 12938, as amended, during the period from May 15, 1999, through November 10, 1999.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 10, 1999.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Certification of Major Drug Producing and Transit Countries

November 10, 1999

Dear _____:

In accordance with the provisions of section 490(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, I have determined that the following are major illicit drug producing or drug transit ''countries'' (including certain entities that are not sovereign states): Afghanistan, The Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Hong Kong, India, Jamaica, Laos, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Taiwan, Thailand, Venezuela, and Vietnam.

This year I have removed Aruba and Belize from the majors list; added Belize as part of this year's Central America region of concern; added the entire Eastern and Southern Caribbean, including the Leeward and Windward Islands, Aruba, and the Netherlands Antilles, as a region of concern; and also added North Korea as a country of concern.

I wish to make clear that the inclusion of a country or entity on the majors list does not reflect an assessment of its government's counter-drug efforts or extent of cooperation with the United States. For example, among the reasons that a transit country or entity is placed on the majors list is the combination of geographical, commercial, and/or economic factors that allow drug traffickers to operate despite the most assiduous enforcement measures of the government concerned. In the case of Hong Kong and Taiwan, for instance, both entities have excellent counter-drug records and cooperate closely with the United States.

Aruba. Aruba was designated as a major transit country in 1997. While geography makes Aruba, like most of the other island countries in the Eastern and Southern Caribbean, a potential drug transit point, at this time we do not have evidence that it is a major transit country for drugs bound for the United States. Rather, the drug trade there appears directed toward Europe. We will continue, however, to keep Aruba under observation together with the rest of the islands in the region.

Belize. Belize's geographical position next to Mexico on the Yucatan peninsula offers would-be drug smugglers an attractive corridor for moving drugs into Mexico and on to the United States. Traffickers have used Belizean territory in previous years, when enforcement activities elsewhere enhanced the value of this route. Recently, however, we have detected significantly reduced drug flows to and through Belize.

Therefore, I have decided to remove Belize from the majors list. If future monitoring of Central America indicates a resumption of important drug flows through Belize bound for the United States, I will again place the country on the majors list.

Central America. Central America's location between South America and Mexico, together with its thousands of miles of coastline, several container-handling ports, the Pan-American Highway, and limited law enforcement capability make the entire region a logical conduit and transhipment area for illicit drugs bound for Mexico and the United States. The variance in seizure statistics from country to country, and their fluctuation from year to year, underscore my concern with Central America's potential and volatile role as a transit region. For instance, Panama and Guatemala continue to report more seizures than other countries in the region, while seizures to date by Costa Rica, Honduras, and Nicaragua are below levels during the same period in previous years and flow levels in El Salvador remain low. Taken together, these circumstances indicate a need to continue to monitor the situation in Central America.

Cuba. While there have been some reports that trafficking syndicates use Cuban land territory for moving drugs, we have yet to receive any confirmation that this traffic carries significant quantities of cocaine or heroin to the United States. In particular, the intelligence and law enforcement communities reviewed the information concerning whether the 7.2 metric ton shipment of cocaine seized in Colombia in December 1998, in a container reportedly headed to Cuba, was destined for the United States. Their judgment remains that Spain, and not the United States, was the intended final destination.

We also looked closely at the use of Cuban waters and airspace for transit of drugs to the United States, as the term ''major drug transit country'' is understood to apply to the land, waters, and airspace of a country over which sovereignty may be exercised, consistent with international law and United States practice. Although we have detected what appears to be some air and sea activity consistent with trafficking patterns, this activity has decreased significantly since last year and indicates a corresponding decrease in drug flow. We continue to keep trafficking in the area under close observation and will add Cuba to the majors list if the evidence warrants.

Eastern and Southern Caribbean. The Leeward and Windward Islands, together with Aruba and the Netherlands Antilles, constitute a broad geographical area through which drugs bound for the United States may pass en route from Latin America. We have no evidence at this time, however, that any of these Eastern Caribbean nations is a major drug transit country under the statutory definition. The information we do have indicates that drugs moving through the area are overwhelmingly destined for Europe. We are, therefore, keeping the region under observation, and I will add the relevant countries to the majors list should conditions warrant.

Iran. Although Iran in the past had been a traditional opium producing country, over the past few years the Government of Iran reported success in eradicating illicit opium poppy cultivation. A survey of the country this year revealed no detectable poppy cultivation in the traditional growing areas. While one cannot rule out some cultivation in remote parts of the country, it is unlikely that there would be enough to meet the threshold definition of a major drug producing country. Important quantities of opiates reportedly continue to transit Iran en route to Europe, but we have no evidence that these drugs significantly affect the United States, a requirement for designation as a major drug transit country under current legislation.

Malaysia. Malaysia was removed from the majors list last year because drug flow estimates did not indicate that drugs transiting the country had reached the United States in significant quantities.

North Korea. Our observations to date have been unable to confirm reports that significant quantities of opium poppy may be under cultivation in North Korea or that heroin originating in the country may be entering the international drug trade. We continue, however, to monitor the situation. If we confirm that there is indeed significant poppy cultivation, or that North Korea is a transit point for drugs significantly affecting the United States, I will add the country to the majors list.

Syria and Lebanon. We removed Syria and Lebanon from the majors list 2 years ago after we determined that there was no significant opium poppy cultivation in Lebanon's Biqa' Valley. Recent surveys have confirmed that there has been no detectable replanting of opium poppy, and we have no evidence that drugs transiting these countries significantly affect the United States. We continue, however, to keep the area under observation.

Turkey and Other Balkan Route Countries. We remain concerned about the large volume of Southwest Asian heroin moving through Turkey and neighboring countries to Western Europe along the Balkan Route. We have no clear evidence, however, that this heroin significantly affects the United States as required for a country to be designated a major transit country. In the event that we determine that heroin transiting Turkey, Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia-Montenegro, Bosnia, Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, or other European countries on the Balkan Route significantly affects the United States, I will add the relevant countries to the majors list.

Major Cannabis Producers. While Kazakastan, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, the Philippines, and South Africa are important cannabis producers, we have not included them on the majors list since in all cases the illicit cannabis is either consumed locally or exported to countries other than the United States. I have determined that such illicit cannabis production does not significantly affect the United States.

Central Asia. We have conducted probes in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan, traditional opium poppy growing areas of the former Soviet Union. These probes have not shown significant opium poppy cultivation. If ongoing analysis reveals cultivation of 1,000 hectares or more of poppy, I will add the relevant countries to the majors list.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Jesse Helms, chairman, and Joseph R. Biden, Jr., ranking member, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Ted Stevens, chairman, and Robert C. Byrd, ranking member, Senate Committee on Appropriations; Benjamin A. Gilman, chairman, and Sam Gejdenson, ranking member, House Committee on International Relations; and C.W. Bill Young, chairman, and David R. Obey, ranking member, House Committee on Appropriations.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Cyprus

November 10, 1999

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

In accordance with Public Law 95–384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question covering the period August 1, 1999, to September 30, 1999. The previous submission covered events during June and July 1999.

In an official working visit to the United States, Turkish Prime Minister Ecevit and I had a productive meeting on September 28. We exchanged views on a number of topics, including Cyprus. I emphasized that reaching a just and lasting solution to the Cyprus dispute remains one of my highest priorities. The Prime Minister and I agreed that there cannot be a solution to the Cyprus problem that would return the situation to what it was before 1974: all Cypriots must live in security. Prime Minister Ecevit supported my idea that my Special Emissary for Cyprus, Alfred H. Moses, travel to the region to explore ways to move forward on the Cyprus issue, in particular by starting comprehensive talks with no pre-condition under U.N. auspices, as called for by the G–8.

The international community mourned the death of Greek Alternate Foreign Minister Kranidiotis. His passing is a true loss for Greece and Cyprus.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Jesse Helms, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Ukraine-United States Treaty on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters With Documentation

November 10, 1999

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the United States of America and Ukraine on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters with Annex, signed at Kiev on July 22, 1998. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, an exchange of notes which was signed on September 30, 1999, which provides for its provisional application, as well as the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty.

The Treaty is one of a series of modern mutual legal assistance treaties being negotiated by the United States in order to counter criminal activities more effectively. The Treaty should be an effective tool to assist in the prosecution of a wide variety of crimes, including drug trafficking offenses. The Treaty is self-executing. It provides for a broad range of cooperation in criminal matters. Mutual assistance available under the Treaty includes: taking of testimony or statements of persons; providing documents, records, and articles of evidence; serving documents; locating or identifying persons; transferring persons in custody for testimony or other purposes; executing requests for searches and seizures; assisting in proceedings related to restraint, confiscation, forfeiture of assets, restitution, and collection of fines; and any other form of assistance not prohibited by the laws of the requested state.

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

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 10, 1999.

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

Remarks at a National Coalition of Minority Business Award Dinner

November 10, 1999

Thank you very much. Thank you. Whew, this is a pretty rowdy crowd tonight. We may have to sing that song before we're done. [*Laughter*]

Chairman Garrett, when you were sort of introducing Weldon, and you kept reading all those quotes about his influence, and this, that, and the other thing—and I thought, this

can all be distilled in one sentence: Bill Clinton does what he asked him to. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Weldon and Mel for having me here. And I want to thank you, Chairman Garrett, and the board and all of you who made this dinner possible tonight. I want to thank the members of the administration who are here. Secretary Slater—do you know what I thought about when Secretary Slater got up to read Reverend Jackson's letter? If Jesse had known Rodney was going to read for him, he probably would have come back for fear that Rodney would read it better than he would. [*Laughter*] I'll pay for that later. [*Laughter*]

I want to tell you, I think Reverend Jackson is where he ought to be tonight, and you should know that he's been with me every step of the two new markets tours we have taken, and it's been a great joy. We've been friends for many years. I can still remember when we ate french fries in the kitchen of the Arkansas Governor's mansion, more than a decade ago, and talked about how foolish it was that we weren't trying to include all Americans in the economic mainstream of our life. And he was on this road before I was, and I'm glad that we're walking it together now.

I want to thank Secretary Alexis Herman and Aida Alvarez for their leadership. There are others here in this administration—Alvin Brown does a wonderful job for the Vice President and for me, leading our empowerment zones and enterprise community initiative. And one of the things I want to compliment him on is that we just got—among the victories in this last-minute budget process is we've now fully funded the second round of empowerment zones to give more poor communities opportunities. Thank you, Alvin.

I told Aida Alvarez that if Weldon really had the guts to tell Erskine Bowles that she was the best Administrator of the SBA, we could all enjoy his misery tonight—[*laughter*]—because you have done a wonderful job. And there are others who are here. Bill Lann Lee, the head of the Civil Rights Division; thank you, sir, for your leadership. And I see Dave Barram, the Government's landlord, GSA; thank you for what you have done here. And Fred Hochberg, at the SBA, out there. And a person who used to be a part of this administration who had a lot to do with ''mead it, don't end it,'' and a lot of other good things, Deval Patrick. Thank you for being here tonight. Bless you, sir.

And thank you for acknowledging Minyon Moore, my political director; and Ben Johnson who runs our One America office; and my good friend Ernie Green. I tell you, I wish every one of you had been in the White House yesterday for that Gold Medal celebration for the Little Rock Nine. It was one of the most moving things that I have ever had the opportunity to be involved in. [*Applause*] Thank you.

I want to also acknowledge the Members of Congress here tonight that I believe are here; Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard; Congressman Rubén Hinojosa, my good friend from south Texas; Congressman John Conyers is here, obviously.

And I want to pay special recognition to one other person who is here, because he's up for reelection next year; he needs your help, and he is one of the most courageous Members of the United States Congress. If ever we had a friend who deserves to be reelected, it's Senator Chuck Robb from Virginia. And I want to ask him to stand up. Thank you. [*Applause*] He may well be the greatest Virginia—greatest Governor Virginia had since Thomas Jefferson, in his record in education and in so many other ways. We served together, and I have seen him cast vote after vote in the Senate, knowing that it might cost him his seat. And he just gets up every day and does what he thinks is right. He deserves the support of every thinking person in America who cares about the direction of the United States Senate. He's got a hard fight. I believe he's going to win, but he has to have all kinds of help, financial, vote, and otherwise, to win. And I want to urge you to support him in every way you can. Thank you. [*Applause*]

I'm told that Mayor David Dinkins from New York is here tonight. If he's here, or was here, anyway—and if you're not here, I still think you're great. [*Laughter*] You've heard this speech before.

I thank you for this award. You know, I always feel generally that Presidents shouldn't receive awards, that having the job

is award enough. But I confess I kind of like this one. [*Laughter*] And I'm going to put it on my desk in the Oval Office tomorrow, so you'll begin to see it on television, and you'll know how much I like it.

You told that joke about ''Lift Every Voice and Sing.'' I remember one time Vernon Jordan and I sang that song to a group of unbelieving people on Martha's Vineyard. [*Laughter*] You know, this is all beginning to cause me some difficulty. Last night I spoke to a Hispanic Democratic dinner, and I was introduced by my friend Miguel Lausell from Puerto Rico. And he stood up and said, ''This President has a Latino soul.'' [*Laughter*] And not long ago, Toni Morrison said that I was—Toni Morrison, the Pulitzer Prize-winning African-American writer, said that I was the first black President America had ever had. [*Laughter*] So I thought to myself, now I'll never be able to go home to Ireland. What am I going to do? [*Laughter*]

All of this that we're laughing about really stems from something I deeply believe. I believe it about America, but I believe it about every person's journey through life. We all struggle, and we all fail. But we all struggle to live a life of integrity, which means literally that we are integrated, that our mind and our body and our spirit are in the same place at the same time, centered and connected to other human beings. And I've always believed that, in so many ways, the purpose of politics is to find a unifying vision that will allow people to release the barriers that keep them from one another so they can join hands and enhance our common destiny.

It's been a privilege to serve. I don't really deserve any awards. I got to be President, and it's the greatest honor that any American could ever have. Your success is the greatest award I could get, because of the mission of our country, the eternal mission of our country is to deepen the meaning of our freedom and widen the circle of opportunity and strengthen the bonds of our community. And it turns out that trying to make sure that everybody shares in our prosperity is not only the morally right thing to do, it's good for all the rest of America, too—which is why all these businesses are here tonight. So we have come a long way by following the admonition of the Scriptures to be doers of the Word and not hearers only.

Twelve years ago, or in the 12 years before the Vice President and I came here, we had a very different view, I think, of ourselves as a country, which dominated Washington, and a very different economic philosophy. But in the end, by 1992, it had brought us to a place where we had economic distress and social division, with a Government that had been discredited by the people who were running it, who said the Government was the problem. And even though along the way I thought they did some quite good things—standing up against communism, signing the Americans with Disabilities Act—but all the time telling us that the Government was the problem. And also defying the basic laws of arithmetic when it came to doing our budget. [*Laughter*]

So in 1992, Vice President Gore and I asked the American people to give us a chance to put people first, to be driven by a vision of opportunity for all, but responsibility from all Americans. I always thought, contrary to the prevailing political rhetoric, that most people wanted to be responsible and would respond to a challenge to do that—and to build a community of increasingly diverse Americans.

We had some new ideas about the economy, about welfare, about crime, about the environment, about national service, about America's role in the world. And with the help of a lot of you here, the American people gave us a chance to try our ideas. And after 7 years, the results are in. And I am very grateful that we have the longest peacetime expansion in our history. By February it will be the longest economic expansion in American history, including the Second World War and World War I and the times we were fully mobilized. Nearly 20 million new jobs; a 30-year low in unemployment; a 32-year low in the welfare rolls; a 25-year low in the crime rate; 20-year low in the poverty rates; the first time we've had back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years, with the smallest Federal Government in 37 years. You've been a part of that. That's the America you have made because you have been given a chance to make it. And you should

be very proud of yourselves for the role you played in it.

Along the way, we tried to make sure that people who worked 40 hours a week and had kids in their homes should not be poor. So we doubled the earned-income tax credit and cut taxes for 15 million working Americans, raised the minimum wage, and I hope we're about to raise it again. We passed the Brady bill, which has now kept 400,000 people with criminal or other problem histories from getting handguns, giving us the lowest murder rate in 30 years.

We fought for and won an increase in children's health coverage that will enable us, I hope and believe, over the next year or so, to cover 5 million more children with health insurance. Ninety percent of our kids are immunized against serious childhood diseases, for the very first time in our history. We've expanded Head Start, and the family and medical leave law has now enabled over 15 million Americans to take a little time off from work without losing their jobs when a baby is born or a parent is sick.

We've opened the doors of higher education with the HOPE scholarship and other tax credits and more Pell grant fundings and tax deductibility for interest on student loans. The air is cleaner; the water is cleaner; the food is safer. We set aside more land in protected areas than any administration in the history of this country, except those of Franklin and Theodore Roosevelt.

One hundred and fifty thousand young Americans, and some not so young, have entered the AmeriCorps program and served in their communities all across America, solving problems and working with people, helping children, dealing with natural disasters, rebuilding dilapidated housing, doing any number of things to make our country a better place. And we have made a clear commitment to building one America in the 21st century.

We've tried to reach out, I might add, in ways that are not always apparent. You know, and you've made—I like that joke about how my administration doesn't look like the one on "West Wing." I don't recognize that White House, you know? [*Laughter*] It's a cute show, but it ought to be more diverse, because America is. And our administration is. You know that. You know the record of our appointments to the Federal Bench and the efforts to increase the effectiveness of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. We've also, I might add, tried to make sure that people who have different political views than mine had their rights respected, that all Federal employees were citizens and could be citizens, that the religious convictions of Federal employees and children in our schools could have the widest possible protection. So I haven't tried just to bring into this tent of one America people who will vote for me at the next election, but all people who should feel that they have a place at America's table.

But we have made a special effort on the economic front to help people who have traditionally been left behind. We've increased by 2½ times the number of small business loans to African-American entrepreneurs, and by 2½ times the number of SBA loans to Hispanic entrepreneurs since 1992. And beneath those economic statistics that I just ran off—the 30 years, 30 years, 20 years—I wish you all could remember that and just tell everybody between now and the next election—[*laughter*]—we have the lowest levels ever recorded of African-American poverty and child poverty, the lowest Hispanic poverty rate in a generation, the lowest female unemployment rate—listen to this—lowest female unemployment rate in 46 years, and the lowest African-American and Hispanic unemployment rates ever recorded since we started separate statistics in the 1970's.

Now, I think the important question is, what do we intend to do with this. You know, I worked as hard as I could, and I will continue to every day for the next 430-some odd days I have to be President, to keep this country going in the right direction, to build that bridge to the 21st century we talked about in 1996. A nation is almost like a vast ocean liner out in the Pacific somewhere. To turn it around, you can't do it on a dime; it takes time. And we've worked hard for 7 years, and the country is moving in the right direction. The question is, what are we going to do with it?

This is the only time in my lifetime that we have had this level of economic strength,

free of any pressing domestic crisis or foreign threat, so that we literally can look ahead into this new millennium and say, what would we like America to be for our children and our grandchildren? Because as good as things are, we know two things. We know, number one, nothing stays the same forever, good or bad. So like all moments, this one will pass. Something will happen sometime down the road. Nothing stays the same forever. The second thing we know is, we know right now that we have some big challenges still out there. I'll mention some I won't talk about tonight in any detail, but just you ought to think about them. We know right now that the number of people over 65 is going to double in the next 30 years, and we'll only have two people working for every one person drawing Social Security. We have to decide right now whether we're going to deal with that.

We know right now that Medicare is supposed to run out of money in 15 years and that 75 percent of the elderly people in this country can't afford prescription drugs. We know right now—children bigger than the baby boom generation, and they're much, much more diverse. In Senator Robb's home State, just across the river from the White House, the Alexandria school district has children from 180 different racial and ethnic groups whose parents speak 100 different languages. One school district. And we know that while we have the best system of higher education in the world, and this administration has succeeded, literally, in opening the doors of college to everybody who is willing to work for it now, no one can seriously assert that every one of our children is getting a world-class education, kindergarten through 12th grade. And we know if we really want to have one America, we have to deal with that.

We know right now that people who are connected to the Internet and are computer-literate and understand that have big economic advantages. Even poor people get big economic advantages. I learned in northern California last week that this company, eBay—I bet a lot of you have bought things from eBay, you know eBay—you know there are now over 20,000 people making a living off eBay? Not working for the company; trading through the site. Many of them, I learned from the company people, used to be on welfare. So we know that it makes a huge difference, and yet we know there's a digital divide out there. The Vice President and I have worked hard to close it in the schools.

Four years ago, we had only 4 percent of our schools and classrooms connected to the Internet. Now 51 percent are, and we're trying to make sure 100 percent are by the end of next year. We're getting close. But there are kids out there in schools that cannot be wired because they are so old and in such disrepair. Forty percent of the schools in New York are over 70 years old. Some of them are still heated by coal. The average age of school buildings in Philadelphia is 65 years. And I could go on and on. I was in a little town in Florida not very long ago, a little town, where there were 12 trailers out behind the grade school. So this is a challenge; we know about this.

I know, and I hope that you believe, that there is really an environmental challenge that the whole world faces in this climate change business and that if we continue to warm the climate at this rate, at some time in the next century the water levels will rise as the polar ice caps melt. The sugarcane fields in Louisiana will be flooded; much of the Florida Everglades will be flooded; some island nations could disappear. And the whole quality of life in America could be changed. The distribution of agricultural opportunity could be irrevocably altered.

But we also know that you don't have to burn more greenhouse gases to get rich anymore, as a nation. It's not necessary. There are technological advances that are now available, and those that will soon be available, which will enable us to totally change that. Congressman Conyers and I went to the Detroit auto show together, and we looked at automobiles that use mixed gasoline and electrical engines that will soon become commercially available, that get 70 miles a gallon, and that can be economical even at presently relatively low gasoline prices. But we have to—we know that.

We know that in the future we'll have to deal with the challenges from terrorists and drugrunners and organized criminals around

the world, and they'll increasingly work together, and they will use the very things that we're using—the Internet and technology and the openness of borders—against us. We know that. What are we going to do about it?

I say all these things not to alarm anyone, but to say that we know right now what most of the large challenges of the next 30 years will be, and right now, for the first time in my lifetime, we have the prosperity and the confidence and the coherence to deal with them. But they require decisions.

I said yesterday, when we were celebrating Ernie and the other members of the Little Rock Nine, that the things that those kids did when they walked up the steps and into the schools, and they were abused and they were run off and they went through this trial, is they forced everybody else to make a decision. Before that I was like everybody else; I thought segregation was a terrible thing, but I never had to really speak about it. I was 11 years old; what the heck did it matter to me? I was more worried about when recess was, or something. You know, it was just the way things were. But sometimes when people act, they change everything. And everybody had to make a decision then. Because there it was. Well, that's where we are now. Except there is no crisis, so we don't have to make a decision. We can just wander on and not deal with this.

Now, how many times in your personal life, in your family life, or in your business life, have you made a mistake because you thought things were going so well you could afford to be distracted, diverted, or indulgent? How many times? It happens to everybody. There's not a person in this room it hasn't happened to. It is human nature.

And so I say to you, the greatest honor I could have is to know that you will work with me for the next 430-some odd days and that you will continue to work to make sure that we do not blow this precious moment. This is an incredible opportunity and an enormous responsibility. And it's never happened in my lifetime, ever. Not once have we ever had this much prosperity, this much confidence, and the absence of a pressing, convulsing domestic crisis or foreign threat. And we will never forgive ourselves if we let our children and our grandchildren down by not looking into the future and saying, here are the big challenges facing this country, and we intend to meet them.

And I just want to mention two more. Number one is there are people in places which still have not participated in this prosperity. That's what the Vice President's employment zones and enterprise community initiative has been all about. That's why we worked hard to establish these community development financial institutions that some of you have participated in. That's why we worked so hard to enforce the Community Reinvestment Act and then to save it in this last banking legislation, because 95 percent of all the lending ever made under that 22-year-old law has happened since this administration has been in office.

And that's what this new markets initiative is all about. We will never have every single neighborhood in an employment zone; we can only pick those that have their act together and have the biggest problems and try to make the fairest judgments we can. But what I have sought to do by going around the country is to say, look, there are all these other places, and shouldn't we at least give investors in America the same incentives to invest in poor areas in America we give them to invest in poor areas in Latin America or Africa or Asia? I support American investment around the world. I am trying to pass right now the Africa trade bill and the Caribbean Basin initiative before this Congress goes home. But I believe that the most important markets we have are the untapped markets still in this country that need to be developed.

So I ask you to think about that. You'd be amazed—again, this is another example where doing—what the right thing to do is also good for the rest of America. You would be amazed how much time we have spent over the last year and a half figuring out how can we keep this economic expansion going. All previous economic expansions have come to an end either because the economy gets so heated up that we get inflation—and then when you break the inflation, the medicine to break the inflation is so strong, it breaks the recovery—or because the recovery just runs out of steam.

Now, we've kept this one going, largely thanks to you and people like you. Thirty percent of it has been powered by technology; 30 percent of it, until this Asian financial collapse, was powered by exports. Traditional economic theory dramatically underestimated the impact of technology to increase productivity and underestimated the impact of open markets in holding down inflation.

So we can keep it going. But to keep it going, with unemployment at 4.1 percent, what have we got to do? If you go into a neighborhood in an inner city, if you go into an abandoned small town that lost its factory and has nothing left, if you go into a Native American reservation—Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, there are plenty of smart people up there. I walked up and down the street with a 17-year-old girl that is as intelligent as any high school child I've talked to since I've been President. But they have 73 percent unemployment. That is wasted human potential. And if you invest there, you create new businesses, new jobs, and new consumers and new taxpayers, and you grow the economy without inflation, by definition, because you are getting both new producers and new consumers. This is the right thing to do for the people that are there. It's the right thing to do for the rest of us because we want this ride to go on just as long as it can.

The other thing I want to say is, if I could leave America with one legacy, and somebody said to me tonight, ''Well, you're going to have to go now, and we'll give you one wish''—you know, the genie deal—[*laughter*]—''But you don't get three wishes; you just get one,'' I'd still pick one America. Why? Because I think when we're getting along and when we're not just tolerating each other, but when we respect and like each other, when we've got a framework for dealing with our honest differences that enables them to be worked out without everybody falling out, the American people nearly always get it right. I mean, why do you think we're around here after over 220 years? Look at all the stuff we've weathered. I mean, we had these Founding Fathers who said we're all created equal, and they were slaveholders. And even white guys couldn't vote if they didn't own property, never mind the women, right? We worked it out. So now we just kept on working at it, and we worked it out. But what is the signal measure of our progress? We kept finding ways to bring more and more and more people into the circle of freedom and opportunity. And then their minds figured out how to maximize the benefits of the Industrial Revolution, how to provide mass education, how to integrate immigrants from all over the world into the mainstream of American life.

This one America deal is much bigger than just sort of, feel good; let's all be nice; don't anybody be prejudiced or say anything at a dinner party you'd be embarrassed by. [*Laughter*] And, to be serious, it's much more than being tough on people who commit hate crimes, although I badly want that hate crimes legislation to pass. It is an understanding about the way we should live if we all want to do well. It is in the nature of the American idea and the core of what it means to be a human being.

Isn't it interesting to you—I mean, do you ever think about this? We continue to have these horrible hate crime incidents in America, and then we see these other countries convulsed by the tribal slaughter in Rwanda; the awful, terrible treatment of the Kosovar Albanian Muslims in Kosovo; the treatment of the Bosnian Muslims in Bosnia; the continuing conflict among the Catholics and the Protestants in Ireland which we're trying to bring to an end; the continuing conflict in the Middle East. What is the common element in that and the hate crimes?

It is that, for all of the wonders of the modern world, we're most bedeviled as societies by the oldest problem of folks living together: We still have a hard time with people who aren't like us, you know, have a hard time with people that aren't like us. And yet, the truth is, when we get over it and let it go, we find that life is a lot more interesting than it used to be. I told somebody last night, the first time I went to a Cinco de Mayo celebration in San Francisco, I thought, where has this been all my life? [*Laughter*] Man, I like this. Where has this been? I like this. So we're laughing, but there's a grain of truth here. Why do American Christians buy books by the Dalai Lama in record numbers, about the ethics of the new millennium? Because

he has a very important piece of the truth, and he has very important peace inside.

So I say to you, look for the unifying vision and continue to work for it. And be clear and focused on the magic moment in which we live. Be humble enough to know it will not last forever; it is not in the nature of human affairs. And if you really want to honor what you have done and the spirit of this award, which you have so kindly given me, make the most of this moment. It is the chance of a lifetime to build a future of our dreams.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:16 p.m. in the Corcoran Ballroom at the Four Seasons Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to James F. Garrett, chair, and Weldon Latham, general counsel, National Coalition of Minority Business; Melvin Clark, president and chief executive officer, Metroplex Corporation; civil rights leader Rev. Jesse Jackson; Ernest Green, one of the Little Rock Nine; attorney Vernon Jordan, long-time friend of the President; and Miguel Lausell, chair, Hispanic Leadership Council. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at Ronald H. Brown Corporate Bridge Builder Award Dinner

November 10, 1999

I was just sitting here—out there—wondering, Michael, if I need to stand up here and announce that I'm changing parties, so that you don't lose your tax-exempt status for the foundation—[*laughter*]—I'd do nearly anything for Alma and you and Tracey and Ron—I don't think I can quite get there, but—[*laughter*].

You know, I had a feeling—the reason I asked for the children to speak—they're young adults, I guess—is that after Patrick spoke so beautifully, and then after Sol spoke so powerfully, I figured, well, what the heck, they've already heard the best speeches of the night anyway. [*Laughter*]

I wanted you to hear them because I think it's important that you see flesh-and-blood examples of why Mr. Trujillo and his company were honored tonight. And I think it's important that you see examples of the work of the Brown Foundation as embodied in Patrick's remarks, and the work that Mr. Trujillo has done as embodied in those two young people, because that's really what we're here about.

I want to thank all of you for being here, and many members of the administration who are here—Secretary Slater; Secretary Herman; Maria Echaveste, my Deputy Chief of Staff; Minyon Moore, my Political Director; Ben Johnson who runs our One America office; Dave Barram at the General Services Administration; and maybe many more people. I know Fred Humphries is here, who now works for US West, but once worked in my campaign. I'm glad that didn't disqualify him for employment in your company. [*Laughter*]

Most of what needs to be said has been said. I'd like to be very personal, if I might. I have just to the right of my desk in the Oval Office, right behind the commemorative pin that was issued for Nelson Mandela's 80th birthday, a picture of Ron Brown and me sharing a funny moment. We shared a lot of funny moments. and we're laughing. And sometimes I find myself almost talking to this picture. I confess that there are a lot of times when I just miss him terribly.

Yesterday we gave—Ernie Green is here—yesterday we gave a Congressional Gold Medal to the Little Rock Nine. And Ernie and I have been friends for more than 20 years. All the Little Rock Nine, because I was Governor of Arkansas, I've known for many years. And it was an incredibly emotional moment. And I was sitting up there on the little stage at the White House, with tears in my eyes. And one of the things I was thinking is, gosh, this is another thing I wish Ron were sitting here for. He ought to be here for this.

And I was thinking when I saw Mayor Dinkins out there, who was a great friend of Ron Brown, how we all got started in New York in '92. You brought Nelson Mandela to meet me the first time. You remember that? And what great friends we all became. And I was thinking before I came over here tonight—I called the Speaker of the House and Senator Lott and pleaded with them—and I don't use that word lightly—to do whatever we could possibly do to pass the Africa trade

bill and the Caribbean Basin initiative before this Congress goes home for Thanksgiving and Christmas. And that issue wouldn't even be on the agenda if it weren't for Ron Brown.

I was thinking about the incredible conversation I had when I talked Ron into being Secretary of Commerce. He thought it was a backwater for political appointees who wanted something else. [*Laughter*] And I said, "You don't understand." I said, "I made up my mind that I'm not going to give any of these political jobs to people who can't do them." And if you—one of the—I believe—let me just back up and say, I believe that when the history of this administration is written, one of the things even our critics will give us credit for is having not only a good economic policy but a good way of making economic policy.

And I discovered when I became President—we have Jim Harmon here, the head of the Export-Import Bank—that all these little orbits were out there. You had the Treasury Department here, and you had the Commerce Department there, and you had the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation over there. You had all these things spread out. And so it was just like sort of a roll of the dice whether you had somebody who was really good and then whether that person ever got the President's ear.

And so we organized a National Economic Council. And Bob Rubin was the first leader of it, before he became Treasury Secretary, when Senator Bentsen was Treasury Secretary. And we put all these people together, including Secretary Herman's Labor Department, to make sure that working people were not cut out. And we all worked together. And Secretary Slater's Transportation Department was part of it, because that's a huge impact on our economy.

And the Commerce Department is this vast Department. And once Ron Brown got a hold of that empire he found that he liked it right well. [*Laughter*] And he discovered that there were a lot of things he could do with it. And it was truly a thing of beauty, for those of us who love public service and politics, to see Ron run the Commerce Department and to see it come alive and to see it reach out for America all around the world and to see it reach deep into America—to minority business people who had been left behind—and to see this great, sort of unifying vision and all this energy he had make the thing fly. It was an amazing thing to see.

And as Sol pointed out in his ungracious reminder of that basketball game in Los Angeles—[*laughter*]—we had a lot of fun, too. And so I really miss him in ways, large and small, at the strangest times. I just do.

But tonight I come here, and I see these pictures, and I want to smile, not cry. Because if we all live to be 100, it's just a brief blink of the eye in the whole sweep of human history. And none of us knows whether we have tomorrow or not. And if we do, it's a gift. And most of us, or we wouldn't be here tonight in the first place, most of us, whatever happens to us from now on, we're going to go out of this world ahead.

And so I think the most important thing I can say to you tonight is that he'd be very pleased that we're here honoring his legacy by, number one, permitting this foundation to bring young people into politics because he thought it was good, politics and public service, and it is—and if it weren't good, we wouldn't still be here after over 220 years—and number two, because he believed in commerce, and he thought that economic growth and economic opportunity was something more than mere materialism.

The fact that we have the lowest unemployment rate in 30 years and the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years and the lowest crime rate in 25 years, those things are not unrelated one to the other. The fact that we are moving in the right direction on all fronts is, in part, the result of the expansion of economic opportunity to the lowest African-American poverty rates and unemployment rates ever recorded, the lowest Hispanic unemployment rate ever recorded, and the lowest Hispanic poverty rate in a quarter century. Those things are not unrelated.

He understood the dignity of work, the dignity of enterprise, the dignity of achievement, and the importance of giving everybody a chance at the brass ring. And those of us who have been left behind have tried to carry on that work in various ways.

I just want to say one thing here. Our leader, Senator Daschle, is here, our Democratic

leader in the Senate. Not a thing I have done could have been done if he hadn't been with me every step of the way—not a thing.

So we honor young people, and the work of Ron Brown and this foundation. And we honor this great company because most people in America don't work for the Government, and most of the economy is not the Government. And I'm very proud that in addition to having the longest peacetime expansion in history, we have the highest percentage of jobs created in the private sector, not the public sector, in the last 50 years of any economic expansion.

But in order to make it work, we have to have corporate leaders who either have the vision, just because they do, of a unified America, or have both the vision and the personal experiences that this great leader has shared with us tonight from his own life. And that's a good thing.

So I ask you to think just about three things before we all go home tonight. We have the most prosperous time in my lifetime and the only time in my lifetime we've ever had this level of prosperity and this level of confidence and no pressing domestic crisis or foreign threat to disturb our daily endeavors. So the question I have for you—this is one time when I miss Ron and his energy—is, what are we going to do with this? Because we know from the ups and downs in our own lives that nothing lasts forever. Nothing bad lasts forever. Nothing good last forever. Nothing lasts forever. So we have this moment, the only time in my lifetime we've ever been like this. What are we going to do with it?

I have been saying to the American people, if you sit around and think about it, how many times had you had a moment like this in your personal life or your family life or your business life, where things were just rocking along great, and then something bad happened because you didn't make the most of the moment. Instead you indulged yourself or you got distracted or diverted, or you thought you didn't really have to deal with these things that you knew were out there.

We know what's out there for us. We know the big challenges. We know the big opportunities. These children's lives have told us some of them tonight. We know we're going to double the number of people over 65 in the next 30 years, and we haven't made sure Social Security will take care of the whole baby boom generation. We know that Medicare is going to run out of money, and 75 percent of our seniors don't have prescription drugs.

We know we've got the biggest group of school children in history, and they're more diverse than ever before. And while we've opened the doors to college to all Americans now with the HOPE scholarship, the increased Pell grants, the deductibility of student loan interests, nobody thinks that every child in America is getting a world-class elementary and secondary education, and we know they need it.

You heard that very powerful presentation by Shayla about going to the computers after school because of what you did. We had a percent of our classrooms connected to the Internet 4 years ago—we have a member of the FCC here, Susan Ness; thank you for the E-rate which allows poor schools to afford to get into the Internet. And now we're up to 51 percent. We're going to try to get to 100 percent. But there are a bunch of these kids that will never get their schools connected because the schools are so old and decrepit, they cannot be wired.

In Mayor Dinkins' hometown 40 percent of the schools are 70 years old or older. We have schools in New York City that are heated by coal in the winter, still. So we know these things.

We know we've got a big environmental challenge in global warming. We can deny it all we want to, but we've got the technology to grow economics without burning up the environment, and we're either going go do it or not.

So what I want to say to you is, this is a moment where we have to decide. And we need people of high energy and vision to remind us that we have to decide. You ought to go home tonight and ask yourself, what do you think the—no fewer than 5, no more than 10 biggest challenges are our country will face in the next 30 years. I bet if we could all gather tomorrow night, there would be 80 percent congruence in our list. We

know what the big opportunities and challenges are out there. The issue is, what are we going to do about it?

Are we going to just sort of rock along and say, ''Boy, this is peachy-keen, and I'm glad?'' Well, I'm not going to rock along. I've got 430-some days to be President, and I'm going to hit it every day I can. But I won't be President after that. But what I want to say to you is, in the coming election season and in the coming years of work we have here ahead of us, and in you own work, you have to decide. You know—if you just stop and think, you know what the big challenges and the big opportunities for America are. This is the only time in my lifetime we've ever had the chance to build the future of our dreams without a pressing domestic crisis or a threat to our national security. And if you believe in what Ron Brown lived for, you will do that, and you won't blow the chance.

The second thing I'd like to say is—I want to say this out of respect particularly to what Beau said when he was up here talking about his people from Montana. We now have the chance, and maybe the only chance, in our lifetime to extend economic opportunity to the people in places that have been left behind. Yes, we've got the lowest unemployment rate and the lowest minority unemployment rate we've ever recorded. That's the good news. The bad news is you know as well as I do that there are people in places that have been totally left behind.

Alma, you talked about New York. You know, if you took away New York City and the suburban counties, and you only had upstate New York, it would rank 49th in job growth of all the States in the country. That's hard to believe. You don't think that about New York. We're talking about Syracuse, Rochester, Buffalo, Albany, places with great infrastructures of education and talented people but where a lot of the economy moved, and it's not been replenished.

Hawaii, a place that we all think of as a place where we go for fun and everything is peachy-keen, the only State in the country that hasn't had economic growth in the last 2½ years because of the collapse of the Asian economies.

That's why I started this new markets initiative, to build on the employment zone program that Vice President Gore has so brilliantly run the last few years that's brought a lot of economic opportunity to discreet places in America. But what I want to do with this new markets initiative is, two things: I want to point up all these places in America that we ought to be investing in, and I want to give Americans the same incentives to invest in developing areas in America we give them to invest in developing areas in Latin America and Africa and Asia. I want you to invest overseas, but our first and biggest and best new markets are here at home.

You know, Senator Daschle and I were in South Dakota the other day, and we went to the Pine Ridge Reservation. And I was—a lot of the tour I made through the reservation I was escorted by this beautiful 17-year-old Native American girl, who was just as articulate and intelligent—and very wise, I might add, because she had a very tough life. I mean, a very tough life. But I thought to myself, why shouldn't this child have the same opportunities that my daughter's had. And if she had them, what in the world could she do with them, not only for herself but for her people.

Do you know what the unemployment rate on the Pine Ridge Reservation is—73 percent. Now, the national unemployment rate is 4.1 percent. I think it's even lower in South Dakota. The female unemployment rate of the 4.1 percent is the lowest it's been in 46 years. But you still have these pockets.

And if Ron Brown were here, I know what he'd be telling you. He'd be saying, now, I want you to hustle up some investment for these areas, and we're going to try to get you a tax break, but you ought to do it whether you get one or not because it's a huge opportunity, in the inner cities, in Appalachia, in the Mississippi Delta, on the Native American reservations.

You would be amazed how much time we spend now with our economic team sitting around thinking, how can we keep this good ride going; how long can we push this expansion out? We know that technology gave us greater productivity than the economists know, and that's part of the reason for the expansion. We know we got 30 percent of our growth out of technology, another 30

percent out of exports. How long can it keep going?

All other economic expansions have ended in one or two ways. Things get so heated up that there's inflation; then you have to stop the inflation, and the price of breaking the inflation breaks the recovery. Or it just runs out of steam. This thing just is chugging along. How can we keep it going?

If you invest in these areas that have been left behind, you create new businesses, new jobs, and new consumers. And when you do that, you don't have any inflation because you've got new production and new consumption. This is a big deal.

The third thing I'd like to say—and I can't say it any more eloquently than Sol Trujillo already said—is—and I told the group next door—if someone said to me, ''You've got to go now. You've had a good time being President, but your time is up. And we'll give you one wish,'' and the proverbial genie showed up. But I didn't get three wishes. I just got one. [*Laughter*] I'd probably mess it up if I had three, you know. [*Laughter*] I got one. I would say, remember these children tonight, all three of them. Remember the powerful example of this great corporate executive and what he said about how he got his start and how many times he could have been stopped.

I would say the most important thing would be for us to genuinely build one America, not just to tolerate one another, not just to avoid saying insensitive things, things that would embarrass you at a cocktail party or something, and on a more serious note, not even to eliminate all the hate crimes, although I dearly want to do that and I hope to pass the hate crimes legislation—but I mean an America where we looked at each other and we thought: Hey, look around this room; this is one great deal here; we're not tolerating each other; we're celebrating each other.

Do we have honest differences? I certainly hope so. It's the only way you ever learn anything. But we manage them instead of letting them drive us apart. And we actually believe that what enables us to tap the benefits of our diversity and have more fun in life is a shared understanding that our common humanity is the most important thing.

If you really strip away what everybody says about Ron Brown, everybody that really knows him just liked him because they thought he loved life. If you see somebody that loves life and loves people, it's hard to dislike them, because it's contagious.

And if I could just have my little one wish, I would say, if you look at the whole history of America, we kept on going because we kept on widening the circle of opportunity and deepening the meaning of freedom and moving closer toward one America.

When we started, we had all these guys that wrote this Constitution say, ''We're all created equal, and God made it so. But, oh, by the way, we've got slavery, and it's unthinkable that women could vote, and we're not even going to let white guys vote unless they own land.'' We've come a long way since then, right? I mean, we started—even I couldn't have voted; my people wouldn't have been landowners. We'd have been hired help. So we've come a long way.

But if you look around the world today, if you look at these horrible hate crimes in America, and you look around the world today, from Kosovo and Bosnia to Rwanda to the Middle East to Northern Ireland, the whole world is still bedeviled in this high technology age by the most primitive problem of human society: We're still kind of scared of one another. We don't deal with people who are different from us as well as we should. And we might rock along doing all right for years and then turn on a dime. That's what happened in Rwanda. Just turn on a dime.

So I say to you, I want you to think about this. When you go home tonight I want you to think about what it would be like in 20 years to hear Patrick standing where Senator Daschle is. I want you to think about what it would be like if Shala headed a program that gave every single child who didn't have a computer in his or her home—every single one in the country—access to the Internet, so there was no digital divide.

I want you to think about what it would be like if Beau Mitchell were the elected president of his tribe, and they celebrated the first time in American history that all the Native Americans had unemployment rates as low as the country and incomes as high.

Just think about that. And think about how much better off all the rest of us would be, just by going along for the ride and doing our part.

I'm telling you it's the most important thing. And it's the hardest thing in life. And the reason we all felt good seeing these young people up here talking tonight is they represented our better selves and our hopes for tomorrow.

If you want to do something to honor Ron Brown, number one, keep supporting this foundation because they'll bring those kids up, and they'll give them a chance. Number two, keep supporting companies like US West because they can really change the face of the future. And number three, do whatever you can as citizens to make sure we do not squander the chance of a lifetime to build a future of our dreams.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 p.m. in the Dumbarton Room at the Four Seasons Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Alma Arrington Brown, widow of Ron Brown, and their children, Michael Brown, Tracey Brown, and Ron Brown; Solomon Trujillo, chairman, president and chief executive officer, and Frederick S. Humphries, Jr., executive director of public policy, US West; Ernest Green, one of the Little Rock Nine; former Mayor David Dinkins of New York City; former Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin; and dinner speakers Patrick Lespinasse, Shayla Barnes, and Beau Mitchell.

Memorandum on Assistance for Refugees and Victims of the Timor and North Caucasus Crises

November 10, 1999

Presidential Determination No. 2000–07

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Presidential Determination Pursuant to Section 2(c)(1) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as Amended

Pursuant to section 2(c)(1) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(1), I hereby determine that it is important to the national interest that up to $40 million be made available from the U.S. Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund to meet the unexpected urgent refugee and migration needs, including those of refugees, displaced persons, conflict victims, and other persons at risk, due to the Timor and North Caucasus crises. These funds may be used, as appropriate, to provide contributions to international, governmental, and non-governmental organizations.

You are authorized and directed to inform the appropriate committees of the Congress of this determination and the use of funds under this authority, and to arrange for the publication of this determination in the *Federal Register*.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 11. An original was not available for verification of the content of this memorandum.

Remarks at a Veterans Day Ceremony in Arlington, Virginia

November 11, 1999

Thank you very much, Secretary West, for your eloquent remarks and your leadership and your many years of devotion to our country. Commander Smart, thank you for your leadership this year. Chaplain Cooke, Lee Thornton, thank you for always being here for our veterans.

The leaders of our veterans' organizations; Members of Congress here; Deputy Secretary Gober and members of the Cabinet; General Ross and members of the Joint Chiefs; General Davis and other Medal of Honor recipients. To the former POW's, the families of those still missing in action, to our veterans and their families.

Let me begin by offering a special word of appreciation to the Army Band and Chorus for their magnificent music today and for making us feel so important. And I want to say a special welcome today to a person you may have read about in the morning papers—Capt. Earl Fox is the Senior Medical Officer at the Coast Guard Personnel Command here in Washington. He also happens to be the last World War II veteran still on active military duty. Now, next week he will

retire at the tender young age of 80. I think he has earned his retirement. But Captain, on behalf of a grateful nation, we say thank you for your service. Thank you.

My fellow Americans, as we all know, we celebrate Veterans Day on the anniversary of the armistice ending World War I, on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month. Eighty years ago today, President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed this a day of solemn pride in the heroism of those who died in the country's service. For 2 full minutes in the middle of that day, all traffic and business across our Nation stopped, as Americans took time to remember family and friends who fought and those who never came home from the ''war to end all wars.'' I don't believe those men and women who were our forebears could ever have imagined that so many other times in this century young Americans would be asked again and again to fight and die for freedom in foreign lands.

When the 20th century began, the headstones that stand in silent formation on these beautiful hills covered fewer than 200 acres. Today, at century's end, they cover more than 600 acres. Hundreds of millions of people in the United States and around the world sleep in peace because more than a million Americans rest in peace, here and in graves marked and unmarked all across the world. Today we come again to say we owe them a debt we can never repay.

In a way, the young men and women who have died in defense of our country gave up not only the life they were living but also the life they would have lived, their chance to be parents, their chance to grow old with their grandchildren. Too often when we speak of sacrifice, we speak in generalities about the larger sweep of history, and the sum total of our Nation's experience. But it is very important to remember that every single veteran's life we honor today was just that, a life, just like yours and mine. A life with family and friends and love and hopes and dreams and ups and downs, a life that should have been able to play its full course.

Fifty-seven years ago this week, the eyes of America were focused on a small, sweltering island in the South Pacific. Pearl Harbor had been bombed the year before, and Japanese forces in the Pacific were capturing one island after another. The task of stopping them fell to a group of young marines in an operation called Project Watchtower, in a place called Guadalcanal. The battle was expected to last 6 weeks. It took 6 months. The jungle was so thick soldiers could hardly walk; fighting so fierce and rations so thin that the average marine lost 25 pounds. Every night shells fell from the sky, and enemy soldiers charged up the hills. The only weapons marines had to defend themselves were Springfield rifles left over from World War I. But with the strength forged in factories and fields back home, they turned back wave after wave of hand-to-hand fighting, until at last, the Navy was able to help the marines turn the tide in the naval battle that began 57 years ago tomorrow.

That turned the tide of battle in the whole Pacific and with it the tide of American history. On that small island, in the Battle of Guadalcanal, Americans proved that our Nation would never again be an island, but rather allied with freedom and peace-loving people everywhere, as the greatest force for peace and freedom the world has ever known.

In the days and years that have followed, men and women, forged from the same mettle, in every branch of our military have built on those sacrifices and stood for the cause of freedom, from World War II to Korea, to Vietnam, to Kuwait City, to Kosovo.

On the beach at Guadalcanal is a monument to those who fought on the island. In the hills that surround us, some of the 1,500 marines and sailors who lost their lives in that battle are laid to rest. They are some of the greatest of the greatest generation.

One of those who served at Guadalcanal was a 19-year-old marine lieutenant named John Chafee. He went on to fight in Okinawa, to lead troops in Korea, to serve as Governor of Rhode Island and Secretary of the Navy, and then, for more than 20 years, as a United States Senator. He helped write the law that keeps our air clean. His fights for health care helped millions of veterans live better lives. Yet he was so humble that when he received a distinguished award from the Marine Corps Foundation last year, he hardly spoke about his wartime service. Two weeks ago, this remarkable man passed away

at the age of 77. At his funeral, Hillary and I spent time with his 5 children and his 12 grandchildren. And I was proud to announce on that day that the Navy will be naming one of its most modern and capable destroyers after John Chafee.

Now, that was the measure of one man's life who fought in Guadalcanal and survived. Today, in our imaginations, we must try to imagine the measure of all the lives that might have been, had they not been laid down in service to our Nation. What about the more than one million men and women who have given their lives so that we could be free? What would have been the measure of their lives? What else would they have accomplished for their families and their country, if only they had had the chance?

Of course we don't have any of those answers. But because we have the question, we clearly have a responsibility to stand in the breach for them. We are not just the beneficiaries of their bravery; we are the stewards of their sacrifice. Thanks to their valor, today, for the very first time in all of human history, more than half of the nations of the world live under governments of their own choosing. Our prosperity and power are greater than they have ever been. It is, therefore, our solemn obligation to preserve the peace and to make the most of this moment for our children and the children of the world, so that those who sacrificed so much to bring us to this moment will be redeemed in the lives they could have lived by the lives that we do live.

How shall we do this? It means at least that we must continue to be the world's leading force for peace and freedom, against terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It means we must keep the commitment I have had since the moment I took the oath of office, that our men and women in uniform will remain the best trained, best equipped, best prepared in the world.

In Kosovo, we had zero combat fatalities, and only two planes shot down, though our pilots took heavy enemy fire every single day and put their lives repeatedly at greater risks to avoid hitting civilians on the ground. That is a tribute to the professionalism we see every day from our military forces all around the world.

Last month I was proud to sign a bill that will keep us moving in that direction, with the start of the first sustained increase in military spending in a decade and the biggest pay increase for our troops in a generation. It means we must also do more to be faithful to our veterans when their service is over. President Theodore Roosevelt once said, ''Anyone good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterward.''

Over the past 7 years we have opened more than 600 veterans' out-patient clinics across America. This year we expect to treat 400,000 more veterans than last year, including more disabled veterans than ever before. We will continue to make sure that all veterans receive the care they deserve. And we must continue to make a special effort to end something that must be intolerable to all of us, the tragedy of homeless veterans.

I want to commend the reigning Miss America, Heather Renee French, who is with us today, along with her family, her father—a disabled Vietnam veteran—her mother, her brother, and her sister, for all the work she is doing in her position finally to bring proper national attention to the plight of homeless veterans. We thank you for what you're doing. Thank you. We must not rest until we have done everything we possibly can to bring them back into the society they so willingly defended.

And we must bear in mind the special sacrifice of the more than 140,000 veterans who were held in prison camps or interned during this century. I want to commend the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund for completing a project they launched a year ago today to create a special curriculum on the Vietnam war and send a copy to every single high school across America. Part of that curriculum focuses on the men and women who never came home. We must not forget them.

I am very proud to announce today that we have successfully recovered the remains of three more United States servicemen lost during the Korean war. They're coming home tonight. But we must not waver in our common efforts to make the fullest possible

accounting for all our MIA's, for all their families to have their questions answered.

Finally, fulfilling our responsibility to lead for peace and freedom and to be faithful not only to our service personnel but our veterans, requires us to do more than prepare people to fight wars and take care of them when they come home. We must work with greater determination to prevent wars. Every American who gave his or her life for our country was, in one way or another, a victim of a peace that faltered, of diplomacy that failed, of the absence of adequate preventive strength. We know that if diplomacy is not backed by real and credible threats of force, it can be empty and even dangerous. But if we don't use diplomacy first, then our military will become our only line of defense.

Of course, it also costs money to help struggling young democracies to stand on their feet as friends and partners of the United States, as we've tried to do from Poland to Russia to Nigeria to Indonesia. It costs money to make sure nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union are secure, for the terrorists and leaders who wish us harm do not acquire the means to kill on a more massive scale. It costs money to support the peacemakers in places like the Middle East and the Balkans and Africa, so that regional conflicts do not explode and spread.

But all of you know, better than most, that freedom is not free. And all of you know, far better than most, that the costliest peace is far cheaper than the cheapest war.

I am pleased to report to you today that the Democrats and Republicans in Congress are working together on a strong compromise that will allow us to meet some of our most urgent needs in foreign affairs, to prevent war. We're not finished yet, but there is a bipartisan center like that which has carried America for 50 years at this hopeful moment now at work in the Congress. I am grateful for it, and our children will be safer for it.

In less than 2 months, we'll be able to say the conflict and bloodshed that took so many American lives came from another century. So we gather today for the last time in this century to dedicate ourselves to being good stewards of the sacrifice of the veterans of our country.

As we look ahead to the large challenges and the grand opportunities of the new century and a new millennium, when our country has more prosperity than ever before, and for the first time in my lifetime has the ability to meet those challenges and to dream dreams and live them because we are unthreatened by serious crisis at home and security threats abroad, let us resolve to honor those veterans, to redeem their sacrifice, to be stewards of the lives they never got to live by doing all we can to see that the horrors of the 20th century's wars are not visited upon 21st century Americans. That is the true way to honor the people we come here today to thank God for.

Thank you very much, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:50 a.m. in the Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery. In his remarks, he referred to John W. Smart, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Jeni Cooke, Chaplain, Department of Veterans Affairs; Lee Thornton, master of ceremonies; and Gen. Raymond G. Davis, USMC (Ret.), Congressional Medal of Honor recipient.

Remarks on Returning From Arlington National Cemetery and an Exchange With Reporters

November 11, 1999

Budget Negotiations

The President. Well, good afternoon. I am delighted to be joined by Secretary Riley and by Bruce Reed, my Domestic Policy Adviser, and by these teachers from our area, some of whom have actually been hired through our class size initiative.

All of you know today is Veterans Day. I've just returned from Arlington Cemetery. We always discussed how best to honor the contributions of our veterans on this day. One good way is by reaching agreement on a budget that honors our values, the values for which they served, that enhances opportunity, reinforces responsibility, strengthens our community and the future of our children. We have made important progress toward that end.

Last night, after many days and hours of discussion, Congress agreed to continue supporting our efforts to hire 100,000 new, highly qualified teachers to reduce class size in the early grades. That is truly good news for our children and for their future.

We know that school enrollments are exploding, record numbers of teachers are retiring. Research is clear that students do learn more in smaller classes with quality teachers. Every parent and teacher in America knows that a child in a second-grade class with 25 students will not get as much attention as he or she needs and deserves.

Just this week, we learned that our class size initiative, which Congress agreed to last year, is working. Communities are using the funds from last year's agreement to hire more than 29,000 teachers and reduce average class size for 1.7 million children to 18 students a class. That's why I've made honoring our commitment to reducing class size such a high priority in these budget negotiations. The agreement we have reached has bipartisan support, and it keeps us on track to hiring 100,000 teachers by 2005.

As I said in my State of the Union Address, we don't just need more teachers, but better ones. This agreement furthers that goal as well. All teachers hired under this program must be fully qualified. The program gives school districts the flexibility to use 25 percent of the funds from this program to train and test new teachers. It also increases flexibility, with the involvement of the Secretary of Education, to get extra funds for school districts that have a high percentage of their teachers that are not certified to teach the subjects they have been hired to teach, so that they can become fully qualified in those subjects.

Through this plan, taxpayer dollars will go for reducing class size in public schools. And I want to thank Members of Congress from both parties. I'd like to particularly mention Chairman Goodling, the chairman of the House committee, for working with us on this, and Senator Patty Murray, who has been such a strong advocate for the class size reduction initiative. But there are many others, as well, who came together in this agreement. This is a victory for America's children.

In addition to reducing class size, we've made progress on other vital education initiatives, as well, more than doubling funds for after-school programs and increasing funding for computers in our schools, for mentoring to prepare our children for college, for the Hispanic education programs. We're also making progress on other vital budget priorities, from hiring up to 50,000 new community police officers, to setting aside funds to preserve natural resources and protect our environment for future generations.

I am committed to continuing this work with Congress to reach agreement on the issues still outstanding, including ensuring assistance for those who have suffered from the devastating impact of Hurricane Floyd, to paying our dues to the United Nations. And if we can just continue in this bipartisan spirit, very soon, we will complete work on a budget that honors our values, lives within our means, and looks to our future.

Thank you all for being here today, for symbolizing what we've been working for.

World Trade Organization Talks in China

Q. Mr. President, Ambassador Barshefsky—stay in China for a third day—WTO negotiations. Are they getting close to a deal? How much progress have they made?

The President. I think the best thing I can say at the present is what I said yesterday: They are working, and whether I know whether we've got an agreement or whether we haven't, I'll let you know. But I think the less we say now, the better. These are difficult negotiations and they're working on them.

President's Visit to Kosovo

Q. Sir, can you tell us why you are going to Kosovo, and is the plan to winterize every home in Kosovo overly optimistic, given that many non-governmental organizations have reported that people are living in tents and don't appear that they will have a winterized area of their home in time for the winter season?

The President. Well, I'm going for several reasons. I'm going to thank our troops and see how they're doing, to support the United Nations' operation there, and to see how

we're doing in helping the peace to take hold and meeting basic human needs.

As to the last question you asked, I can't give a definitive answer because I don't know what the possibilities are. I think we have to do what is necessary to make sure that people are not too cold this winter because they exercised their right to go home.

I want to remind you that in some ways we have this problem because almost everybody who left Kosovo went home, because the world community acted more quickly here than we acted in Bosnia, where there are still hundreds of thousands of refugees who have not gone home because the Bosnian war went on for 4 years and a quarter of a million people died there. So I'm—it's a problem, but I think we'll deal with it, and I think the Kosovars know that it's a problem because they all got to go home so fast. And we just have to work it through and find out whatever is necessary to get them through the winter.

One more. I'll take one more. Go ahead.

Africa and Caribbean Trade Legislation

Q. Mr. President, in your conversation with Mr. Lott, you have raised the African and CBI legislation. Did you get any assurance from him that there would be action on that before the end of the session?

The President. Oh, I'll tell you exactly what he said, and actually, I think he's basically right about this. He said, we've got every available resource now, all of our available resources thrown into resolving all the remaining budget issues. As you know, we stand up—Senator Lott and Senator Daschle and Speaker Hastert and Mr. Gephardt and I, we stand up and we give these talks, and we answer your questions. And for every question we answer there are scores of people that are required to do all this work and hammer out the agreements to turn it into legislative language, to work out the mechanics of how it's going to get on the calendar and all that.

So what Senator Lott said was that he strongly supported the legislation, as do I. Senator Daschle strongly supports it. They want to know that we have—put mechanically—that we have a way to resolve all the budget issues and deal with getting it up, getting it voted on at the appropriate time next week. And if we can get this resolved, then they're going to try to get the Africa trade-CBI bill worked out. And I do think this is a completely good-faith offer on their part.

There are still some differences between the Senate and the House approach. The House bill doesn't have CBI in it. And there will, inevitably, be some disputes about some provisions of the CBI bill. I think we can work through them all. I do believe there is a majority in both Houses for this legislation. But it just takes—it's not something that can be done without some time and care. And right now, everyone's energies are focused on resolving the budget agreement.

So I pledged to him that we would do our best to resolve the budget agreement as quickly as possible—to reach a budget agreement. And he pledged to me that if we got it done in time, if they could physically do it, he would try to hammer out an agreement on Africa-CBI that both Houses can support. And I think it's terribly important, so I hope very much we can do it.

Israeli Radar Sales to China

Q. Sir, can you take a question on Israel? Could you tell us, sir, how it is that Israel got the notion that it would be prudent to sell radar equipment to the Chinese, and what are you doing about it?

The President. Well, we have raised it with them because we raise—whenever any of our friends sell sophisticated equipment that might be American in origin that is inconsistent with the terms under which the transfer was made, then we raise that. That has not been acknowledged yet; the facts are in dispute. So I think before I can tell you what I'm going to do about it, we have to be absolutely sure what the facts are.

Our people had questions, and they had good reason to have questions. But sometimes when you hear these things, it's not always right. So the story is accurate that we've raised the matter, but it is inaccurate to say that we know it's an actual fact that such a transfer has occurred. As soon as we do know the facts, then we will decide what is appropriate, and I'll be glad to tell you that. I just—but I don't want to say anything that I'm not sure is true. And I do not believe

that the Israeli Government has confirmed this yet, and I think the matter is still in some dispute.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:54 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Statement on the Proposed "Ending Discrimination Against Parents Act of 1999"

November 11, 1999

I am pleased that last night Senators Dodd and Kennedy introduced the "Ending Discrimination Against Parents Act of 1999." This landmark bill protects America's working parents from unfair treatment on the job. It builds on our Nation's longstanding commitment to equal opportunity. And it sends a clear message that parents striving to meet their responsibilities both at home and at the office should never be considered second-class workers.

This bill would, for the first time, protect parents and those with parental responsibilities against job discrimination. It does not stop employers from making hiring and promotion decisions on the basis of qualifications or job performance, but it does ensure that workers are not discriminated against simply because they are parents or exercise parental responsibilities. It would, for example, bar employers from taking a parent off the "fast track" because of unsubstantiated concerns that parents cannot perform in demanding jobs. Similarly, it would not allow employers to prefer applicants without children over equally or better qualified working parents or to refuse to hire single parents.

As more mothers enter the workforce and as more families rely on the earnings of single parents, these protections are increasingly important. We cannot afford to let working parents be held captive to baseless assumptions about their ability to work.

Already, a number of States have enacted commonsense laws that prohibit or pave the way to prohibiting discrimination on the basis of parental or familial status. I urge Congress to safeguard the interests of America's working families and give this legislation prompt and favorable consideration. Our workplaces should work for all Americans.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Abdurrahman Wahid of Indonesia and an Exchange With Reporters

November 12, 1999

President Clinton. Let me say, it's a great honor for me and for all of our team to welcome President Wahid here, with the members of his government. He is now the leader of the world's third-largest democracy, and we are very encouraged by that. We have seen this peaceful transition in Indonesia. We've seen a resolution in East Timor, even though there's still the problem of refugees in West Timor. And I'm looking very much forward to this visit.

I think the American people know that a strong and stable and prosperous and democratic Indonesia is very much in our interest. That's the sort of partnership we're interested in pursuing, and I hope I can be helpful in that regard.

So I'm delighted to have you here, Mr. President. And if you'd like to make any public comment to the press while you're here——

President Wahid. Well, thank you for putting a little time for me today to visit you, Mr. President, because you know that I come from Indonesia just to make sure that we are still great friends of the United States, that we are still in good touch with you. And I think that in the future, we meet you more than before. So also that you know that although there is a shift in policy but not at the expense of the American-Indonesian relationship. This is very important to know, since you understand that this is one world, so we have to create that kind of one world.

And I'm interested in the comment you made about our religious dialog, which goes toward one world, in that sense. You see, from far away we heard that you made very nice comments on those inter-religious dialogs in Indonesia. And I hope that 2 months to come, in January, we'll have a discussion initiated by the Americans from Philadelphia, with the Foreign Minister to be a participant there, to be on the organizing committee. We

will invite, of course, chief rabbi of Israel as well as the former chief rabbi. And from here from the Catholic side and so forth, I don't know who will come. But anyway, around 50 people will come there of the three Abrahamic traditions.

And since, you know, that kind of thing is special for us in Indonesia, I would like to use this occasion to inform you about this, before anything else—economic things. Those are the troubles there.

So I'm very glad. Today I met people from the World Bank and the IMF and then from the Ex-Im Bank, in which we see the possibility of having more hands extended towards us, to help us to overcome the difficulties in the economic shape, now.

Well, you mentioned about East Timor. I think that, of course, we still have trouble, and we would like the United States to take attention to this kind of problem as well. But I would like to inform you, Mr. President, that—[*inaudible*]—will come to Jakarta, and I'll meet him. So I hope that will ease a little bit the situation in that area, because East Timor is, you know, our brothers.

President Clinton. Thank you very much. That's very good news.

Pardon for President Soeharto

Q. President Wahid, sir, President Wahid sir, why are you inclined to be willing to pardon your predecessor, President Soeharto? And President Clinton, what do you think of the possibility of a pardon for him?

President Wahid. I think if we—we will use law, of course. And we would like to know whether he is guilty or not, according to the law. But after that, we will pardon him because of two reasons. First is that he was our President, so we have to be careful about this for the future generations. Second thing is that, you know, that it's not easy, because Mr. Soeharto still has big followers. So we have to be careful not to, let's say, topple the cart.

President Clinton. I think the decision, first of all, is one for the Indonesian people and Government to make. And I think every country has to decide how to resolve the tension between the pursuit of a particular case and the desire for the reconciliation of people, and to go forward. And I think that that's a decision that the President has to make, and we ought to support his—anything that he's trying to do to build democracy and to take Indonesia into the future.

Yes, you had a question?

Military Assistance to Indonesia

Q. Mr. President, after this meeting will you resume military assistance to Indonesia?

President Clinton. Well, we're going to talk about that and about what kinds of things that we both can do, over a period of time, to strengthen our relationships, including the issue of military-to-military ties. And I look forward to talking to the President about that.

Territorial Integrity of Indonesia

Q. How important is the structural integrity—the territorial integrity of Indonesia? And is it more important than the self-determination of the peoples of Indonesia?

President Clinton. Well, I don't think it has to be an either-or thing. I think the—I said, at the time when Indonesia supported giving the East Timorese a vote, that I would support that, and that having given them the vote, that the vote had to be respected.

On the other hand, we support the territorial integrity of Indonesia. And I think we have to acknowledge that it's quite a challenging task to preserve a democracy so widespread and so diverse. And I hope we can be somewhat helpful in the President dealing with this challenge.

Abortion Rights and U.N. Dues

Q. Sir, are you willing to compromise on the abortion funding issue in order to get the U.N. dues paid? And where is the status of those talks concerning the budget matter?

President Clinton. Well, I think it's very important that we pay our United Nations arrears. We can hardly ask others to do their part unless we do ours. And its a big national security issue for us.

And it's related to this whole idea of whether we're going to fulfill our responsibilities in the world. And we have negotiations ongoing. They haven't been resolved yet. And I think I should follow the same admonition I try to give others when they're involved in negotiations around the world: the less we

say, the better—until we have an agreement that we think we can all stick by. But we're working on it, and I hope we can work it out.

Deputy Press Secretary Siewert. Thank you, pool.

World Trade Organization Talks in China

Q. [*Inaudible*]—Mrs. Barshefsky coming back tomorrow? Have you given up hope of any deal, a WTO deal before the end of the year?

President Clinton. No. You know, they're actually—I have committed not to talk about the details of the talks, and I won't. But there are a finite and limited number of issues over which there are still differences, and they're working on them. And I have not given up.

I think it would be a very good thing for the world, and a very good thing for the Chinese if China were in the WTO. But the reason it would be a good thing is that it would give them participation in a rule-based system, where you could have more and more open trade on fair and balanced terms. So the entry has to be a decision that has some real integrity to it, and it makes sense in terms of everybody else's membership and everybody else's responsibilities. And we're just trying to work through that. I hope we can.

But I think it's a very, very important objective. And I'm certainly glad we've pursued it, and we will continue to do so. And I hope we'll be successful, but I don't really have anything to say. I wouldn't read too much one way or the other into developments so far. Let's wait and see where we are when we've actually run out of time.

Q. On Pakistan, do you have any information?

President Clinton. Not yet.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:20 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on Signing Legislation To Reform the Financial System

November 12, 1999

Thank you, and good afternoon. I thank you all for coming to the formal ratification of a truly historic event. Senator Gramm and Senator Sarbanes have actually agreed on an important issue. [*Laughter*] Stay right there, John. [*Laughter*] I asked Phil on the way out how bad it's going to hurt him in Texas to be walking out the door with me. [*Laughter*] We decided it was all right today.

Like all those before me, I want to express my gratitude to those principally responsible for the success of this legislation. I thank Secretary Summers and the entire team at Treasury, but especially Under Secretary Gensler, for their work, and Assistant Secretary Linda Robertson. I thank you, Chairman Greenspan, for your constant advocacy of the modernization of our financial system. I thank you, Chairman Levitt, for your continuing concern for investor protections. And I thank the other regulators who are here.

I thank Senator Gramm and Senator Sarbanes, Chairman Leach and Congressman LaFalce, and all the Members of Congress who are here. Senator Dodd told me the Sisyphus story, too, over and over again, but I've rolled so many rocks up so many hills, I had a hard time fully appreciating the significance of it. [*Laughter*]

I do want to thank all the Members here and all those who aren't here. And I'd like to thank two New Yorkers who aren't here who have been mentioned, former Secretary of the Treasury Bob Rubin, who worked very hard on this, and former chairman, Senator Al D'Amato, who talked to me about this often. So this is a day we can celebrate as an American day.

To try to give some meaning to the comments that the previous speakers have made about how we're making a fundamental and historic change in the way we operate our financial institutions, I think it might be worth pointing out that this morning we got some new evidence on the role of new technologies in our economy, which showed that

over the past 4 years, productivity has increased by a truly remarkable 2.6 percent. That's about twice the rate of productivity growth the United States experienced in the 1970's and the 1980's. In the last quarter alone, productivity grew at 4.2 percent.

This is not just some aloof statistic that matters only to the Federal Reserve, the Treasury, and Wall Street economists. It is the key to rising paychecks and greater security and opportunity for ordinary Americans. And the combination of rising productivity, more open borders and trade, working to keep down inflation, the dramatic reduction of the deficit and the accumulation of the surplus, and the continued commitment to the investment in the American people, research and development, and new productivity-inducing technologies has given us the most sustained real wage growth in more than two decades, with the lowest inflation in more than three decades.

I can tell you that back in December of 1992, when we were sitting around the table at the Governor's Mansion, trying to decide what had to be in this economic program, the economists that I had there, who normally are thought to be—you know, you say, well, they're Democrats; they'll be more optimistic—none of them believed that we could grow the economy for this long with an unemployment rate this low and an inflation rate this low. And it's a real tribute to the American people.

So what you see here, I think, is the most important recent example of our efforts here in Washington to maximize the possibilities of the new information age global economy, while preserving our responsibilities to protect ordinary citizens and to build one nation here. And there will always be competing interests. You heard Senator Gramm characterize this bill as a victory for freedom and free markets. And Congressman LaFalce characterized this bill as a victory for consumer protection. And both of them are right. And I have always believed that one required the other.

It is true that the Glass-Steagall law is no longer appropriate to the economy in which we live. It worked pretty well for the industrial economy, which was highly organized, much more centralized, and much more nationalized than the one in which we operate today. But the world is very different.

Now we have to figure out, what are still the individual and family and business equities that are still involved that need some protections? And the long and often tortured story of this law can be seen as a very stunning specific example of the general challenge that will face lawmakers of both parties, that will face liberals and conservatives, that will face all Americans as we try to make sure that the 21st century economy really works for our country and works for the people who live in it.

So I think you should all be exceedingly proud of yourselves, including being proud of your differences and how you tried to reconcile them. Over the past 7 years, we've tried to modernize the economy, and today what we're doing is modernizing the financial services industry, tearing down these antiquated walls, and granting banks significant new authority.

This will, first of all, save consumers billions of dollars a year through enhanced competition. It will also protect the rights of consumers. It will guarantee that our financial system will continue to meet the needs of underserved communities, something that the Vice President and I tried to do through the empowerment zones, the enterprise communities, the community development financial institutions, but something which has been largely done through the private sector and honoring the Community Reinvestment Act.

The legislation I signed today establishes the principles that as we expand the powers of banks, we will expand the reach of that act. In order to take advantage of the new opportunities created by the law, we must first show a satisfactory record of meeting the needs of all the communities the financial institution serves.

I want to thank Senator Sarbanes and Congressman LaFalce for their leadership on the CRA issue. I want to applaud the literally hundreds of dedicated community groups all around our country that work so hard to make sure the CRA brings more hope and capital to hard-pressed areas.

The bill I signed today also does, as Congressman Leach says, take significant steps

to protect the privacy of our financial transactions. It will give consumers, for the very first time, the right to know if their financial institution intends to share their financial data and the right to stop private information from being shared with outside institutions. Like the new medical privacy protections I announced 2 weeks ago, these financial privacy protections have teeth. We granted regulators full enforcement authority and created new penalties to punish abusive practices. But as others have said here, I do not believe that the privacy protections go far enough. I am pleased the act actually instructs the Treasury to study privacy practices in the financial services industry and to recommend further legislative steps. Today I'm directing the National Economic Council to work with Treasury and OMB to complete that study and give us a legislative proposal which the Congress can consider next year. Without restraining the economic potential of new business arrangements, I want to make sure every family has meaningful choices about how their personal information will be shared within corporate conglomerates. We can't allow new opportunities to erode old and fundamental rights.

Despite this concern, I want to say again, this legislation is truly historic. And it indicates what can happen when Republicans and Democrats work together in a spirit of genuine cooperation, when we understand we may not be able to agree on everything, but we can reconcile our differences once we know what the larger issue is: how to maximize the opportunities of the American people in a global information age and still preserve our sense of community and protection for individual rights.

In that same spirit, I hope we will soon complete work on the budget. I hope we will complete work on the Work Incentives Improvement Act, to allow disabled people to go to work. And I know Senator Gramm has been working with Senator Roth and Senator Jeffords and Senator Moynihan and Senator Kennedy on that.

There are a lot of things we can do once we recognize we're dealing with a big issue, over which we ought to have some disagreements but where we can come together in constructive and honorable compromise to keep pushing our country into the possibilities of the future.

This is a very good day for the United States. Again I thank all of you for making sure that we have done right by the American people and that we have increased the chances of making the next century an American century. I hope we can continue to focus on the economy and the big questions we will have to deal with revolving around that. I hope we will continue to pay down our debt. I still believe in a global economy. We will maximize the opportunities created by this law if the Government is reducing its debt and its claim on available capital. So I hope very much that that will be part of our strategy in the future.

But today we prove that we could deal with the large issue facing our country and every other advanced economy in the world. If we keep dealing with it in other contexts, the future of our children will be very bright, indeed.

Thank you very much. I'd like to ask all the Members of Congress to come up here while we sign the bill. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:37 p.m. in the Presidential Hall (formerly Room 450) in the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building. S. 900, the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, approved November 12, was assigned Public Law No. 106–102.

Statement on Signing Legislation To Reform the Financial System

November 12, 1999

Today I am pleased to sign into law S. 900, the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. This historic legislation will modernize our financial services laws, stimulating greater innovation and competition in the financial services industry. America's consumers, our communities, and the economy will reap the benefits of this Act.

Beginning with the introduction of an Administration-sponsored bill in 1997, my Administration has worked vigorously to produce financial services legislation that would not only spur greater competition, but also protect the rights of consumers and guarantee that expanded financial services

firms would meet the needs of America's underserved communities. Passage of this legislation by an overwhelming, bipartisan majority of the Congress suggests that we have met that goal.

The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act makes the most important legislative changes to the structure of the U.S. financial system since the 1930s. Financial services firms will be authorized to conduct a wide range of financial activities, allowing them freedom to innovate in the new economy. The Act repeals provisions of the Glass-Steagall Act that, since the Great Depression, have restricted affiliations between banks and securities firms. It also amends the Bank Holding Company Act to remove restrictions on affiliations between banks and insurance companies. It grants banks significant new authority to conduct most newly authorized activities through financial subsidiaries.

Removal of barriers to competition will enhance the stability of our financial services system. Financial services firms will be able to diversify their product offerings and thus their sources of revenue. They will also be better equipped to compete in global financial markets.

Although the Act grants financial services firms greater latitude to innovate, it also contains important safety and soundness protections. While the Act allows common ownership of banking, securities, and insurance firms, it still requires those activities to be conducted separately within an organization, subject to functional regulation and funding limitations.

Both the Vice President and I have insisted that any financial services modernization legislation must benefit American communities by preserving and strengthening community reinvestment. I am very pleased that the Act accomplishes this goal. The Act establishes an important prospective principle: banking organizations seeking to conduct new nonbanking activities must first demonstrate a satisfactory record of meeting the credit needs of all the communities they serve, including low- and moderate-income communities. Thus, the law will for the first time prohibit expansion into activities such as securities and insurance underwriting unless all of the organization's banks and thrifts maintain a ''satisfactory'' or better rating under the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA). The CRA will continue to apply to all banks and thrifts, and any application to acquire or merge with a bank or thrift will continue to be reviewed under CRA, with full opportunity for public comment. The bill offers further support for community development in the form of a new Program for Investment in Microentrepreneurs (PRIME), to provide technical help to low- and moderate-income microentrepreneurs.

The Act includes a limited extension of the CRA examination cycle for small banks and thrifts with outstanding or satisfactory CRA records, but expressly preserves the ability of regulators to examine these institutions at any time for reasonable cause, and does not affect regulators' authority in connection with an application. The bill also includes a requirement for disclosure and reporting of CRA agreements. The Act and its legislative history have been crafted to alleviate burdens on banks and thrifts and those working to stimulate investment in underserved communities. It is critical that depository institutions and their community partners continue efforts that have led to the highest home ownership rate in our history, including a particularly dramatic increase in recent years in minority and low-income home ownership. My Administration remains committed to ensuring that implementation of these provisions does not in any way diminish community reinvestment, and stands ready to remedy any problems that may arise.

Last May, I proposed strong and enforceable Federal privacy protections for consumers' financial information. I am very pleased that the Act provides a number of the new protections that I proposed.

Under the Act, financial institutions must clearly disclose their privacy policies to customers up front and annually, allowing consumers to make truly informed choices about privacy protection. For the first time, consumers will have an absolute right to know if their financial institution intends to share or sell their personal financial data, either within the corporate family or with an unaffiliated third-party. Consumers will have the right to ''opt out'' of such information sharing

with unaffiliated third parties. These protections constitute a significant change from existing law, under which information on everything from account balances to credit card transactions can be shared or sold by a financial institutions without a customer's knowledge or consent, including the sale of information to telemarketers and other nonfinancial firms.

Of equal importance, these restrictions have teeth. For the first time, the Act allows privacy protection to be included in regular bank examinations. The Act grants regulators full authority to issue privacy rules and to use the full range of their enforcement powers in case of violations. The Act grants new, and needed, rulemaking authority under the existing Fair Credit Reporting Act. In addition, it establishes new penalties to prevent pretext calling, by which unscrupulous persons use deceptive practices to determine the financial assets of consumers. The Act will specifically allow the States to provide stronger privacy protections if they choose to do so.

Although these are significant steps forward, we will continue to press for even greater privacy protections—especially choice about whether personal financial information can be shared within a corporate family. Privacy is fundamental to Americans, and to my Administration.

The Act also streamlines supervision of bank holding companies and preserves financial regulation along functional lines. Activities generally will be overseen by those regulators who are most knowledgeable about a given financial activity, including the Securities and Exchange Commission for securities activities and State regulators for insurance activities. Given the broad new affiliations permissible under this legislation, I fully expect our regulators to work together to protect the integrity of our financial system. The bill also promotes the safety and soundness of our financial system by enhancing the traditional separation of banking and commerce. The bill limits the ability of thrift institutions to affiliate with commercial companies.

There are provisions of the Act that concern me. The Act's redomestication provisions could allow mutual insurance companies to avoid State law protecting policyholders, enriching insiders at the expense of consumers. We intend to monitor any redomestications and State law changes closely, returning to the Congress if necessary. The Act's Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLB) provisions fail to focus the FHLB System more on lending to community banks and less on arbitrage activities and short-term lending that do not advance its public purpose.

The Act raises certain constitutional issues with respect to the insurance privacy provisions in title V. The Act might be construed as contrary to Supreme Court decisions that hold that the Congress may not compel States to enact or administer a Federal regulatory program. I interpret section 505(c) of the Act, however, as providing States with a constitutionally permissible choice of whether to participate in such a program. States that choose to participate will gain the powers listed in section 505(c); States that decline will not. I believe that the Congress, in giving States a choice (in section 505(c)) whether to ''adopt regulations to carry out this subtitle,'' intended to allow States to accept or decline all of the rulemaking and enforcement obligations assigned to State authorities under sections 501–505 of the Act. This interpretation is consistent with the explanation in the conference report that both the rulemaking and enforcement roles of State insurance authorities are voluntary not mandatory.

Section 332(b) of S. 900 provides for Presidential appointment of the board of directors of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers (NARAB), established by the bill in the event that certain stated conditions occur. Because members of the NARAB board would exercise significant Federal governmental authority under those conditions, they must be appointed as Officers pursuant to the Appointments Clause of the Constitution. Under section 332(b)(1) of the bill, the President would be required to make such appointments from lists of candidates recommended by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. The Appointments Clause, however, does not permit such restrictions to be imposed upon the

President's power of appointment. I therefore do not interpret the restrictions of section 332(b)(1) as binding and will regard any such lists of recommended candidates as advisory only.

The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act is a major achievement that will benefit American consumers, communities, and businesses of all sizes. I thank all of those individuals who played a role in the development and passage of this historic legislation.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 12, 1999.

NOTE: S. 900, the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, approved November 12, was assigned Public Law No. 106–102.

Statement on Signing a Proclamation To Expand Sanctions Against the Milosevic Regime in Serbia

November 12, 1999

Today I signed a proclamation that will significantly expand the visa sanctions we impose on those who support the Milosevic regime in Serbia. The Secretary of State will now have greater flexibility to deny visas to a broad range of Milosevic's key supporters, who are obstructing democracy, suppressing freedom of speech, and financially supporting the regime. Family members, relatives, and close associates of those on the list may also be excluded.

This proclamation sends a clear message to those propping up the Milosevic regime that Serbia faces a clear choice: It can take its rightful place in a prosperous democratic Europe or sink further into isolation and economic decline under a dictator who has betrayed the best interests of the Serbian people. And if it chooses the latter path, those responsible will not be able to escape the consequences of their actions by leaving their country.

In this and other ways, we and our European allies are determined to support the Serbian opposition in its effort to bring true democracy to Serbia.

Proclamation 7249—Suspension of Entry as Immigrants and Nonimmigrants of Persons Responsible for Repression of the Civilian Population in Kosovo or for Policies That Obstruct Democracy in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) ("FRY") or Otherwise Lend Support to the Current Governments of the FRY and of the Republic of Serbia

November 12, 1999

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

In light of the actions of President Slobodan Milosevic and other officials of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) ("FRY") and the Republic of Serbia against elements of the civilian population of Kosovo, including actions within the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia; in light of actions being taken by the Milosevic regime to obstruct democracy and to suppress an independent media and freedom of the press in the FRY, Serbia, Montenegro, and Kosovo; and in light of the ongoing efforts of the Milosevic regime and its supporters to thwart the economic sanctions imposed by the United States and other countries against the FRY, I have determined that it is in the interests of the United States to suspend the entry into the United States of certain officials of the FRY Government and the Government of the Republic of Serbia and of other persons who either act in support of such officials' policies or who are closely associated with such officials.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, by the powers vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, hereby find that the unrestricted immigrant and nonimmigrant entry into the United States of persons described in section 1 of this proclamation would, except as provided

for in sections 2 through 4 of this proclamation, be detrimental to the interests of the United States. I do therefore hereby proclaim that:

Section 1. The immigrant and nonimmigrant entry into the United States of the following persons is hereby suspended:

(a) Slobodan Milosevic and other persons who, as senior FRY or Serbian officials or as members of the FRY and/or Serbian military or paramilitary forces, formulated, implemented, or carried out repressive actions against the civilian population in Kosovo;

(b) Officials of the Government of the FRY or of the Republic of Serbia and FRY nationals who formulate, implement, or carry out policies obstructing or suppressing freedom of speech or of the press in the FRY, Serbia, Montenegro, or Kosovo, or who otherwise are obstructing efforts to establish a peaceful and stable democracy in these areas;

(c) Officials of the Government of the FRY or of the Republic of Serbia and FRY nationals who, individually or as officers or employees of business or financial entities, engage in financial transactions that materially support the Government of the FRY, the Government of the Republic of Serbia, Slobodan Milosevic, or members of the Milosevic regime; and

(d) Any spouse, minor child, close relative, or close personal associate of any person described in subsections (a) through (c) above, if the entry into the United States of such spouse, minor child, close relative, or close personal associate would not be in the interests of the United States in light of the objectives of this proclamation.

Sec. 2. Section 1 shall not apply with respect to any person otherwise covered by section 1 where the entry of such person would not be contrary to the interests of the United States.

Sec. 3. Persons covered by sections 1 and 2 shall be identified by the Secretary of State, or the Secretary's designee, in the Secretary or the Secretary's designee's sole discretion, pursuant to such procedures as the Secretary may establish under section 5 below.

Sec. 4. Nothing in this proclamation shall be construed to derogate from United States Government obligations under applicable international agreements.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of State shall have responsibility to implement this proclamation pursuant to procedures the Secretary may establish.

Sec. 6. This proclamation is effective immediately and shall remain in effect, in whole or in part, until such time as the Secretary of State determines that it is no longer necessary and should be terminated, in whole or in part.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twelfth day of November, 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., November 16, 1999]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on November 17.

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.

November 8

In the afternoon, the President met with Prime Minister Milos Zeman of the Czech Republic and Prime Minister Mikulas Dzurinda of Slovakia.

The President announced his intention to nominate Mark L. Schneider to be Director of the Peace Corps.

The President announced his intention to nominate Juanita Sims Doty and Leslie Lenkowsky to be members of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

The President announced his intention to nominate Gov. Mel Carnahan of Missouri to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation.

November 9

The President announced his intention to nominate Gary A. Barron to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The President announced his intention to nominate Antony Merck to be Commissioner of the Federal Maritime Commission of the United States.

The President announced his intention to nominate Randolph D. Moss to be Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice.

The President announced his intention to nominate John R. Lacey to be Chair and Laramie F. McNamara to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.

November 10

In the morning, the President had telephone conversations with Speaker of the House J. Dennis Hastert and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott concerning the budget negotiations. He later had a second telephone conversation with Senator Lott concerning trade legislation for Africa and the Caribbean.

Later in the morning, the President traveled to York, PA, where he toured the Harley-Davidson Motor Co. plant. In the afternoon, he returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to nominate Robert M. (Mike) Walker to be Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The President announced his intention to nominate Frank S. Holleman III to be Deputy Secretary of the Department of Education.

The President announced his intention to nominate Luis Lauredo to be the U.S. Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador.

The President announced his intention to nominate Donald R. Vereen, Jr., to be Deputy Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

The President announced his intention to nominate Deanna Tanner Okun to be a member of the International Trade Commission.

The President announced his intention to nominate Ernest W. DuBester, Francis J. Duggan, and Magdalena G. Jacobsen to be members of the National Mediation Board.

The President announced his intention to nominate Jerome F. Kever and Virgil M. Speakman, Jr., to be members of the Railroad Retirement Board.

The President announced his intention to nominate Carol Waller Pope to be a member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

The President announced his intention to nominate Eric D. Eberhard to be a member of the Board of Trustees for the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation.

The President announced his intention to nominate Monte R. Belger to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation.

The President announced his intention to nominate Joan R. Challinor to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The President declared a major disaster in Vermont and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms and flooding associated with Tropical Storm Floyd on September 16–21.

November 11

In the morning, the President traveled to Arlington, VA, where he participated in a Veterans Day wreath-laying ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknowns. In the afternoon, he returned to Washington, DC.

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 November 3 [1]

Irwin Belk,
of North Carolina, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Fifty-fourth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Carol Moseley-Braun,
of Illinois, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Samoa.

Revius O. Ortique, Jr.,
of Louisiana, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Fifty-fourth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Bobby L. Roberts,
of Arkansas, to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 2003 (reappointment).

Michael G. Rossmann,
of Indiana, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation for a term expiring May 10, 2006, vice Eve L. Menger.

Daniel Simberloff,
of Tennessee, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation for a term expiring May 10, 2006, vice Sanford D. Greenberg.

Earl Anthony Wayne,
of Maryland, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Economic and Business Affairs), vice Alan Philip Larson.

Submitted November 8

Carol Jones Carmody,
of Louisiana, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2004, vice Robert Talcott Francis II.

[1] These nominations were not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.

Donald W. Horton,
of Maryland, to be U.S. Marshal for the District of Columbia for the term of 4 years, vice Herbert M. Rutherford III, term expired.

Submitted November 9

Mel Carnahan,
of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation for a term expiring December 10, 2005 (reappointment).

James John Hoecker,
of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2005 (reappointment).

John R. Lacey,
of Connecticut, to be Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for a term expiring September 30, 2000, vice Delissa A. Ridgway, term expired.

Laramie Faith McNamara,
of Virginia, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for a term expiring September 30, 2001, vice John R. Lacey, term expired.

Antony M. Merck,
of South Carolina, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 2001, vice Ming Hsu, term expired.

Randolph D. Moss,
of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Walter Dellinger.

Mark L. Schneider,
of California, to be Director of the Peace Corps, vice Mark D. Gearan, resigned.

Withdrawn November 9

Beth Nolan,
of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Walter Dellinger, which was sent to the Senate on March 5, 1999.

Marshall S. Smith,
of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Education, vice Madeleine Kunin, which was sent to the Senate on March 25, 1999.

Submitted November 10

Monte R. Belger,
of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, vice Linda Hall Daschle.

Joan R. Challinor,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 2004 (reappointment).

Eric D. Eberhard,
of Washington, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation for a term expiring October 6, 2002, vice Ronald Kent Burton, term expired.

Luis J. Lauredo,
of Florida, to be Permanent Representative of the United States to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador, vice Victor Marrero.

Carol Waller Pope,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term expiring July 1, 2004, vice Phyllis Nichamoff Segal, term expired.

Donald Ray Vereen, Jr.,
of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of National Drug Control Policy (new position).

Ernest J. Wilson III,
of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2004, vice Alan Sagner, resigned.

Gary A. Barron,
of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2002, vice Mark Erwin.

Juanita Sims Doty,
of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring June 10, 2004, vice Robert B. Rogers, term expired.

Ernest W. DuBester,
of New Jersey, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2001 (reappointment).

Francis J. Duggan,
of Virginia, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2000, vice Kenneth Byron Hipp, term expired.

Frank S. Holleman III,
of South Carolina, to be Deputy Secretary of Education, vice Madeleine Kunin.

Magdalena G. Jacobsen,
of Oregon, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 2002 (reappointment).

Alan Phillip Larson,
of Iowa, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years; U.S. Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years; U.S. Alternate Governor of the African Development Bank for a term of 5 years; U.S. Alternate Governor of the African Development Fund; U.S. Alternate Governor of the Asian Development Bank; and U.S. Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, vice Stuart E. Eizenstat.

Leslie Lenkowsky,
of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring February 8, 2004, vice Eli J. Segal, term expired.

Deanna Tanner Okun,
of Idaho, to be a member of the U.S. International Trade Commission for a term expiring June 16, 2008, vice Carol T. Crawford, term expired.

Robert M. Walker,
of West Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Memorial Affairs (new position).

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 November 6

Announcement: President Clinton Announces Nationwide Initiative To Prevent Telemarketing Fraud [1]

Released November 8

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Transcript of a press briefing by Education Secretary Richard Riley and Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy Planning Bruce Reed on class size reduction

Released November 9

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Listing: Cabinet Meeting

Released November 10

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's visit to Greece

Released November 12

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Adviser Samuel Berger, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs Mark Grossman, and NSC and Special Assistant to the President for Southeastern Europe Chris Hill on the President's visit to Europe.

Announcement: U.S. Special Envoy for the Americas Headed for Panama and Colombia To Discuss Trade and Other Bilateral Issues

Fact sheet: "Southwest Europe Trade Preference Act"

[1] This item was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 5, but it was embargoed for release until 10:06 a.m. on November 6.

Acts Approved By the President

Approved November 8

H.R. 1175 / Public Law 106–89
To locate and secure the return of Zachary Baumel, a United States citizen, and other Israeli soldiers missing in action

H.J. Res. 62 / Public Law 106–90
To grant the consent of Congress to the boundary change between Georgia and South Carolina

Approved November 9

S. 437 / Public Law 106–91
To designate the United States courthouse under construction at 333 Las Vegas Boulevard South in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the "Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse"

S. 1652 / Public Law 106–92
To designate the Old Executive Office Building located at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, in Washington, District of Columbia, as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building"

Approved November 10

H.J. Res. 76 / Public Law 106–93
Waiving certain enrollment requirements for the remainder of the first session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress with respect to any bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2000

H.J. Res. 78 / Public Law 106–94
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes

Approved November 12

H.R. 441 / Public Law 106–95
Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999

H.R. 609 / Public Law 106–96
To amend the Export Apple and Pear Act to limit the applicability of the Act to apples

H.R. 915 / Public Law 106–97
To authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges

H.R. 974 / Public Law 106–98
District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999

H.R. 2303 / Public Law 106–99
History of the House Awareness and Preservation Act

H.R. 3122 / Public Law 106–100
To permit the enrollment in the House of Representatives Child Care Center of children of Federal employees who are not employees of the legislative branch

H.J. Res. 54 / Public Law 106–101
Granting the consent of Congress to the Missouri-Nebraska Boundary Compact

S. 900 / Public Law 106–102
Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act

Approved November 13

H.R. 348 / Public Law 106–103
To authorize the construction of a monument to honor those who have served the Nation's civil defense and emergency management programs

H.R. 3061 / Public Law 106–104
To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend for an additional 2 years the period for admission of an alien as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(S) of such Act, and to authorize appropriations for the refugee assistance program under chapter 2 of title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act