AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, September 18, 2000
Volume 36—Number 37
Pages 2025–2103

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Congressional candidate Mike Ross, reception—2055
Connecticut
Community in Danbury—2037
Luncheon honoring Representative James H. Maloney in Danbury—2032
Education, legislative agenda—2047
Hate crimes, legislative agenda—2059
Hillary Clinton, dinner—2093
IMPAC 2000 reception—2091
India, state visit of Prime Minister Vajpayee, welcoming ceremony—2097
Legislative agenda—2047, 2049, 2059
National Campaign Against Youth Violence luncheon—2085
New York
Community of Westchester County in Scarsdale—2029
Dinner for Hillary Clinton in New York City—2025
Partners in History dinner in New York City—2044
Reception for Hillary Clinton in New York City—2042
Reception for Representative Anthony D. Weiner in New York City—2040
Patients' Bill of Rights—2081
Radio address—2027
Religious leaders, breakfast—2075
Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson, reception—2053

Communications to Congress

Azerbaijan-U.S. investment treaty, message transmitting—2052
Panama-U.S. Investment Treaty, message transmitting protocol—2053

Communications to Federal Agencies

Continuation of the Exercise of Certain Authorities Under the Trading With the Enemy Act, memorandum—2052
Delegation of Authority Under the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000, memorandum—2039
Improving Hate Crimes Reporting, memorandum—2063
Japanese Research Whaling, memorandum—2075

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Cabinet Room—2049
Oval Office—2098
South Lawn—2047
South Portico—2081
Interview with John Harris of the Washington Post—2064

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

India, Prime Minister Vajpayee—2097, 2098

(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

Proclamations

National Hispanic Heritage Month—2088
National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week—2089
National POW/MIA Recognition Day—2090

Statements by the President

Congressional action, need for
COPS program—2061
Housing vouchers—2051
Quality child care and after-school opportunities—2028
Tobacco—2041
Death of Representative Herbert H. Bateman—2039
Japanese whaling practices—2062

Statements by the President—Continued

"Marriage Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000," congressional effort to override veto—2062
Northern Ireland peace process—2062
United Nations' peacekeeping scale of assessment—2025

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—2103
Checklist of White House press releases—2103
Digest of other White House announcements—2101
Nominations submitted to the Senate—2102

Statement on the United Nations' Peacekeeping Scale of Assessment

September 8, 2000

I am pleased that so many nations have announced their support for a revision of the United Nations' peacekeeping scale of assessment—a revision that will better reflect the reality of peacekeeping costs in the year 2000. Much will depend on the outcome of this fall's deliberations, including the future of U.N. peacekeeping.

Specifically, I want to express my personal appreciation to the countries who have demonstrated leadership by agreeing to assume additional financial responsibility under the peacekeeping scale: Antigua and Barbuda, Bulgaria, Kuwait, Malta, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, and Slovenia. The formula used for funding U.N. peacekeeping operations, the so-called scale of assessment, is long out of step with today's realities and is in pressing need of change.

Yesterday all permanent five members of the Security Council supported a revision of the peacekeeping financial structure. My team and I will be working on this important issue for the remainder of this administration.

The U.N. General Assembly will be debating revisions to the scale of assessments over the next few months. These deliberations will be guided and inspired by the example of the countries.

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

Remarks at a Dinner for Hillary Clinton in New York City

September 8, 2000

Thank you. First of all, I want to thank Jonathan for this incredible setting. It's a beautiful place. It makes me want to get in your line of work, so I can have a place like this. [*Laughter*] And I want to thank Jerry Colonna and Barbara and Fernando and Ann Espuelas and Andrew Rasiej and all the people on the host committee and all of you who came tonight for Hillary and for a better future for this country.

I want to thank these Senators here. Nothing I was able to do in the last 8 years would have been possible without them, both when they were in the majority and most of the time—and even especially—when they were in the minority. I want to thank them for being on our high-tech council and trying to put the Democrats on the side of positive change in this economy.

And I want to say a special word of thanks to Jay Rockefeller, who served with me as Governor for many years. And we used to sit together and ruminate together and fight for the same things together. And the socioeconomic profiles of West Virginia and Arkansas were the two most identical in the country. The real reason I'm glad he's here tonight is that he proved that you could go someplace else and represent them real well in the Senate. [*Laughter*] He is exhibit A for Hillary's campaign.

I want to thank Mark Green, the public advocate, for being here tonight. And he's my great friend of many years, thank you.

I would just like to make a couple of points in introducing Hillary. First of all, I am profoundly grateful that I've had the chance to serve and grateful for the opportunities that Al Gore and I and our whole administration had to help make America a better place.

I think it is important to point out something that you know because it's a part of what you do every day, and that is that the most important force in the world are ideas—forces in the world. And they have consequences. And if your ideas are good and you implement them, they have good consequences. And if they're not so good, you live with the consequences. We forget that sometimes in politics—when we vote, when

we debate issues, we forget that in the end, it really does matter whether your ideas are right or not. And I remember when I went around the country in 1991 and 1992, and the economy was stagnant, and inequality was increasing, and all the social indicators were going in the wrong direction, I came to the conclusion that one reason was that Washington was being run on a set of ideas that were, if they were ever any good, their time had long since passed, and some of them never were right.

And we changed the economic policy, the welfare policy, the crime policy, the education policy, the health care policy, and the environmental policy and the foreign policy of this country. Ideas have consequences in public life just like they do in what you do.

And so, for me, apart from my extraordinary personal feeling about this race, the reason I'm going around the country now—the first time in 26 years when I haven't been on the ballot during an election—[*laughter*]—is because I've worked as hard as I could to turn our country around and move it in the right direction. But I honestly believe all the best things are still out there. And I think this is the first time in my lifetime that our Nation has had a chance to shed its baggage, to shed its racial baggage, to shed its homophobic baggage, to shed all of its divisive baggage. My party has shed a lot of its baggage that basically was rooted in our fear of change and has embraced change.

And I really believe that all the best stuff is still out there. You look at the last 8 years. It's a very impressive record. But basically what it did was lay the foundation for Americans together to be able to build the future of our dreams for ourselves and our children. Almost everybody in this room is younger than me, and most days, I'm okay about it. [*Laughter*] But you've got a lot more at stake in this election than I do.

And I believe that elections are determined, by and large, by what people think they're about. So that if people believe this is really about building the future of our dreams for our children, if they believe we have to empower everyone, if they believe we all do better when we work together, if they believe that the ideas that work are the ones that ought to be embraced instead of the ones that sound good in 5-second sound bytes, then we'll win the White House, and we'll win the Senate, and we'll win the House, not because it's us but because of you and the future you want for yourselves and your children.

Martin Luther King once said, "The arc of history is long, but it bends toward justice." It's a wonderful, eloquent line, and a lot of people said, "It's a wonderful, eloquent line, but it may not be true. Look at all the horrible things that happened in the 20th century." There is a new book out by Robert Wright, called "Non Zero." Some of you may have read it. But essentially what he argues is that as societies become more complex and people grow more interdependent, all of us are forced to look more and more for non-zero sum solutions, for win-win solutions, not win-lose solutions, for things that bring us together and unite us and lift us all up, not things that divide us so I can win at your expense.

And that basically has been the social and economic policy we have tried to follow. I'm very proud that more millionaires and even more billionaires have been created in the last 8 years than at any time in American history by a long stretch. But I'm also proud that the people that are serving and catering this event tonight have a better chance to send their children to college and make a better life than they did before. I think that's important.

I just got back from Nigeria, and I went into this desperately poor village, and I had all these little children dancing for me and giving me their village gifts. And I was looking at those children, wondering whether there was someone who had just as good a brain as I did, who could grow up to speak just as well, and whether that person would have the chance, that boy or girl, to live their dreams as I have.

And one of the reasons I've loved the sort of new, high-tech world, even in the areas that challenge me technologically—[*laughter*]—is that I think that it is so egalitarian, and I think it's so open to people and their ideas and their efforts. And I think it also has more non-zero action than most sectors

of the old economy. That's the sort of politics I believe we ought to embrace.

And so I'm going all across the country trying to help Al Gore and Joe Lieberman and all of our candidates for the Senate and the House, because it's the right thing to do for America's future.

Now, that brings me to Hillary and this race. You have to pick the person who will succeed to the Senate seat of Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Robert Kennedy. You don't have to worry about whether she'll be the junior Senator. Senator Schumer's aggression will take care of that—[*laughter*]—and I say that with great admiration.

I do want to say one other thing about him. For all the good things he's done, the thing that I'll never forget is that he helped Al Gore and me and our administration stand up to the NRA and stand for gun safety.

But Senator Schumer already said a few things about Hillary. Let me say, of all the things that her adversaries sometimes say, the thing that steams me the most is that she wouldn't be doing this if she weren't the First Lady. What I want you to know is, if she weren't the First Lady, she'd have been in a position to do this 25 years ago.

She will tell—when we first met and fell in love, I actually felt guilty about it because I thought I was robbing her of the career that I felt she should have. I thought she was better organized than me. I thought she was a better—I thought she understood things about public policy I didn't know. I thought she had more talent as a public servant than anybody I ever met. And I have watched her spend 30 years helping other people as a private citizen, all the way up until she came to the White House and she wrote a best-selling book and gave 100 percent of the money to children's charities that she earned; when she fought for the family and medical leave law; when she fought to insure millions more children under the Child's Health Insurance Program; when she fought for better treatment for breast cancer and diabetes and Parkinson's. And I could just go on and on and on.

I can tell you that when the record of this administration is written, one of the chapters will have to be how she fundamentally changed the scope, depth, and range of the role of First Lady.

I do think there ought to be one person in the Senate who is a recognized national lifetime advocate and expert on children's issues and on the relationship of work and childrearing and on education and health care. I think that's important. But the main thing you need to know is that I still feel the way I did almost 30 years ago: I've never known anybody that I thought had a greater capacity for public service, had a greater sense of mind and heart and operational effectiveness.

And I want to see this seat occupied by someone, yes, that I happened to have loved for three decades, but more important, whose love can change the future of America and New York in a positive way.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:05 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Jonathan Lidersdorf, dinner host; Jerry Colonna, Barbara Chang, Fernando Espuelas and his wife, Ann, and Andrew Rasiej, dinner host committee; Senator John D. Rockefeller IV, who was Governor of West Virginia, 1976–1984; and Mark Green, New York City Public Advocate. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

September 9, 2000

Good morning. This year our Nation is experiencing one of the worst wildfire seasons in memory. Extreme weather and lightning strikes have helped spark an estimated 250 fires every day. More than 6.6 million acres have burned already, and more than 35 large fires continue in 9 States. We've all witnessed the tragedy of family homes destroyed and admired the bravery of firefighters and citizens joining efforts to battle the blazes. I saw it firsthand in Idaho last month, and I'll never forget it.

Today I want to talk with you about important new steps we're taking to help communities recover and to ease the threat of fires in the years ahead. For months now, we've been mobilizing Federal resources to provide firefighters and communities the tools they

need to combat the fires. More than 25,000 Federal, State, and local personnel have been engaged in the effort. We provided $590 million in emergency firefighting funds, and recently I declared Montana and Idaho disaster areas, making them eligible for more Federal relief. But we must do more.

That's why I directed Interior Secretary Babbitt and Agriculture Secretary Glickman to prepare a report outlining a strategy to help communities recover from these fires and to ensure that others are spared from similar tragedies in the future. Today I'm accepting the recommendations contained in this report and announcing the first steps we're taking to implement them.

First, saving lives and property is and will remain priority one. Our Nation is blessed with the best firefighting force in the world. They're doing an extraordinary job in some of the most dangerous and difficult conditions imaginable. Some are finally returning home for well-deserved rest. But the fire season isn't over, and as long as the fires burn, our firefighters will continue to receive our strong support to get the job done as quickly and safely as possible.

Second, we're launching new actions to help hard-hit communities recover as the smoke clears. Once the fires are out, the threat doesn't stop. Rain, for example, could trigger mudslides, and dirty runoff threatens water quality. To help prevent further damage, we've dispatched more than 50 rapid response teams to work with local communities to develop plans to repair damaged lands and protect precious water supplies.

In addition, we've just released nearly $40 million for 90 restoration projects throughout the West. We'll also soon establish one-stop centers in Idaho and Montana, so that citizens can gain quick access to assistance, from unemployment aid to small business loans. We want to make sure the help gets to those who need it right away.

Finally, we must continue to take a long-range look to diminish the threats from fires in the years ahead. For almost 100 years our Nation pursued a policy focusing on extinguishing all wildfires. It was well-intentioned, but as a result, many of our forests now have an unnatural buildup of brush and shrubs. This excessive undergrowth fuels forest fires, making them far more dangerous and difficult to control.

Our administration has taken a new approach to protect communities and reduce wildfire risks by getting rid of the forest underbrush that has accumulated over the last century. We're reducing the risk of fire on more than 2.4 million acres a year, a fivefold increase since 1994. We want to work with communities to expand these efforts in an environmentally sensitive way, particularly in those areas at greatest risk of wildfire.

Today's report provides a blueprint for action, immediate steps to deliver assistance to hard-hit communities, new measures to build on our efforts to ease the threat of wildfires nationwide. The report recommends an additional $1.5 billion to carry out this strategy, and I'm committed to working with the Congress to secure this critical funding.

Throughout this wildfire season, we've seen our fellow citizens come together to save lives and aid communities in need. That's the best of the American spirit. It's reflected in these new steps to help put out the fires today, help communities heal tomorrow, and help to reduce wildfire threats for years to come.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6 p.m. on September 8 at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on September 8. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 8 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast.

Statement on the Need for Congressional Action on Quality Child Care and After-School Opportunities

September 11, 2000

Today the Urban Institute released a report highlighting the struggle working parents face in trying to provide supervised care for their children before and after school. The report found that over 4 million children of working mothers ages 6 to 12 were regularly without any adult supervision when they were not in school. While the report highlights that child care patterns for schoolchildren differ greatly from community to

community, one thing is clear: Far too many children have no care when they are not in school. Millions of children without care in the hours after school are in harm's way—we know that crime and victimization rates among school-age children are highest in the after-school hours. The report also highlights research showing that high-quality after-school programs can give school-age children access to academic and enrichment activities that lead to improved student achievement and better behavior.

It is clear from this report that we need to do a much better job of providing working parents with access to affordable quality child care or after-school opportunities for their schoolchildren. That is why I call on Congress to respond to the needs of working parents for more help. I ask Congress to accept my budget proposal to invest $1 billion in the 21st Century Community Learning Center program to provide over 2 million children with after-school opportunities. I also ask that Congress invest in child care options that can be used to provide child care for children up to age 13, expand the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit to help over 8 million families pay for child care, and boost the Child Care and Development Block Grant by an additional $817 million.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 8 but was embargoed for release until 12:01 a.m., September 11.

Remarks to the Community of Westchester County in Scarsdale, New York

September 11, 2000

Thank you. Patty was really good, wasn't she? [*Laughter*] She did a great job. I want to thank her for being here, for the work she does as a parent and the work she does in her day job for our children.

And thank you Peggy Charren, a long-time friend of Hillary's and mine, and of all the children of America. Thank you, Andy Spano, for being here. And thank you, our great friend, Nita Lowey. What a terrific Representative in Congress she is, and I hope you get a little help. Thank you.

I want to thank Eileen Lehrer and Ellen Lazarus and all the people here at the JCC who made us feel so welcome today. I even got to walk downstairs and shake hands with some of the children and teachers and parents on what I understand is the first day of school—[*laughter*]—which makes this quite appropriate.

This happens to me often—and I'm sure it will more and more now that Hillary is in politics as a candidate—but very often I get to speak last, and everything that really needs to be said has already been said. [*Laughter*] Everything that needs to be said has been said. But what does it all mean? And how can we distill it? So let me just try.

First of all, this is, in some ways, the newest of issues and, in some ways, the oldest of issues. Plato said, thousands of years ago, "Those who tell the story, rule society." Whenever a young person comes to me, interested in politics, wanting to run for office, dreaming of public service, and they ask me for advice, I always tell them two things: One is, you've got to have some reason to run bigger than yourself; and the second is, you have to learn to listen, to hear the music of other people's lives, because everybody's got a story.

Now, that's really what this is about. We live in a culture, and a lot of the stories our children have, the stories of their lives, come direct from the accumulated experiences and memories that they absorb from their parents, their grandparents, their extended family, the people of their faith, the people of their school, the people of their community.

And then there's all the stuff they get from a further reach. And more and more and more now, over the last 40 to 50 years, with the advent of television and then the computers and the video games and music video and, frankly, the 24-hour news cycle, and then the explosion of cable channels, you can get more and more and more of your story by indirection, from third party sources, at all hours of the day and night, from all kinds of sources, that parents have less and less direct control over.

Because what this is really about is, what will be the stories that shape these children,

and how will they relate to it? And what specifically does this FTC report mean? It's already been mentioned that we've known now for 300 years, through some 300 studies, I might add—300—this is not something that's subject to debate—that regular, persistent exposure of children at young ages to indiscriminate violence tends to make them less sensitive to the real and human impact of violence in their own lives. It changes their story. That's what this is about. It shapes how they think about the implications and the impact of what they do and what other people do.

So we started working on this, I guess, Hillary and I did—well, she started working on it years ago—but from I think the first time I went to Hollywood to talk to people about this was December of 1993, I believe. And then we began to work about 5 years ago with the entertainment community on a ratings system for television programs and on the V-chip. And this year will be the first year, I think, that all new televisions have to have the V-chip built in. Before, you had to get a little box to go with it.

And meanwhile, we've been working with the video game industry about kind of a ratings system and a little control over access to that. And we've done some more things I'll mention in a minute with movies. But the whole idea was, in the fight to save public broadcasting, to try to encourage more children's and educational programming on all networks, the fight to get the TV ratings system and the V-chip and deal with the video games and the movies—the whole idea was to try to give parents more control over the stories of their children's lives at their earliest and most vulnerable points, so that later on, the kids would be happier and more full and less anxiety-ridden, and the society would be more stable and less violent.

And it's a very old story. What Plato said a long time ago is still true today. So the problem is, this FTC report says that some entertainment companies are engaged in marketing practices that if not illegal are clearly wrong because they're trying to sell their movies and their other products to the very people that they, themselves, say shouldn't see them. "So here's my rating system. Here's what I hope the parents will act on, and while the parents aren't looking, I'm going to beam this advertising in and hope they'll come anyway."

This validates what Hillary has been saying for years. But the real issue is, what are we going to do?

I don't really think that there are a lot of people making these movies and video games that hope your kids turn out to be violent. Do you? I mean, I don't think that they want your kids to have a twisted story and our society to become ever more unstable. This is about the economics of the modern media: both the explosion of media outlets, the explosion of movies being made, the explosion of video games being made, the explosion of television programs being made, a gazillion channels on your television at night; the coming integration of all these media forces so that some day not too long from now you'll hang a thin little, very high-definition screen up on a wall, take it from wall to wall in your house, and you'll be able to have the Internet and your video games and your television, and, sooner or later, we're going to beam direct in movies. You won't even have to wait for the DVD. That's what's all happening. And there will be a gazillion options, and it will be 24 hours a day, and that's where it's going.

And what happens is—and these people face the same problems here, same challenges. All these folks are just giving us news. And what happens to them? You know, a very small percentage of these films make money directly in the theater. And interestingly enough, the R-rated movies, a smaller percentage of them than the G and the PG movies make money directly in the theater. So a lot of these movies are made for an after market. But they've got to get as much money as they can. We're just talking about the movies now. And they turn around and sell the movies to television or sell the movies overseas or whatever. But that's no help to you. You've got children to raise. You don't care about their problems.

And we're working this out as a society. I'm very worried about it for a lot of reasons. It used to be all of the programming that only adults should see when we had three networks were on television at night, after a certain time. Now everything is on all the

time, at least somewhere. I don't know when some people sleep at all anymore. [*Laughter*] The whole rhythm and pattern of normal life has been affected by this constant barrage of stuff.

Now, last spring I asked the movie industry to reevaluate the PG rating, to make sure that it was meaning something. And I asked them to keep guns out of the ads that kids might see. And I asked the theater and video owners to enforce more strictly the ratings system.

Now, I'm glad that the theater owners accepted this challenge, and the report shows that they're actually making progress. But according to the FTC investigators, underage children still frequently are sold tickets for R-rated movies.

So here's where we are on the specific issue at hand. We know that extreme, consistent, persistent exposure to violence of children at young ages desensitizes them to the impact of their own behavior and others. It disables them from having full feelings about violent conduct. We know this. This is not subject to debate.

We know now that we're making progress with a lot of good people in the entertainment industry. They're doing more to rate their shows and try to provide other kinds of shows. But we know that a lot of people are out there now—we know—today, advertising these very programs to the people they say shouldn't see them and that some of the people who control children's access in theaters are still letting them in, in a very casual way.

So what do we do? Peggy said we don't want to get into first amendment censorship. I agree with that. I think we have to challenge and say, the American people, "I agree with what Hillary said." The American people will give, I think, the entertainment industry a period now to fix this, but something has to be done. You can't make a mockery of a system that you say has integrity. They say these ratings systems mean something. They can't turn around and advertise to people that shouldn't see this stuff. They can fix this. They can fix this. So I think it's very important.

Now, we will know whether they take appropriate action or not sometime in the next few months. Sometime in the next few months, I won't be President anymore. [*Laughter*] And I'll just be a citizen like the rest of you, and I look forward to that. But that's what makes these elections very important. Because one of the major factors—challenges, I think, facing this country over the next decade, with all of our prosperity, will be how to make it possible for more and more Americans to succeed at work and at their most important work, which is raising children. It's the most important job any mother or father does, raising children. It is society's most important work.

I don't know how many times I said that when I had an argument with my daughter over the last umpty-ump years—[*laughter*]—"At least I want you to know this. I consider you my most important job, even if you disagree with me. You've got to understand that." This is important, what are we going to do?

Now, that's where these elections are important. You heard Hillary talk about; you heard Peggy talk about it. Hillary has been working on this stuff for 30 years. You need somebody in the Congress who has a lifetime commitment and world-class expertise on these issues, somebody who doesn't go around just jumping at the latest headline.

I was kind of proud of her today. I didn't know exactly what she was going to say. She stood up here and said, "I'm not suggesting we ought to have censorship here, but we've got to have mutual responsibility in this society, and they have to do something about this. This report says that people in the entertainment industry, not all of them but a lot of them, are doing things that are wrong, that they acknowledge are wrong. We've got to see what happens."

You need people like that in the Congress, and especially in the Senate because it's such a debating forum for America's hot issues. You need someone who understands that all these rating systems don't make a lot of sense to a lot of people, and it would be far better if there were one, uniform, unambiguous rating system for all forms of entertainment to which our children are exposed, something Hillary, I think, was the first and maybe the only person to forcefully advocate in the entire country.

And you need someone who sees in a larger sense that this media issue is tied to other issues: the need for gun safety legislation, the need for safe and drug-free schools, the need for after-school and summer school programs for kids, to give them positive things to do, so you won't have to spend all of your time just telling them what not to do. There needs to be things for children to do. It's very unproductive raising a child if you spend all your time saying no. It is a dead-bang loser strategy for any parent if all you have to say is, no. You've got to say something, yes. You've got to have something for the kids to say yes to, who understands that we need greater support for child care, for foster care, for adoptions, for family leave. The reason I think that she ought to be New York's Senator is that this media issue is another example of a lifetime of commitment to the whole idea of what our common responsibilities are for our children and for each other. It really does take a village, and that's her whole idea.

So I ask you to think about it. I want you to go home tonight and talk at dinner about this FTC report. I want you to talk to the people you work with about it. And instead of just railing against the people out there, I want you to think about some of the things that have been said here today and what Patty said about what your responsibilities are.

And I want you to think about what kind of person you really want in the United States Senate when the chickens come home to roost on the whole question of the role of media violence in your children's and your grandchildren's lives and gun safety and whether the schools are open enough and have the right kind of programs for after-school and summer school and whether we're really doing what we need to on family leave and foster care and adoption.

All these issues have to be dealt with together, because I'm telling you there is no more important challenge for any society than maximizing the chance that good people can succeed at work and at their most important work, raising their children. There's nobody better prepared to do that than Hillary.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:07 a.m. in Henry Kauffman Hall at the Jewish Community Center of Mid-Westchester. In his remarks, he referred to Patty Cathers, director of program and volunteer services, Child Abuse Prevention Services of Roslyn, NY, who introduced the President; Peggy Charren, founder, Action for Children's Television; Andrew J. Spano, Westchester County executive; Eileen Lehrer, president, and Ellen Lazarus, cochair, board of directors, Jewish Community Center of Mid-Westchester . The President also referred to a September 11 report by the Federal Trade Commission entitled "Marketing Violent Entertainment to Children: A Review of Self-Regulation and Industry Practices in the Motion Picture, Music Recording & Electronic Game Industries."

Remarks at a Luncheon Honoring Representative James H. Maloney in Danbury, Connecticut

September 11, 2000

Thank you. Wow! [*Laughter*] Well, first of all, that's the best talk I ever heard Jim Maloney give. It was amazing. [*Laughter*] I thought two things when he was giving that speech: The first thing I thought is, that's the speech everybody ought to be giving around America this year; and the second thing I thought is, if he keeps giving that speech, this election won't be nearly as close as the last one was, if you guys help to get the message out. Thank you.

Let me say, I'm honored to be here with Jim and Mary and what he referred to as the delegation from his family. I thought Lew Wallace gave a great speech, too. We ought to give him—[*applause*]—it was a very good speech. Thank you.

I want to thank your attorney general and my law school classmate and friend of 30 years Dick Blumenthal for being here, and Secretary of State Susan Bysiewicz and Comptroller Nancy Wyman, thank you. Did I say it right?

And I want to thank the mayor of Danbury for making me feel welcome here. Thank you, Gene. Where are you? Thank you, Gene Eriquez. And Ed Marcus and John Olsen, John Walkovich, I want to thank all them. And I'd also like to, on a point of personal privilege, one of the most talented people who ever served on my staff and one of the

most valuable to me, personally, is a young man named Jonathan Prince, who has now gone off to do well. But he's from Danbury. He and his parents are here today. Jonathan, where are you? Give him a hand. He did a great job. He's here somewhere. [*Applause*] Thank you.

I also want to thank my longtime friend Mayor Joe Ganim from Bridgeport for coming over here. He and Gene and I took a picture together. We took a picture together, and they whispered to me that most mayors, unlike Presidents, aren't term limited. [*Laughter*]

Let me say to all of you, I am having a great day today. I started off today, Hillary and I were in Washington at the White House, and we went up to Westchester County, where we now make our home. And we did an event at a Jewish community center on the Federal Trade Commission report today on violence in the media, pointing out that a number of entertainment companies—by no means all of them; we don't want to paint with too broad a brush—but a number of them actually have been advertising these violent movies to the same kids that they say shouldn't go see them.

And Senator Lieberman and Vice President Gore talked about it yesterday, and I think Joe is going to testify before the Congress sometime this week, in the next few days, about it. But we had a wonderful time, talking about the future and the challenges that families at work face, and succeeding at work and succeeding at raising their children, which is the most important work of all.

And then I came up here to be with you, and I'm going back to New York, and we're going to do, I think, three or four more things today. [*Laughter*] And I'm going to—Hillary and I are going to end up tonight at a dinner honoring the efforts that we made, along with several others in a bipartisan way, to deal with the so-called Nazi gold issues in Switzerland and get the wealth returned back to the people who needed it. So, it's a great day.

This is an interesting time in my life. My family has a new candidate. My party has a new leader, and I've become the Cheerleader in Chief of America. [*Laughter*] And I like it. [*Laughter*]

I guess what I would like to tell you is, as someone who is not running for office—for the first time since 1974, I'm not going to be on the ballot—I, too, believe what Jim Maloney said. And the most important thing to me to try to get across to the American people is, yes, we've had a great year. This has been a terrific run. And I'm grateful, not just for the economic prosperity but for the greater sense of unity that the country has, for the social progress we see in crime and welfare and teen pregnancy and a whole lot of other indicators, showing our country is coming together, for the change in the American political climate now, away from the kind of just dripping venom that dominated so many elections of the last 20 years. I'm grateful for all that.

So what I want you to understand and believe is that the best is still out there, because we have spent a great deal of time these last 8 years just trying to turn the country around, to dig it out of a mountain of debt, to dig it out so that the interest rates could come down and so that people just in their private lives could go about making America the success it ought to be, changing the crime policy, changing the environmental policy, changing the education policy, changing the health care policy. But a lot of the biggest, best things are still out there.

At least in my lifetime, we have never had a period where we had so much progress and prosperity with so little internal crisis or external threat. I think Jim told me when I came in that Theodore Roosevelt was the last President to come to Danbury and spend any time. And I like Theodore Roosevelt. [*Laughter*] If he were alive today, he'd be a Democrat, too. [*Laughter*]

You know, Roosevelt governed at another magic time. He inherited the Presidency as the youngest man ever to be President, when President McKinley was assassinated shortly after his reelection in 1900 and was inaugurated in 1901, and shortly after that, he was killed. So Teddy Roosevelt inherited the Presidency and did, I think, a very good job with it, in dealing with a time that is probably more like this time in historical terms than any period in the middle, because we were moving from an agricultural to an industrial society, and we had to redefine our sense

of national community and what our obligations were to one another. How were we going to take in that huge wave of immigrants that came into America at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century; how were we going to deal with this huge influx of people who couldn't make a living on the farm anymore but wanted to make a living in the factory? But a lot of them were children, and a lot of them were working 12 and 14 or 15 hours a day, and there were all kinds of abusive conditions there.

And in the first Roosevelt era, we began to come to grips with our responsibilities to immigrant populations living in difficult situations in the slums, our responsibilities to end child labor in the most abusive labor conditions. And we began to be aware of the capacity of the industrial revolution to damage the environment. And Teddy Roosevelt became our first great environmental President by meeting the challenges of the moment.

And then when—ironically, there was a brief interruption because after he left office, his designated successor, William Howard Taft, was elected, the person he wanted to succeed him, but he turned out not to be a progressive. So Woodrow Wilson got elected, with a little help from Theodore Roosevelt, and we had 8 more years.

But then what we were trying to do was interrupted by war and then by depression and then again by war. And so Franklin Roosevelt had to build this sense of unity out of all this adversity. But in a funny way—I used to talk to my grandfather all the time about the Depression. One thing, it's almost a purging effect, total adversity has on you, because you don't—it's not like you have all the options in the world. You got up in the morning. You tried to figure out how to keep body and soul together, and you know you've got to change something, because if you keep on doing the same thing, you'll be in the same hole.

However, when things are going very well, your opportunity for error increases because you have lots of options. And that really is what's going on in this election. You've got to decide what you want to do with the most truly astonishing moment of prosperity and social progress and national security in our lifetime. You have to decide.

And people ask me all the time, you know, for a year and a half or 2 years, "Do you really think that Al Gore is going to win?" And I always said, yes, and I always believed it, when the polls weren't nearly as good as they are today, because I knew the underlying conditions of the country were good. I knew that he was a good man. I knew he had played a terrific role in the building of what we have done. But I also knew that he was thinking about what we should do in the future. And when he picked Joe Lieberman to be on the ticket with him, it proved that he was thinking about what we should do in the future.

People ask me all the time if I think Hillary is going to win. I tell them, yes. And I do, and I always have, but I do for the same reasons.

But the truth is—I meant precisely what I said when I said, if Jim keeps giving that speech and you all keep giving him enough money to make sure people hear the message—[*laughter*]—and make sure people hear the message, the race won't be as close as it was last time, because that's where America is and where America wants to go.

But I'm telling you, this is not exactly your standard political speech, but the truth is, I've been doing this a long time now—[*laughter*]—and I have nearly got the hang of it. [*Laughter*] And I have observed that very often, an election is determined not so much by who the two candidates are but by what the people think the election is about. Now, I'll get serious a minute.

If the people believe the election is about how much they can get for themselves today, right now, never mind tomorrow, and never mind my neighbor, we're going to be in a tough fix, folks, and especially if they talk nice about it, you know? [*Laughter*] "I would like to raise the minimum wage, and I would like to have a Patients' Bill of Rights. And I know all the seniors need prescription drugs, and half of them will be left out if we only take people at 150 percent of the poverty line. I'd like to do all that, and I feel really terrible that I can't. But I've got to keep dishing out this tax cut money." [*Laughter*]

Now, you're laughing, but times are good. And a lot of people say, "Well, what could be wrong with that? I could use the money." So I'm telling you—you hear me now—it's good that you gave him a check, but it's not enough. You've got 60 days here, and every time you see somebody, you need to talk to them about this election. Every day, when you come home from work or when you end your day, if you are a homemaker or whatever you do, you ought to ask yourself if you've talked to one or two people about the decision that we have to make as a people in this millennial year.

Because I'm telling you, there are profound economic and educational and health care and environmental and criminal justice and what I call one America—how we're all going to live and work together—issues, that there are honest differences—big election, big differences. All the best stuff is still out there. The other side wants to blur over the differences and emphasize how appealing their tax cuts are.

We want to have tax cuts, too, very badly, actually, in the area of the marriage penalty or giving kids—families a tax deduction for their children's college tuition, long-term care credit for elderly and disabled family members that you have to take care of, making it easier for people to save for retirement. We've got quite a nice tax package, but theirs is 3 or 4 times bigger than ours.

But there's a reason theirs is 3 or 4 times bigger—because we don't want to get rid of this whole surplus. We think it's a good thing that we're paying the debt down. We know that we need some money to invest in education and health care, in science and technology, in the future of America. We know we may have some emergency come up. We know we may have some defense crisis develop, where we need to give our military even more than we anticipate. We know that over 10 years we might have a recession, and the money might not all come in.

So we can't make the expansive tax cut promises they can, and that may obscure the fact to the voters that we actually have, as Jim said, quite a good tax cut package that we strongly believe we can still pass in this Congress, if they want to do it. But I think they'd rather have the issue, because they want it to look like we're sort of the, you know, the curmudgeons that won't give the average Joe a break, and the country's rolling in dough, and it's their money, and the other side is going to give it all back to them.

Let me just remind you, that rhetoric quadrupled the debt of the United States of America in the 12 years before I took office with Al Gore. And we have worked very hard—we've worked very hard to turn that around. A lot of Members of Congress gave up their seats after 1993, because they voted to turn it around. And we'd better think a long time before we play games with our fiscal discipline and our ability to pay down that debt.

Let me just give you one example. They talk all the time about tax cuts. If you did everything they're talking about, you passed all the tax cuts they've advocated and all the one's they're rolling out and all the one's their nominee for President rolled out and then you pass their Social Security privatization plan, which costs another trillion dollars, nearly—and that's before they pay for Star Wars or any of their other spending—no, seriously, before they pay for any of that—and you compare that to the Gore-Lieberman-Maloney positions—now, listen, hear me here—you can—interest rates under our approach would be one percent lower a year for a decade. Why? Because we're going to keep paying down the debt until we get America out of debt for the first time since 1835, and they'll have to stop doing that, because they're going to spend so much money on the tax cuts and the privatization program. They're going to spend all this projected surplus, and then some.

And when you do that, interest rates will go up, and the market will react accordingly, and the economy will be weaker. Everybody will have their tax cut. I don't know how much good it will be if the economy gets weak. But let me say this—I had a study done—you know how much a one percent reduction in interest rates for a decade is worth? Three hundred and ninety billion dollars in home mortgages, about $900 a year on a $100,000 mortgage—I don't want to mess this up—$30 billion in car payments, and $15 billion in student loan payments. So that's a $435 billion tax cut the American

people get for paying for a strong economy and getting rid of the debt and saving some money to invest in caring for the needs of all Americans.

You know, we believe, our party does, that all these people in these pretty uniforms that served our lunch here, we believe that they ought to have the same chance to send their kids to college that I have to send my child to college. We believe they ought to be able to make a living. And if they need child care, they ought to have it. And when the time comes to raise the minimum wage, we ought to raise it. And that's what we believe.

We believe the rest of us are going to make more money when the average Americans are all out there working, making a good living, and able to support their children. So I'm just saying to you—I realize I'm preaching to the choir, but what I'm really trying to do here is to drive home the imperative of your taking some time every day to talk to your fellow citizens.

Most of you are more interested in politics than most of your friends. Is that right? Isn't that right? Every one of you has friends who—even the Congressman's in-laws, I'll bet, have friends. [*Laughter*] I used to have an uncle—let me tell you, I had a great uncle I buried a couple of years ago. He was 91 years old, and I loved him like he was my own father. And he was my total barometer about how I was doing when I was Governor. This guy had about a sixth grade education and about a 200 IQ and total recall of events that occurred in the 1930's.

And I called him one time to ask about something. He said, "I don't care about politics." He said, "I wouldn't care about you if you weren't my nephew." [*Laughter*] And so whenever I needed to know how I was doing, I called him, and he was better than any poll I ever took. [*Laughter*] So I'm telling you, you all know people who—they think they're too busy. They're too preoccupied with their lives. They don't think about this all the time like you do. They've never been to one of these political fundraisers. They've never heard their Congressman give a speech like this, and they may never get a chance to.

And it may be that the only direct flesh-and-blood contact they ever have with anybody asking them to think about this is with you. Otherwise, it's just some secondhand experience with the television ads or the debates for President or whatever.

Now, I've done everything I could to turn this country around. You know there are big differences in this election. I hope you believe me when I tell you, as good as the last 8 years have been, the next 8 years can be better. And we can keep building on this if we decide that we're going to use and not abuse what is a truly unique moment in our history.

But the members of the clergy who are here will tell you that throughout human history, people have been more likely to make a mistake when things were so good than when things were full of adversity and the options were clearer. So I implore you. This is a good man representing you in Congress. He is a good man, and he deserves to be reelected. And I want Joe Lieberman to be the next Vice President, and I believe he will be.

But believe me, you can make a difference here. You can make a difference if every day—you just look at how many people there are in this room—if every one of you talk to three people every day between now and November, it's enough to turn the entire margin—that would be far more, by the way—if every one of you talk to three people between now and November, that would be far more than the victory margin he had in the last election. Far more, right?

Now, I'm telling you, it's your country—and if you know anybody in New York, I wouldn't mind you talking to them either. [*Laughter*] If the American people really believe this is a magic moment, if they really believe that together we can build the future of our dreams for our children, if they understand clearly what we're for and what we're not, then Al Gore and Joe Lieberman, Jim Maloney and Hillary, the whole crowd, they'll win.

Clarity, clarity and focus are our friend. You've got to bring this message clearly into focus for people who might never come here but who are going to be just as affected by the decision we make as a people in November as you are. So you cared enough to come here for Jim. Care enough to talk for him,

every day for the next 60 days, and help us build America's best days.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:25 p.m. in the Amber Room Colonnade at Western Connecticut State University. In his remarks, he referred to Representative Maloney's wife, Mary; State Representative Lewis Wallace, Jr.; Edward L. Marcus, chair, Connecticut State Democratic Party; delegates to the 2000 Democratic National Convention John Olsen and Joseph Walkovich; former Special Assistant to the President and Presidential Speechwriter Jonathan Prince; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush. Representative Maloney is a candidate for reelection in Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District. The President also referred to a September 11 Federal Trade Commission report entitled "Marketing Violent Entertainment to Children: A Review of Self-Regulation and Industry Practices in the Motion Picture, Music Recording & Electronic Game Industries."

Remarks to the Community in Danbury

September 11, 2000

Well, thank you very much. First, thank you, Mayor Eriquez, for your wonderful speech and for outlining some of the things that we've been able to do together to help the people of Danbury.

I want to thank all of you for coming. And President Roach, thank you for making us feel welcome at your wonderful school. And I want to say to all of you, I may be the first President to come and spend this much time in Danbury, but this is not the first time I've been to Danbury. I first came here in 1970, 30 years ago. That was when I met Joe Lieberman, who was running for the State Senate.

Then I came back to Connecticut as a Governor in 1980, when I met Chris Dodd. And then I had to become President before I met Jim Maloney. But I will say this, it has not been a disappointment. He is one of the best Members of the United States House of Representatives, and you need to send him back down there in November and reelect him.

You know, Jim made a very good case for himself and for our side. And you've been out here waiting a long time, and the last thing you need is another political speech. So I'm not going to repeat what he said. I'm just going to make a few very brief points that I want you to think about.

This election is profoundly important, because we're doing so well. What do I mean by that? Well, because we're doing so well, we have a chance to meet some really big goals for this country. We could get this country out of debt over the next decade for the first time since 1835—America debt-free, low interest rates.

We could take every child in a working family in America out of poverty by making sure we had a tax system that was fair to the working poor. We could provide health care to every single child and every working family in America that don't have it today. We can make sure that every child who needs it has preschool and after-school programs and mentors. We can make sure that every child in America, when he or she comes of age, could afford to go to all 4 years of college. We've already opened the doors, universally, to the first 2 years. We can do it for all 4 years.

We can meet the big environmental challenges of the 21st century, like climate change, and do it in a way that would create millions of new jobs here in America with the new technology of alternative energies and more efficient use of energy. It could mean a fortune of new jobs and wealth to Connecticut, just by doing the right thing to preserve the environment for our children, our grandchildren, and their grandchildren.

Jim talked about breast cancer. We now have identified the two genes which, when they are slightly bent in their structure, make it more likely for women to get breast cancer. We have now seen the first sequencing of the human genome. Within a matter of just a few years, young girls who are in this audience now, when they grow up a little, get married, and begin to have babies, when they come home from the hospital, they'll come home with a gene map of their children, and it will tell you everything that's good about their structure, and all the problems. And when that happens, Americans will have a life expectancy of about 90 years. Just in a few years, all this is going to happen.

Now, what's that got to do with this election? We have to make the right decisions now about what to do with our prosperity if we want to make the big goals for America for the 21st century come true. One I didn't mention is dealing with the aging of America. I'm the oldest of the baby boomers. Everybody between the ages of 36 and 54 was the biggest generation of Americans ever born, until this group that is in our schools right now.

And when we retire, for a period of about 18 years, there will only be about two people working for every one person eligible for Social Security. And I can tell you that everybody I know in my generation is determined that when we retire, our retirement will not bankrupt our children and their ability to raise our grandchildren. It doesn't have to happen. We can save Social Security and save Medicare and add this prescription drug benefit and take the burden off of our children and our grandchildren.

But it all depends on what the American people decide today, in a moment of great good fortune, great national optimism. All the mean and stinging rhetoric we used to hear from the other side for 20 years why, it's gone away, and butter wouldn't melt in their mouths—[*laughter*]—and I appreciate that. It's a good thing. I never liked the politics of personal destruction. But there are real differences here which cannot be obscured.

And I would argue to you that it may be harder for a free people to make the right decision in good times than it is in bad times. After all, back in 1992, when you took a chance on me, it wasn't much of a chance. The country was in a ditch, and you knew we had to change. [*Laughter*] We were in terrible shape, and you knew we had to change.

Now, things are going along so well, there seem to be options. And often the debate is blurred about what the options is—are. I need to come back to college—[*laughter*]—about what the options are. We say "We're for the Patients' Bill of Rights that 200 health organizations are for," and they say, "We're for a Patients' Bill of Rights." The difference in "a" and "the" is a huge difference.

We say, "We're for a Medicare prescription drug program through Medicare, that all of our seniors who need it can afford to buy into." They say, "We don't know how much that's going to cost. We want to give the neediest of our seniors a prescription drug benefit and let the others buy insurance." They don't say that there's never been an insurance plan designed to sell drugs that will work. It's already failed in one State, and their program would leave half the people out who need it.

They say, "We want to give you a tax cut. It's your money, and we've got this big surplus." They don't say that if they give it all to you in a tax cut, what are you going to do if the money doesn't come in and we're back into deficits? What are you going to do for investments in education? What are you going to do when we get rid of the surplus and we stop paying down the debt and interest rates start going up again?

Do you know how much Jim Maloney's position on giving you a modest tax cut, so you get a deduction for college tuition, a credit for long-term care for elderly or disabled members in your family, some means of saving for retirement income, and more for child care, an abatement of the marriage penalty but at an affordable cost—do you know how much money that will save you in interest rates, as opposed to the plan of their nominee and all their crowd for Congress? It will save you about one percent a year for a decade.

Do you know how much that's worth? That's worth $390 billion in home mortgages, $30 billion in car payments, $15 billion in college loans payments, a $435 billion tax cut to ordinary Americans for car payments, college loan payments, and home mortgage payments, if we'll just keep paying off the debt, keeping the interest rates down, keeping the American economy strong and going. That's another reason you ought to be for him and Al Gore and Joe Lieberman.

Now, let me say, I'm going to do my best, when the Congress comes back in, to work closely with them. I'm going to do everything I can to get as much done as I can for you in the next 5 weeks. But however much we get done, you remember this. There are real differences here: differences in economic

policy, differences in education policy, differences in health care policy, differences in environmental policy, differences in criminal justice policy, differences in arms control and world peace policy, and differences about how we're going to live together across all the diverse cultures and races and genders and all the differences in this society that make us up.

There are big differences. And what I think you have to do is to ask yourself, what do I want this election to be about? If you want the biggest check at the earliest point and never mind the consequences, you ought to be for them—if you're an upper income person. Actually, our tax cut gives two-thirds of you more money, even though it just costs a third as much. What does that tell you about it?

But if you would like a tax cut that helps you pay for the education of your children, the long-term care of your elderly or disabled family members, helps you to save more for retirement, helps with child care, helps with the marriage penalty, but saves enough money to keep paying this debt down and investing in education and health care and science and technology so that we can keep going forward together, if you believe that we ought to make a future in which the most important thing is our common belief that everybody matters, everybody deserves a chance, and we all do better when we help each other, then you need Al Gore, Joe Lieberman, and Jim Maloney.

Thank you, and God bless you. And thank you for the Hillary sign back there. If you vote in New York, help her. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:52 p.m. in the Charles Ives Center for Performing Arts at Western Connecticut State University. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Gene F. Eriquez of Danbury and James R. Roach, president, Western Connecticut State University.

Statement on the Death of Representative Herbert H. Bateman

September 11, 2000

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the death of Congressman Herbert Bateman.

For more than 30 years, Herb Bateman served the people of Virginia with honor and distinction. As a veteran of the Air Force and a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, he worked to support our Armed Forces and was a strong advocate of fiscal discipline and a balanced budget.

Herb Bateman was a fine man and dedicated public servant who will be missed by many. Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Laura, their family, and their friends.

Memorandum on Delegation of Authority Under the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000

September 11, 2000

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Subject: Delegation of Authority Under the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–178)

By the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code, I hereby delegate to the Secretary of State the functions and authorities conferred on the President under the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–178), with the exception of subsections (f) and (g) of section 6, from which I delegate to the Secretary of State only sections 6(f)(2)(A) and 6(g)(1)(B). The remaining functions and authorities under subsections (f) and (g) of section 6 not delegated to the Secretary of State I hereby delegate to the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The authorities and functions delegated in this memorandum may be redelegated.

Any reference in this memorandum to any act shall be deemed to be a reference to such act as amended from time to time. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to publish this memorandum in the *Federal Register.*

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., September 15]

NOTE: This memorandum was published in the *Federal Register* on September 18.

Remarks at a Reception for Representative Anthony D. Weiner in New York City

September 11, 2000

Thank you very much. First, I want to thank Richard and Maureen for their warm welcome here—[*laughter*]—for opening their home. This is a beautiful place and a beautiful gathering. And the reason we're all so warm is that you came out here to support Anthony in record numbers, and I'm grateful to you. [*Laughter*] So you should enjoy the temperature; you generated it by your commitment and your support.

I want to thank you for reminding me that you were in Little Rock on election night in '92. Hard to believe it was almost 8 years ago. It's been a good 8 years, and I thank you for being there. I have a particular interest in this congressional district, because in 1992 I came to Chuck Schumer's home in Brooklyn, and I drove around this congressional district with him. I mean, I know we're not in it now, but I drove around the congressional district.

I drove to the synagogue where a swastika had been painted on the wall. And we began to see the evidence of the kind of intolerance and bigotry that we still see manifested from time to time in these terrible hate crimes around our country. And I thought then that, you know, we could turn the country around if we had the right ideas, and we literally changed the economic policy, the education policy, the health care policy, the crime policy, the environmental policy, and the foreign policy of America. And I believe that the results have been pretty good.

Now, what I want to say today is, I'm here because, number one, I'm very grateful for the support that Anthony has given me over the last 2 years, and I appreciate it very much. Secondly, and far more important, I think he has enormous capacity to serve this district well and to continue to grow in stature and leadership and impact for the people of this district, this city, and this State, in the United States Congress.

And that's very important. You know, I've reached a point now where I was looking at him and thinking how young he was and trying not to resent it. [*Laughter*]. I realize, you know, I spent most of my life as the youngest person who ever did anything, and now I'm the second youngest person ever to leave the office of the President, the youngest ever to leave after two full terms. Theodore Roosevelt was a couple of years younger than me, also of New York, so I decided I'd come to New York to see if it was in the water and catch it. [*Laughter*].

But my concern now—this is the first time since 1974 I haven't been on the ballot, and most days I'm okay about it. [*Laughter*] My party has a new leader, whom I admire and support strongly, and his Vice Presidential candidate has been a friend of mine for 30 years. I was thrilled about Senator Lieberman's pick. And my family has a new candidate. So I have become the Cheerleader in Chief of America, and I'm very happy to do that.

I want to say one thing very, very seriously. A great people are more vulnerable to making a mistake when times are good than when they're difficult. The American people and the people of New York took a chance on me and Al Gore in 1992, but it wasn't much of a chance, because the country was in the ditch. We were in trouble. We had a bad economy, worsening social problems, an increasingly divisive political climate. Now, we have a good economy; all the social indicators are going in the right direction. We are without severe internal crisis or external threat. And there is a new sense of harmony in the country, at least among the strong majority of American people, as evidenced by the different rhetoric that they have adopted in running this campaign, except in their mass mails. [*Laughter*]

That's the good news. The bad news is, it may be harder for people to tell the difference this year. I think it's quite important, just to make it clear. Anthony mentioned a few things. This is what you can do with what we have done in the last 8 years, and how these elections—whether he is successful, whether Hillary wins, whether Al and Joe win, depends in large measure on what the American people and the people of New

York believe this election is about. And I think you should believe it is about making the most of a truly magic moment in the history of America.

We can get this country out of debt for the first time since 1835. We can take Social Security and Medicare out beyond the life of the baby boom generation, so that when those of us in the baby boom generation retire and there are only two people working for every one person eligible for Social Security, we won't bankrupt our children and their ability to raise our grandchildren.

We can get rid of child poverty in this country. We can now afford to give working people a subsidy to buy health insurance and get rid of most of the uninsured people in America who are working for a living and their little kids. We can grow the economy and improve the environment. We can continue to see improvements in our education system, and there have been some substantial turnarounds in the last 4 years nationwide.

We can open the doors of 4 years of college to all Americans by adopting the bill that Senator Schumer and Hillary have so strongly endorsed to let people deduct up to $10,000 a year in their college tuition. We can do big, great things. Yes—the college students clap. [*Applause*]

We can pass hate crimes legislation and continue to grow together at home, and we can continue to be a force for peace and reconciliation around the world. But it won't happen by accident. As Anthony said, I get tickled—you know, when the other crowd were in, they took credit when the Sun rose in the morning. [*Laughter*] And everything bad that happened was someone else's fault. Now they say it's just all an accident. We just stumbled through the last 8 years. I only stumbled when I was tired. [*Laughter*]

So I want you to think about this. I'm glad you came here. I'm glad you gave him your money. I appreciate that. But it's not enough. Almost all of you have more friends who are less interested in politics than you are, than you have friends who are as interested or more interested than you are. Almost all of you have a lot of friends who would never come to an event like this or who at least have never been. And I just want to urge you, in the next 60 days, to try to take a little time everyday for citizenship. Tell people, we may never get another chance like this, when there's so much progress at home and the absence of so many threats to us abroad and so much opportunity to do good for our children and our grandchildren, to build the future of our dreams for them. And tell them we can't blow it. Tell them there are real and significant differences between the two parties and the candidates in every race—in the U.S. Senate race in New York and the House race here and certainly in the race for President and Vice President.

And there is evidence here. We've tried it their way; we've tried it our way. You have a track record here. And I think it's really worth some of your time and effort, if you went to the trouble to come here and stand in this hot room because you believe you ought to be here and you believe you ought to support this fine young Congressman, then it is worth some time in the next 60 days to talk to your friends and neighbors who don't come to things like this, who don't normally take the same position you do or activity you do in politics, and try to convince them that you came here for a reason, and they ought to vote with you in November.

I'm telling you, if people believe this election is about building the future of our dreams for our children, he will win, Hillary will win, Al Gore and Joe Lieberman will win, and we will have a great celebration on election night.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to reception hosts Richard Medley and his wife, Maureen A. Murray. Representative Weiner is a candidate for New York's Ninth Congressional District.

Statement on the Need for Congressional Action on Tobacco

September 11, 2000

Today researchers are releasing two important studies that remind us why we must act quickly to protect young people from the dangers of tobacco.

According to an NIH-funded study in the September issue of Tobacco Control, children become addicted to nicotine more

readily than researchers previously suspected. The study shows that kids do not need to smoke every day before they become dependent on nicotine—even adolescents who smoke as little as once a month experience symptoms of addiction. And because we already know that at least one third of the children who get hooked will have their lives cut short as a result, the national consequences are devastating. Another study released today in the September issue of Preventive Medicine underscores the effectiveness of price increases as part of any comprehensive effort, especially among young people—up to 2.3 million lives could be saved over the next 40 years by a $1.00 per pack inflation-adjusted price increase alone.

These studies today show why Congress must join Vice President Gore and me in making the health of our children a priority. Today I renew my call to Congress to affirm the FDA's authority to limit tobacco marketing and sales to youth and fund the Clinton-Gore administration's tobacco-related budget proposals. I also urge Congress to reject special interest protections for big tobacco by letting the American taxpayers, who have spent billions in tobacco-related Federal health costs, finally have their day in court. By working together, we can improve our Nation's health and save children's lives.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 11 and was embargoed for release until 7 p.m.

Remarks at a Reception for Hillary Clinton in New York City

September 11, 2000

Well, if I were showing good judgment, I would say nothing after that. [*Laughter*] First, let me thank our host and hostess for making us feel so welcome in this beautiful, beautiful place.

I would like to thank all of you for the contributions you have made to America in these last years that I've been privileged to serve as President, because I sometimes think that most of what I did was to get the stumbling blocks out of your way. You did the rest—every one of you, each in your own way.

One of the things that bothers me as I travel around the world today is, I see everywhere I go, in the poorest village in Africa—I can sit with children for 10 minutes, and I see the light of intelligence in people's eyes. I see the energy, the belief, the hope. And I realize that so many times, people like me in positions of responsibility just mess it up for them, if people play games with power and create illusions in the minds of people about false values, and all of a sudden, all these brilliant children grow up and there's nothing for them to do; there's no education for them to get and no dreams for them to fulfill.

And so if I've had anything to do with what any of you have achieved in the last 8 years, I've just tried to make sure that we were doing the right thing so that you would be able to do what you do so well.

And I have to tell you, I think America is profoundly indebted to all of its immigrant people, and there are many people who came here from other countries, not from India, here in this room tonight, and I thank them as well.

But I think I should say a special word of appreciation to the Indian community in the United States which, of all of our more than 200 ethnic and religious groups, ranks first in education and in income, a great tribute to your efforts and to your values.

I loved my trip to India. And when Hillary and Chelsea came home, they told me that if I didn't go to another country before I left the Presidency, I had to go to India. So I did. As you know, I visited more briefly the rest of the subcontinent. I regret that I was not more help to you in the cause of peace, but I will keep trying.

I had to confess to a reporter the other day—I say this out of deference to my good friends John and Margo Catsimatidis, who are here, who have more than a passing interest in Greece and the relationships between Greece and Turkey and the problems in Cyprus. I do believe when I leave office, I will have made progress on every problem I tackled around the world except, so far, I can't say I moved the ball forward on the Indian subcontinent or in Cyprus. But I have tried, and I will keep trying. I promise you that.

I just want to say a couple of words about this election and about Hillary in particular. So many of you were kind to say things when you went through the line, and you wished I could run for a third term and all of that. But this is a country of citizens, and this has always been a country in which the citizens were the most important people.

When Harry Truman went home to Missouri after an enormously important period in our country's history, when he basically organized our world to deal with the cold war, he said that he was resuming his most important title, that of citizen. And so now that my party has a new leader and my family has a new candidate—[*laughter*]—I suppose my official title should be Cheerleader in Chief instead of Commander in Chief. [*Laughter*]

But I will say this because I think all of you who have enjoyed great success in our country will identify with it. If you work hard, you also have to work smart. Ideas have consequences. If you have a bad idea, it doesn't matter how hard you work with it; you still won't get good consequences out of it. And the important thing that I think that has been at the core of all my concern about this election is that I think it is easier for a free people to make a mistake when times are good than when times are bad.

The American people took a chance on me and Hillary and Al and Tipper Gore in 1992, but it wasn't much of a chance, because we were in trouble, and everybody knew we had to change and try something new. So they gave us a chance. But we changed the economic policy, the education policy, the health care policy, the environmental policy, the criminal justice policy, and big parts of the foreign policy of our country.

You now have had a test run. And so, yes, I feel especially strongly, obviously, about Hillary. But the thing that matters to me as an American is that we keep changing but that we keep changing in the direction in which we are going, because we still have big challenges out there. There are still too many children living in poverty in this country when they should not be. There are still too many children that don't have excellence of education that they should have. There is still inadequate preparation for the aging of America when the so-called baby boom generation retires. And under present estimates, there will only be about two people working for every one person retired and on our Social Security system. We must not let the aging of America impose a burden on our children and their ability to raise our grandchildren.

So we have these big challenges. We also, as Americans, have not fully recognized the extent to which we are interdependent with the rest of the world. We should be doing more to develop the capacities of Indians within India and other peoples around the world and building trading and other ties with people and working with people more. That's why I came up here and spent 3 days last week at the Millennium Summit of the United Nations, meeting with leaders from all over the world, doing my best to try to create the impression that America does not wish to dominate the world but to work with it so that we can all win together.

There is a very interesting book out today called "Non Zero," by an American writer named Robert Wright. But it might have had some roots in Oriental philosophy. The basic argument of the book, the "Non Zero" book, is that as societies grow more advanced and complex, people inevitably grow more interdependent, both within nations and across national boundaries.

And therefore, notwithstanding the terrible things that happened in the 20th century and the World Wars and the oppression of the dictatorships, the world essentially has continued to grow more interdependent, which means that wisdom dictates that we look for more and more human interaction where everyone wins, which are not, in the parlance of game theories, zero-sum solutions, but win-win solutions, where we look for non-zero solutions.

The reason that I think it is important for Hillary to be in the Senate is that for 30 years, staring with the welfare of children and their families, with the need for people to balance work and childrearing with the understanding that the most important work of any society is raising children well, she has spent a lifetime looking for solutions in which everyone comes out better.

Now, the book is not naive, and neither am I. There is a race for President. One person will win, and one person will lose. There's a race for this Senate seat. One will win, and one will lose. But we should vote for the person who will make us all win more, who realizes that we all do better when we help each other and when everyone has a chance. And for all the advances in this country, we can't yet say that is the truth.

One of the things that upsets me from time to time is when some of our critics—and I say it because, regrettably, she's inherited most of my enemies—[*laughter*]—and probably, maybe she's made one or two on her own, but not many—[*laughter*]—they'll say, "Well, she wouldn't be up here running for the Senate if she weren't the First Lady." The truth is that if she hadn't been married to me and spent 30 years trying to help other people and do things for other people, she might have been doing this 20 years ago.

So I want you to understand that, yes, I'm biased, but New York could not pick a person who is better suited for the genuine challenges that our State, our Nation, and our world face in the new millennium than Hillary. And I thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:43 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to reception hosts Sant and Daman Chatwal; and John A. Catsimatidis, former president, U.S. Greek Orthodox Archdiocesan Council, and his wife, Margo.

Remarks at the Partners in History Dinner in New York City

September 11, 2000

Thank you very much. Let me say, first of all, Hillary and I are delighted to be here with all of you, and especially you, Edgar, with all of your family, including Edgar, Clarissa, and the about-to-be 22d grandchild here. They are probably an even more important testament to your life than this important work we celebrate tonight.

I thank Israel Singer and the World Jewish Council leadership, Elie Wiesel, my fellow award recipients, especially Senator D'Amato and Congressman Leach, without which we could not have done our part, and Stuart Eizenstat, without which I could have done nothing. And I thank you all.

I thank the members of the Israeli Government and Cabinet who are here and those of you who have come from around the world. But I would like to say, not only as President but as an American, a man who studied German as a child and went to Germany as a young man in the hopes of reconciling my enormously conflicted feelings about a country that I loved which had done something I hated.

Foreign Minister Fischer, I have rarely in my life been as moved as I was by your comments tonight. And I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Edgar once said that, "In forcing the world to face up to an ugly past, we help shape a more honorable future." I am honored to have been part of this endeavor, and I have tried to learn its lesson. Within our country, I have been to Native American reservations and acknowledged that the treaties we signed were neither fair nor honorably kept in many cases. I went to Africa, to Goree Island, the Door of No Return, and acknowledged the responsibility of the United States in buying people into slavery. This is a hard business, struggling to find our core of humanity.

As Edgar said, we are here in an immediate sense in part because Edgar buttonholed Hillary back in 1996 and said I had to see him the next day. And that night, she told me I had to see him the next day, because the time for redress was running out. And I did, as he said.

I do want to thank Hillary for more than has been accounted, because I can't tell you how many times she reminded me of her meetings with elderly survivors all around the world, and how many times she tried to shine a light on the quest for material and moral justice. So thank you for helping me be here tonight.

I would like to say again what I said before, Senator D'Amato and Representative Leach made it possible for us to do what we did together as Americans, not as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans. Governor Pataki and Alan Hevesi marshal city and State governments all across America, not as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans. People like Paul Volcker, Larry Eagleburger,

and Stan Chesley, all of whom could choose to do pretty much whatever they like, chose instead to spend their time and their talents generously on this cause.

And I would like to thank Avraham Burg, former Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, and the current Prime Minister, Ehud Barak, and the members of his government who have supported this cause after it had begun earlier under a different administration of a different party, not out of party reasons but because of humanity. And again, let me say how personally grateful I am to the dedication of Stu Eizenstat, who is literally unmatched in his commitment to doing the right thing and his skill in actually finding a way to get it done.

I would like to echo what Foreign Minister Fischer said about the German *Bundeskanzler,* Gerhard Schroeder. He showed remarkable leadership. He showed a generosity and a courage of memory, and no little amount of political prodding could do what his country has done. And we are grateful to him, as well.

Thanks to all of you, humanity begins this new millennium standing on higher grounds. Of course, we can never compensate the victims and their families for what was lost. It is beyond our poor power to restore life or even to rewrite history. But we have made progress towards setting history straight and providing compensation for lost or stolen assets and forced or slave labor.

We have an especially sacred obligation to elderly survivors, particularly the double victims who endured first the Holocaust and then a half century of communism. For their sake, there can be no denying the past or delaying the compensation.

We must also meet our obligations to the future, to seek the truth and follow where it leads. That's why it is so terribly important that your efforts have led to commissions in the United States and a dozen other nations examining their own involvement in the handling of assets that rightfully belong to victims of the Holocaust, and why it is so important that the horror of the Holocaust never fade from our memories and that we never lose sight of its searing lessons.

We're at the beginning of this new century with all of its promise. We still are beset by humanity's oldest failing, the fear of the other, the fear that, somehow, people who are different from us in the color of their skin or the way they worship are to be distrusted, disliked, hated, dehumanized, and ultimately killed. It is a very slippery slope, indeed.

This fear makes us vulnerable in two ways. It makes societies vulnerable, as ours have been, to individual crimes of hate by people who cannot come to grips with their own sense of failure or rage or inadequacy, and so, blame someone else.

Not very long—a poor demented person blamed a Filipino postal worker and killed him dead in California shortly after he tried to blame innocent little Jewish children going to their school. A little before that, a demented person in the United States, who said he belonged to a church that did not believe in God but believed in white supremacy, killed an African-American basketball coach walking in his neighborhood in Chicago and then shot a young Korean-American Christian walking out of his church; James Byrd, dragged to death in Texas because he was black; Matthew Shepard, stretched out on the rack of a fence to die because he was gay. People still can be quickly brought into the grip of that kind of poison hatred. And even more troubling, whole societies still can be exploited in their fears by unscrupulous leaders who seek to convince them that they should blame their problems on groups within or beyond their midst.

It is unbelievable to me today when German and American and Russian and French troops serve together for peace in the Balkans, when Israeli rescue teams travel the world to help people of every faith, when Greeks and Turks help to dig out one another's dead amid the rubble of earthquakes, when the latest breakthrough in genetic science tells us that we are all genetically 99.9 percent the same, and that within any ethnic group, the genetic differences are greater than they are from group to group—still, we have not completely learned this lesson. And still, when you strip it all away, at the root of the not-quite-finished peace process in Ireland, at the root of the ethnic and tribal wars of Africa, at the root of the uprooting of almost a million people in Kosovo, and

at the root of the hard, unresolved questions in the Middle East, is the fear of the other.

Here in our country, we have tried to make great strides, but we have a lot to do. One of the reasons I have so strongly supported the hate crimes legislation that is pending in the House is that it gives us another chance to say in America we are going to let go of the fear of the other. And if anybody can't let it go, we are going to take a strong and unambiguous stand against it so it will never infect us as a people again.

I just came back from Africa where I went to Arusha, Tanzania, to the Peace Center to meet with Nelson Mandela, to meet with all the parties, some 20 of them, in the Burundian peace process where, at the beginning of the last decade, somewhere between 200,000 and 300,000 people were killed in the ongoing ethnic struggle between the Hutus and the Tutsis, which cost over 700,000 lives in neighboring Rwanda just a couple of years later.

The point I'm trying to make is, it is not enough for us to do everything we can to make whole the Holocaust victims, survivors, and their family members. What we have to do, all of us, to merit the forgiveness of the Almighty, is to root out the cancer which gave it life wherever we find it. For it is not something that was localized in Germany. How many nations can thank God that at a particularly vulnerable point in their history, they did not produce a Hitler, or God forbid, they might have done the same thing?

And so I say to you, we have to fight this everywhere. We can't give up on the Balkans and let them go back to slaughtering each other because some are Muslim and some are Orthodox Christian and some are Catholics. And we cannot give up on the Middle East until the whole thing is done.

Several of you have come up to me tonight and said, "Well, what do you think now? What's going to happen?" I say, "Well, I'm pretty optimistic." The Speaker of the Knesset said, "Ah, yes, but that's your nature. Everyone knows it." [*Laughter*] The truth is, we have come to a painful choice between continued confrontation and a chance to move beyond violence to build just and lasting peace. Like all life's chances, this one is fleeting, and the easy risks have all been taken already.

I think it important to remind ourselves that the Middle East brought forth the world's three great monotheistic religions, each telling us we must recognize our common humanity; we must love our neighbor as ourselves; if we turn aside a stranger, it is as if we turn aside the Most High God.

But when the past is piled high with hurt and hatred, that is a hard lesson to live by. We cannot undo past wrongs in the Middle East, either. But we are never without the power to right them to some extent. And the struggle you have waged and won here for restitution, the struggle we honor tonight, shows that the effort is always worth making.

I thank you for supporting that good work. I salute you for what you have accomplished. But I remind you: The demon that has driven so much darkness since the dawn of human history has not yet quite been expunged from the human soul. And so we all still have work to do.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:38 p.m. in the Grand Ballroom at the Pierre Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Edgar Bronfman, Sr., president, World Jewish Congress, his son, Edgar Bronfman, Jr., president and chief executive officer, Seagram and Sons, and his daughter-in-law, Clarissa Bronfman; Israel Singer, secretary general, World Jewish Congress; Nobel Prize winner and author Elie Wiesel; Vice Chancellor Joschka Fischer and Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder of Germany; Gov. George E. Pataki of New York; Alan G. Hevesi, New York City comptroller; Paul A. Volcker, former Chairman, Federal Reserve Board; former Secretary of State Lawrence S. Eagleburger; attorney Stanley M. Chesley; Speaker Avraham Burg, Israeli Knesset; Prime Minister Ehud Barak and former Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel; and former President Nelson Mandela of South Africa.

Remarks on Returning From New York and an Exchange With Reporters

September 12, 2000

Legislative Agenda for Education

The President. Good morning, everyone. I'm looking forward to a meeting this afternoon with congressional leadership, that will be an important part of our ongoing efforts to resolve the budget differences that we still have in these last few weeks, on the basis of good policy, not politics or partisanship.

Perhaps the most important issue is education, where politics always should stop at the schoolhouse door. We've worked very hard for 7½ years now for higher standards, more accountability, reforms that work, and greater investment. The results are coming in, and it's clear that this strategy is working, thanks to the efforts of our educators, students, and parents.

Today I'm releasing a report showing that American students in schools are making steady gains in almost every category. I urge Congress to invest more in the priorities that work well for our students, in smaller classes, good teachers, modern schools, more after-school programs and preschool programs, and accountability for results. The Vice President is also talking about this important issue today in Ohio.

In 1996 only 14 States had statewide academic standards. Today, with strong Federal incentives, 49 States have them. The results are measurable. Reading and math scores are up across the country. The number of African-American students taking advanced placement courses has nearly tripled, and for Hispanics the number has jumped 500 percent.

Over 90 percent of our schools are now hooked up to the Internet. Overall, SAT math scores are the highest since they've been since 1969, the year Neil Armstrong landed on the Moon. And thanks in part to the HOPE scholarships, bigger Pell grants, and more affordable student loans, more students are going on to college than at any time since the GI bill.

We've also been working hard to help more low-income students go to college, expanding the TRIO program, and pushing our new GEAR UP initiative. GEAR UP is a partnership with low-income kids that says if you'll aim high and aspire to college, we'll help you get there with counseling, mentoring, tutoring, and financial aid. It sends a message that with hope, hard work, and high hopes—high expectations, you can go as far as your abilities will take you.

Today I'm releasing $46 million in GEAR UP grants to create even more college opportunities. With existing funding, these grants will now enable more than 700,000 of our students to study hard, graduate, and get ahead. But we need to do more. For every student participating in GEAR UP, many more were turned away.

In fact, just a few days ago, I received a letter, signed by more than 100 college presidents, underscoring the need for more GEAR UP funding. That's why I'm asking Congress to increase next year's support to $325 million, which would give another 600,000 students the chance to succeed.

Making sure these students get the attention and instruction they need is even more vital in the early grades. That's why we're working so hard to reduce class size by putting 100,000 good, new, well-trained teachers into our classrooms. Over the past 2 years, we've helped our schools to hire nearly 30,000 of these teachers, and this year we're asking Congress for the funding to make that 46,000.

And we can't act fast enough. This fall, our schools are overflowing with a record 53 million students. Around the country, school districts are struggling hard to find good teachers. They shouldn't have to shoulder this burden alone. That's why we've requested a billion dollars for recruitment and training to help to put a qualified teacher in every classroom.

We also need to ensure that the classrooms themselves make the grade. The average American public school was built 42 years ago. Time has taken its toll. Congress should act quickly to help districts modernize old schools and build new ones. It's high time we got our children out of trailers and into 21st century classrooms. As you know, our initiative would help to build or dramatically overhaul 6,000 schools and to repair another 5,000 a year over the next 5 years.

Yesterday the Urban Institute reported that at least 4 million American children between the ages of 6 and 12 are latchkey kids, fending for themselves every day after school, until a parent gets home from work. Experts tell us this is precisely the time of day when young people without adult supervision get into the most trouble. That's why after-school programs are so important.

We had the beginnings of our after-school program with a $1 million demonstration program back in 1997. Now, it's a critical program providing a safe learning environment and extra academic support in the after after-school hours to students all across the country. Last year the 21st Century Community Learning Centers provided after-school and summer school opportunities to 850,000 of our students across the country.

This year our budget would more than double that program to a billion dollars. If we more than double the 850,000, that will make a significant dent in the number of those kids who are latchkey kids.

These are just some of the education priorities that we need to address this fall. There are a number of others included in our budget. I hope they'll be in the final agreement. But we need to do this, again I say, based on good policy. We need to do right by our children, make smart choices, and give them and our Nation a better future.

Thank you very much.

Firestone Recall

Q. Mr. President, do you think that the Government dropped the ball in detecting the Firestone tire problem and was aggressive enough in ordering a recall?

The President. Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press], I honestly don't know. I have been following the congressional hearings, and as you know, I've been otherwise occupied for the last several days. So before I can give you an informed opinion, I need to be fully briefed, and I haven't been.

United Kingdom Petroleum Protests/ OPEC Production

Q. Mr. President, do you have any reaction on the situation in Britain, where they're protesting they don't have enough oil? Even though OPEC has promised to increase output, there are still problems.

The President. Well, all I know about it is what I read this morning in the press. And I couldn't tell, frankly, whether the protest was over high prices, where 76 percent of the price is in fuel taxes—their gasoline prices, I think, are about more than 2½ times what ours are—or whether they're worried about short supplies.

But I don't think blocking the weight of the refineries is a way to deal with the short supply issue. I'm just not sure I know enough about the facts there.

I think what we need to be concerned about is what we're doing here. We're working very hard to make sure our home heating oil reserve is filled for the Northeast by the end of October. And I think we'll get there. The Secretary of Energy has let the contracts, and we're watching very closely what the market will do on prices, as a result of the recent OPEC initiative. And we're also examining what other options we might have in the event we have a tough winter.

So I think we need to look at that, and we need to make sure we do everything we can to get through this winter. The fundamental challenge here is that the economies are now strong in Europe and the United States; they're picking up in Asia. So oil price consumption is going up, and it has been above oil price production.

Oil price production can get above consumption again, and we can replace some of our depleted inventories, which are quite low in the United States, and I hope that will happen. But I also hope that the American people and the Congress will look at the long-term implications. I believe we can get through this winter, and we can get through another couple of years, by continuing to push production above consumption.

But it's clear, if you look at the United States and North America, where the population is just a little over—well, our population, combined with Canada's, is about 80 percent of Europe's, and our fuel, our oil usage is about 50 percent more than theirs. So I think that we have lots of low hanging fruit here for energy conservation that will create jobs, increase incomes, and reduce our vulnerability to the tight oil markets.

I have, for the last several years, asked the Congress to adopt some vigorous tax incentives to encourage both businesses and individuals to buy energy conservation supplies and appliances. I hope that Congress will consider them this year, favorably, and I hope that we will also increase our investments in high mileage vehicles and alternative fuels. We're on the verge of some very, very promising discoveries, and now is not the time to weaken our commitment to the partnership for the next generation vehicles that the Vice President has supported so strongly, and to developing these other alternative sources of fuels and other means of getting high mileage vehicles.

We've got to deal with the long term and the short term and recognize that, at least over the long term, we're going to have to have a combination of alternative energy sources and greater conservation. And it can be a great job boon to our country, and it can save money for ordinary Americans if we do it right. So I'm hoping we'll have a short-term and a long-term resolution.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:20 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

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

September 12, 2000

Legislative Agenda

The President. I'd like to make just a couple of brief remarks and then ask the congressional leaders to speak. Let me, first of all, thank them for coming here. I'm looking forward to our meeting and to these last few weeks of working together before they adjourn for election season.

I'm hoping that we can resolve our differences over the budget, especially in the area of education, and I made a more detailed statement about that earlier today. I'm also hoping that we can pass a Patients' Bill of Rights and hate crimes legislation and a minimum wage agreement that will have some small business tax relief in it and perhaps some other things that I think there is bipartisan support for, like the long-term-care credit.

I hope that we can reach agreement on the new markets legislation that passed the House overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion and, I think, has big bipartisan support in the Senate. And I still have some hope we can reach agreement on this Medicare drug issue, and I'll keep working.

But the main thing is that we're here meeting, and we'll see what we can do together. And I think we ought to do just as much as we possibly can, and I'm looking forward to the meeting.

Mr. Speaker.

[*At this point, Speaker of the House of Representatives J. Dennis Hastert, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, Senate Minority Leader Thomas A. Daschle, and House Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt made brief remarks.*]

Q. Mr. President, is the 90 percent of the surplus set aside, is that acceptable for you? And given the proximity of the election and the major philosophical differences over a Patients' Bill of Rights and how to do a drug benefit, any realistic chance in your view of getting that done?

The President. Well, let me answer the two substantive questions. Then I'll talk about the budget.

I think the—we have honest differences over the Medicare drug issue and how to achieve it. Whether we can bridge them or not, I don't know, but we ought to try.

Secondly, on the Patients' Bill of Rights, I think we're almost down to one issue—one or two issues—and I think we could get a majority for a good bill if we really work at it. I think the chances of that are reasonably good, still, and I'm prepared to do everything I can to keep working on it.

Now, on the budget, let me say, I presented a budget back in January which saves 90 percent of the surplus for debt reduction. And obviously, I agree with that. I think the most important thing is whether we're on a glide path to pay the debt off over the next 10 to 12 years, which is what I think we ought to do, because I think it will keep interest rates lower, and that will save people money. That amounts to a huge tax cut. If you keep

interest rates a point lower for a decade, that's $390 billion in lower mortgage payments alone. So I think that's important.

Whether we can do it this year or not depends upon what the various spending commitments are. I'd have to—I've got to add them all up. Senator Lott mentioned some. We've got a pretty large bill on wildfires in the West that we have to pay. We have to see where the farmers are with the farm prices and what we're going to have to pay. We're back on a glide path toward increasing the defense budget, and we've got to keep the pay up. The military expects to meet its recruitment bills this year and all major services for the first time in a few years, and it's in no small measure because the Congress voted to raise the pay.

So we've got to add all this up. Then we still have to decide which tax cuts we're going to be for and how much does that cost in this year. The most important thing is that over a 5-year period, over a 10-year period, are we paying down enough of the debt to get the country out of debt by at least 2012? And I think if we can get a commitment to that, then we can work out the details in this budget year in a way that everybody can go home and say, "Well, this is what we did. I like this. I didn't like that, but we're still on the right path, and we're going to get there." That's the most important thing.

Federal Death Penalty

Q. Mr. President, is it time for a moratorium on the Federal death penalty, in light of the racial disparity and the way it's administered?

The President. Well, first there was a racial disparity; then there is a rather astonishing geographic disparity, apparently, which, since we're supposed to have a uniform law of the land, raises some questions.

I think it's important, first of all, for the Attorney General to be able to comment and make some kind of report and recommendation to me before I say anything else about that. I want to wait and hear from her and consult with others.

There has been no suggestion, as far as I know, that any of the cases where the convictions occurred were wrongly decided. That is, there has been no DNA type questions or ineffective-assistance-of-counsel type questions raised. There has been a bill in the Senate that seeks to address those issues nationwide, which I think is a very good thing to do.

So I think if—anyone like me, who supports capital punishment and has actually presided over executions, I think has an extra strong responsibility to make sure that there's nothing wrong with the process. And so I want to wait and hear from the Attorney General, but I don't think I should make a judgment one way or the other today based on just what I've read in the press, and that's really all I know right now.

Vietnam Trade Legislation

Q. Mr. President, have you decided not to send the Vietnam trade agreement to the Hill? And if so, why not?

The President. I do not believe that I have made that decision. Maybe someone in the administration has, and you may know it, and I don't—[*laughter*]—because last week I was occupied, as you know, at the United Nations with a whole wide range of issues.

To the best of my knowledge—if I don't send it up there, it'll be only because I believe that the Senate and the House couldn't deal with it at this time. And I don't believe there is substantial opposition to it. It's just a question of whether we can get it up on the calendar. But to the best of my knowledge, we haven't made a final decision on that.

Legislative Agenda

Q. Mr. President, this is your final time through this. Some of these gentlemen will most likely all be here next year, although some might like to be in different seats. [*Laughter*] This is your last time through this. Any one thing that you want to come out of this budget fight with?

The President. Well, I'd like us to be faithful to the progress we've made since we really started working together. I mean, since 1996, we've had all—every year we've had a fight with—both sides have honestly said what they thought. And then at the end, we found a way to come together and pass a

budget that was good for the American people.

And my overwhelming hope is that we'll do that again. And the only way to do that is, we've got to take some of their ideas, and they've got to take some of ours, and maybe we'll come up with a third way. But what I always believe is that no matter how much progress we make, there will be enough honest differences for the people, for the voters to make a judgment at election time on whom they would choose for President, Vice President, Senate, Congress.

So what I'm just hoping is that we'll find a way to do what we've done ever since '96, and we'll find a way to do some things together that are quite important. And we have done some important things. We did welfare reform together. We did the Balanced Budget Act of '97 together. We did the child health insurance program together. We made some remarkable steps forward in education in '98 and '99. We had—4 years ago, this after-school program was a $1 million experiment. Now there are 850,000 kids in after-school programs in America.

There was a study yesterday in the paper by the Urban Institute that said, I think, 4 million more children that go home alone after school, between the age of 6 and 12. This budget would put another 850,000 to a million of those kids in after-school programs.

So every year we've been able to do some things that are—that every one of us, without regard to party, could be proud of. And we've kept this deficit coming down, and now we've got a surplus, and we're paying the debt off.

So that's my goal, that within that framework we'll just keep on trucking, and we'll do the best we can. And the American people will make their judgment in November, and the country will go on and be just fine.

Bush Campaign "Rats" Ad

Q. What do you think of the "rat" ads, sir?

The President. I think you can deal with that one without my help. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:30 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of House Speaker Hastert, Senate Majority Leader Lott, Senate Minority Leader Daschle, and House Minority Leader Gephardt. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the Need for Congressional Action on Housing Vouchers

September 12, 2000

I am pleased that, today, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Andrew Cuomo is announcing a plan to increase payment levels for Section 8 housing choice vouchers. Raising the fair market rent level in certain difficult housing markets across the country will increase the pool of apartments affordable to low-income renters by more than 1.4 million units nationwide. This important initiative builds on the significant progress the Vice President and I have made on affordable housing—boosting homeownership to record levels, transforming public housing, stemming the losses of privately assisted housing, expanding the role of secondary markets, and enlarging the supply of housing vouchers for hard-pressed working families.

This decision to change rent guidelines to reflect a changing market complements the 110,000 new housing vouchers secured through the efforts of my administration working with Congress in the past 2 years. These housing vouchers subsidize the rents of low-income Americans, enabling them to move closer to job opportunities—many of which are being created far from where these families live. The new rent rule will give voucher holders more choice and mobility than they have under current regulations.

I urge Congress to again join us in making make more housing available to hard-pressed working families, including those moving from welfare to work, by funding my FY 2001 budget request for 120,000 new housing vouchers. In addition, our proposal for an innovative $50 million Housing Voucher Success Fund would enhance the effect of this fair market rent increase by helping families pay for the cost of transportation and other housing search services they need to access

a wider range of available units. These budget proposals would expand the supply of affordable housing for the 5.4 million very low income families who pay more than half their incomes for housing or live in severely inadequate units, including a growing number of families working full time.

More than 50 years ago, the Nation committed itself to the goal of a "decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." Today's action brings us a step closer toward that goal.

Memorandum on the Continuation of the Exercise of Certain Authorities Under the Trading With the Enemy Act

September 12, 2000

Presidential Determination No. 2000–29

Subject: Continuation of the Exercise of Certain Authorities Under the Trading With the Enemy Act

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury

Under section 101(b) of Public Law 95–223 (91 Stat. 1625; 50 U.S.C. App. 5(b) note), and a previous determination made by me on September 10, 1999 (64 *Fed. Reg.* 51885), the exercise of certain authorities under the Trading With the Enemy Act is scheduled to terminate on September 14, 2000.

I hereby determine that the continuation for 1 year of the exercise of those authorities with respect to the applicable countries is in the national interest of the United States.

Therefore, pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 101(b) of Public Law 95–223, I continue for 1 year, until September 14, 2001, the exercise of those authorities with respect to countries affected by:

(1) the Foreign Assets Control Regulations, 31 CFR part 500;
(2) the Transaction Control Regulations, 31 CFR part 505; and
(3) the Cuban Assets Control Regulations, 31 CFR part 515.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
Washington, September 12, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., September 13, 2000]

NOTE: This memorandum was published in the *Federal Register* on September 14.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Azerbaijan-United States Investment Treaty With Documentation

September 12, 2000

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Azerbaijan Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex, signed at Washington on August 1, 1997, together with an amendment to the Treaty set forth in an exchange of diplomatic notes dated August 8, 2000, and August 25, 2000. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to this Treaty.

The Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT) with Azerbaijan is the fourth such treaty signed between the United States and a Transcaucasian or Central Asian country. The Treaty will protect U.S. investment and assist Azerbaijan in its efforts to develop its economy by creating conditions more favorable for U.S. private investment and thereby strengthening the development of its private sector.

The Treaty furthers the objectives of U.S. policy toward international and domestic investment. A specific tenet of U.S. policy, reflected in this Treaty, is that U.S. investment abroad and foreign investment in the United States should receive national treatment. Under this Treaty, the Parties also agree to

customary international law standards for expropriation. The Treaty includes detailed provisions regarding the computation and payment of prompt, adequate, and effective compensation for expropriation; free transfer of funds related to investments; freedom of investments from specified performance requirements; fair, equitable, and most-favored-nation treatment; and the investor's freedom to choose to resolve disputes with the host government through international arbitration.

I recommend that the Senate consider this Treaty as soon as possible, and give its advice and consent to ratification of the Treaty at an early date.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
September 12, 2000.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Protocol Amending the Panama-United States Investment Treaty With Documentation

September 12, 2000

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Protocol Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Panama Amending the Treaty Concerning the Treatment and Protection of Investments of October 27, 1982. This Protocol was signed at Panama City, on June 1, 2000. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State with respect to this Protocol.

The 1982 bilateral investment treaty with Panama (the "1982 Treaty") was the second treaty to be signed under the U.S. bilateral investment treaty (BIT) program. The 1982 Treaty protects U.S. investment and assists Panama in its efforts to develop its economy by creating conditions more favorable for U.S. private investment and thereby strengthening the development of its private sector.

As explained in the Department of State's report, the Protocol is needed in order to ensure that investors continue to have access to binding international arbitration following Panama's 1996 accession to the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States, done at Washington, March 18, 1965 (the "ICSID Convention"). The Protocol provides each Party's consent to international arbitration of investment disputes under the 1982 Treaty before the International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, established under the ICSID Convention. The Protocol also provides for arbitration in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. The Protocol thus facilitates the use of such procedures by investors of the Parties to resolve investment disputes under the 1982 Treaty. The Protocol also sets forth each Party's consent to ICSID Additional Facility arbitration, if Convention Arbitration is not available. Convention Arbitration would not be available, for example, if either Party subsequently ceased to be a party to the ICSID Convention.

I recommend that the Senate consider this Protocol as soon as possible, and give its advice and consent to ratification of the Protocol at an early date.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
September 12, 2000.

Remarks at a Reception for Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson

September 12, 2000

Well, that's not really why we're here. [*Laughter*] But if you want to change the Constitution in any way that's good, you're going to have to change the Congress first. [*Laughter*] And if you change the Congress and you have the right outcome in the Presidential election, you won't need to change the Constitution. [*Laughter*]

Let me say, first of all, to Bob and Sheila, how glad I am to be back in their home. They have been so phenomenally generous to so many people who have devoted their lives to public service, who, therefore, have

to have the help of people like them to continue to serve. But I'm grateful to them because a lot of people wouldn't do that, and I thank them.

I will say to you publicly what I said to them privately a few moments ago. They've enjoyed a great deal of success in life, and God's been good to them, and they've worked hard to help God along—[*laughter*]—and they've done right well. It's a long way from Mississippi. [*Laughter*]

But I think their greatest glory is in their two children. And I expect Brett, one day, to win the U.S. Open in tennis—[*laughter*]—and I think his sister will one day win the gold medal in the Olympics for her equestrian skills. Whether they do or not, they're really good people, and that's the ultimate tribute to Bob and Sheila, because they take all this good fortune they've had and instead of just thinking about themselves, they think about their children, and they think about our children, which is why they're helping Eddie Bernice and why they've helped so many other people, and I want to thank you for that.

Now, I got Eddie Bernice in a sentimental mood tonight, because we were in the living room visiting with a few people. I put my arm around her, and I said, "Let me ask you something. Do you think there is anybody here who has known you as long as I have?" [*Laughter*] She said, "You know, come to think of it, I don't believe there is."

And 28 years ago, when we were working together, it was a pretty interesting experience. Senator McGovern got 33 votes—percent of the vote in Texas. I never will forget, one day I was on a plane from Dallas to Little Rock with a young businessman from Jackson, Mississippi, and he said, "What are you doing?" And I told him what I was doing. He said, "You're doing what?" [*Laughter*] I said, "Yes, I'm working for McGovern in Texas." And he looked at me—he didn't crack a smile—and he said, "You know, you're the only white man I ever met for McGovern." [*Laughter*] It's a true story. It's a true story.

Two years later, when Sam Ervin was having his hearings, the phone rang in my house in Little Rock one day, and it was this guy on the phone. He had kept my card, and he said, "I just called to tell you, you were right, and I was wrong." [*Laughter*]

Well, Eddie Bernice was right on so many things. Look, I can be very brief. This woman has been a friend of mine for 28 years, and she still pretty much looks exactly like she did 28 years ago. And since I don't even look like what I did 8 years ago, I resent that. [*Laughter*]

But she's the sort of person that I think we need in positions of leadership in the country and in our party. She is a passionate proponent of equal rights for everybody. She cares about health care. She cares about giving everybody a chance, but she also understands how to run the store. She's fiscally responsible. She's committed to the global economy. She wants America to run toward it, not run away from it. She's taken a lot of tough votes to stick with me when I tried to modernize this economy. When even members of our own party thought I was wrong, she always stood with me—sometimes when it wasn't easy. And she understands that if you want to really help working people, you also have to help business, too. And there's a lot of you here tonight because of that.

So I think the country would work better if everybody believed that you could be pro-business and pro-labor, pro-growth and pro-environment, pro-civil rights and pro-individual opportunity. I think the country would work better.

So I would have come here regardless, because she's been my friend for 28 years, but I'm telling you, she is a great Member of Congress. And she believes the things that I think are important for Americans to believe and to live by and to work by together if we're going to make the most of the phenomenal opportunities that are before us.

You know, I just had an interview with Wired magazine. You all ever read Wired magazine? [*Laughter*] And these two young women came in and interviewed me, and they're miles ahead of me on a lot of this operational technology. But they think I've been a fairly good friend of the high-tech sector, and we were talking about it. And they said, "You know, it might even be more interesting to be President in the next 8 years than it was in the last." [*Laughter*]

And I just would say this. One of the reasons that I'm so interested in this election for—I've got a lot of personal stake in this election. As you know, I voted in New York for my wife for the first time in my life today. It was a big kick, one of the greatest thrills I ever had. I loved it. And obviously, I feel a deep personal commitment to Al Gore because he's been the best Vice President the country has ever had. And I have—Joe Lieberman and I have been friends for 30 years. I met Joe Lieberman 2 years before I met Eddie Bernice, when he was 28 years old, running for the State Senate.

So it's funny how life goes in circles, you know? None of us ever could have known that we would be where we are today doing what we're doing today. In spite of what she says, I don't believe that even my mother thought I could be President in 1973. [*Laughter*] Most people I knew just wanted me to get a haircut. [*Laughter*]

But you know, when Harry Truman went home to Independence, Missouri, he said he was reclaiming the most important title any American can have, that of citizen. And I believe that. I've worked as hard as I could to try to turn this country around, and we're in better shape than we were 8 years ago.

I think if you listen to the political rhetoric today and compare it to the rhetoric of 8 years ago, or even 2 years ago, the people have sent the politicians a clear message: They're tired of hate-mongering and division; they want to hear people talk about the issues. And they have figured out again that elections are job interviews. All these things are jobs. It really matters if you get up and go to work every day. It matters if you're doing the right things. It matters if you've got good people around you. It matters if you're not embarrassed to say, "I don't know, but I'd sure like to learn."

And I take a lot of pride in that. But what I want you to understand is that as a citizen, just like I said when I spoke in Los Angeles, I've waited for 35 years for my country to have the chance again to build the future of its dreams for our children. All of the best things are still out there. In spite of every good thing that's happened to us in the last 8 years, the best is still out there. But we have to make good decisions, and we have to hire good people for President and Vice President, for Senator and Representative. And then we've got to make up our mind we're going to go forward together.

The basic reason I'm a Democrat is because when I was a little boy, my grandfather told me a story about how he cried one Easter in the Depression because he couldn't afford $2 to buy my mother an Easter dress. And when I was a kid, everybody had to have a new outfit at Easter. And my mother made me get one whether I wanted one or not. And if you remember the fashions of the fifties, it was fairly painful for me sometimes to wear some of the things that were mandated just because my granddaddy had a tough time in the Depression. [*Laughter*]

But anyway, my grandfather believed everybody deserved a chance without regard to their race. And he believed that we all do better when we help each other. I still believe that. And I'm proud to be a member of the oldest political party of any democracy in the world, and I'm proud for whatever contribution I was able to make to those two goals. But the best is still out there.

And so I'm crazy about our candidates for President and for Vice President. I love my wife more than life, and I've been nuts about Eddie Bernice Johnson for 28 years. But the real reason we ought to be helping them is, it's the right thing for America.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:35 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Robert L. and Sheila Johnson, their son, Brett, and their daughter, Paige. Representative Johnson is a candidate for reelection in Texas' 30th Congressional District.

Remarks at a Reception for Congressional Candidate Mike Ross

September 12, 2000

The President. Thank you very much. Well, this is a special way for me to end what has been a special day, here in the home of my oldest friend in the world. The older we get, the more we want to say, longest standing—[*laughter*]—or some phony substitute. Mack and Donna Kay have been so wonderful to me, and I'm very grateful that they

did this for Mike, because it's particularly important, and I want to say a little more about that.

I want to thank Senator Bumpers and Senator Lincoln and all the Members of Congress who are here from Arkansas and throughout the country and former Members who are here and all the members of my administration who are here and all of you who are here without whom I would not be here myself and those of you who have worked so hard to make our last 8 years successful for America.

You know, Mack was my first Chief of Staff, and then he was my Envoy to the Americas. And I think he now feels as at home in any South American country as he does in south Arkansas—[*laughter*]—because he's done such a great job for our country, and I'm very grateful for that.

And I'm grateful for all of you who've served in this administration, one way or the other—those of you still here to the bitter end and those of you that got out when you can still make some money. [*Laughter*] Look at old Billy laughing. [*Laughter*]

Now, I want to say a few things about this race. On the way down, Mack looked at me, and he put his arm around me, and he said, "Now, you know, you can't go down there and say what you really think." [*Laughter*] "Show a little restraint." So I'll try.

I want you to know a couple of things about Mike Ross and a couple things about south Arkansas. This district runs the whole length of the southern part of our State. It includes not only Hope, the place where I was born, but Hot Springs, the place where I grew up.

It includes a big chunk of the Mississippi Delta, one of the poorest parts of America. In fact, it's the poorest part of America outside of the Native American reservations. It is an unbelievably wonderful place. I don't know that I ever had so much fun in my life as I did campaigning down there. It's a place where personal contact matters a lot, and it's a place where I got 63 percent of the vote in the 1996 Presidential election. It is, therefore, the most Democratic seat in America presently held by a Republican, a genial person and a person who, wherever two or more gathered, was always happy to go, and that's good politics in south Arkansas. I know. I've been there. I never lost since they stood with me through thick and thin.

And it's a long way from Washington to the piney woods of south Arkansas, a long way from those soybean fields. And it's sometimes hard to get the message clear over the transom that exists between here and there. But all I can tell you is, I think that part of our State and our entire State are better off because of the economics, the education, the health care policies we've pursued, and whenever the chips were down, the Representative from south Arkansas was always on the other side.

Whenever the people down there needed one thing and the party leaders up here of the Republican Party said another, another always won. Over and over and over again, for 8 long years. It was just as hard politically for Blanche Lambert to stand up there 8 years ago and vote for that economic plan, as it would have been for the Congressman from the Fourth Congressional District. She did it, and he didn't, because they told him not to.

And when they said, "Now, here's this budget with the biggest education and environmental and health care cuts in history, and, oh, by the way, we're going to abolish the Department of Education," he stood up there and said, "Yes, sir, count me in."

And I'll bet you there never was a speech given about it at any country crossroad in south Arkansas. More to the point, when they—when we finally got out of debt and started running surpluses and started paying down an accumulated national debt which had quadrupled in the 12 years before we came here, when they controlled the economic policy of the country, then they were up here voting for tax cuts, most of which would go to a lot of people in this room that don't need it as bad as they need—[*laughter*]—as bad as you need lower interest rates in a strong economy and a good stock market that will give you a better future.

[*At this point, a member of the audience collapsed.*]

The President. We've got a doctor here. It's just hot. Can we get my doctor back there? Yes, open the door. Get the air in

here. Oh, Vic's back there. Doctor Prince is there. Well, we should have opened that long ago; look how breezy it is. You can't do any good by staring, so just come back here. Let him go to work.

Now, let me tell you just two other things that are more important. All these elections are always about the future.

Can you get through? We now have three doctors. [*Laughter*] We observe the Patients' Bill of Rights in practice, even though it's not law yet. [*Laughter*]

I want to tell you just two other things. I've known Mike Ross, as he told you, since he was a teenager. And when I heard he wanted to run for Congress, I told everybody that would listen that he could win if he won the nomination. You know why? Because he'll go to every country crossroads, too. He'll be working when his opponent quits, and when he gets elected, he'll actually vote for the people that he said he was going to try to help.

This is not a complicated deal here. This is simple, straightforward, but hard. The reason he needs your money is, the people have got to understand what the consequences of their vote is, not in south Arkansas but in Washington.

I can't help just making one other point. You know, I can't believe—the other day I got questioned by a reporter from a paper that had always opposed me when I was down there, asking me if I didn't feel bad that I hadn't delivered more pork barrel to Arkansas like Lyndon Johnson did to Texas. And I thought to myself: Well, if we had a Democratic majority in Congress and all the Representatives and Senators from Arkansas were Democrats, we could have done a lot better on that one, once the economy turned around.

The last thing I want to say is, elections are always about the future. I worked really hard to turn this country around, and we're in better shape than we were 8 years ago, but I believe what I said at the convention. The best is still out there. I've waited since I was a boy for my country to be in a position to build the future of our dreams for our children. All the best is still out there.

So even though my party has a new leader, whom I believe will be the next President, and his Vice Presidential partner is a man who's been a friend of mine for 30 years, and a very, very good person; even though my family has a new candidate—and I had one of the great thrills of my life voting for her this morning for the first time—I have decided to assume the role of Cheerleader in Chief in this election. [*Laughter*]

What I want you to know is, the best is still out there, but it depends on what decisions the American people make, for President and Vice President, the Senate races and the House races. I'm just telling you, you need—those of you from Arkansas need to go home and lay the bacon down to all those people.

When I passed that economic plan by a single vote, they said it was going to wreck the economy. Like Mike said, time has not been kind to their prediction. When I signed the Brady bill, when Mike and I got that done, I thought half the hunters in Arkansas were going to write us off the list, and the Congressman from down there was telling everybody, "Oh, this is going to end hunting, and it's going to end the way of life in Arkansas." I want every hunter that missed a single day, an hour in the deer woods, to vote against Mike Ross for Congress, and every other one ought to vote for him, because the crime rate has gone down for 7 years in a row in this country, because we put 100,000 police on the streets.

If you look ahead—let me just mention two or three of the issues. If they win, they're going to give those of us who are in good income groups—and finally, maybe I'll be making at least half what Mack does next year—and we'll get some sort of short-term satisfaction, but they'll put this country back in debt.

I'm telling you, by the time you add up all the taxes they passed last year—this year, that they promise to pass again and all the ones their nominee promised to pass and the trillion dollar cost of partially privatizing Social Security—$1 trillion—and all their other spending policies, you're back in deficits again.

If you want to know—you know what it would mean—I just got an economic analysis that said that if the Vice President's economic program passes and we keep on track

to get this country out of debt in 12 years for the first time since 1835, it will keep interest rates one percent lower for a decade than it would if the other nominee's program and the program of this Congress, the congressional majority, passes.

Do you know what that's worth? Listen to this: $390 billion in 10 years in home mortgages; $30 billion in car payments; $15 billion in college loan payments. In other words, a $425 billion tax cut to ordinary working families, like the people that live in south Arkansas.

Now, that's just one example. They promised to get rid of the 100,000 police program, and the other 50,000 we're putting on, even though crime has gone down 7 years in a row because we're preventing more crime. There are consequences to this.

They're not for a Patients' Bill of Rights, because HMO's don't want it. I don't know about you, but I want more young people not only to run for Congress but to want to be physicians, want to be in general practice, and want to know if they'd make a referral to a specialist, because somebody desperately needs it, they're not going to be second-guessed.

I don't like the fact that most health care plans won't let people who aren't in so-called high risk groups get tests for colon cancer, when we know that if 100 percent of us, after we got over 50, did the test, we'd cut the death rate by 50 percent in 2 years. I don't like that. There are consequences to this.

They talk about how they're for Medicare drugs, and they want to help the poor people first because this plan might be so expensive. My Medicare drug program—and they've got that ad on, talking about how we want the Government to take over health care. We want Medicare to run a drug program. Medicare has lower administrative costs, by far, than any HMO in America.

Even the insurance companies—God bless them; I've got to give them this—even the insurance companies have tried to tell the Republicans they can't offer drug insurance at affordable rates, and nobody will buy it. And in Nevada, they tried it, and they couldn't get a single company to offer it. And the Republican majority says, "I don't care. They're going to offer it, or you can't have your drugs. But we're going to give it to the poor people."

What they don't say is, half the people in this country, half the senior citizens who need medicine and can't afford it and don't have insurance, are not covered by their program. They're above 150 or 175 percent of the poverty line. Do you know what 175 percent of the poverty line is? Fourteen thousand seven hundred dollars for a senior citizen. So if you make $14,800 and you've got a $200 drug bill a month, which is small compared to what some people in that age group have, you get nothing.

Now, there are consequences to this, and what you are doing here, if you're not from Arkansas, is giving him the money to make sure that we can run ads down there, so that people understand when he shows up at the country store, they'll get somebody who'll come home every weekend and work for them but who will go back to Washington and work for them, too.

I've talked longer than I meant to, but I think—I think that in these 8 years, I've earned the right to say what I think about the next 4 years. [*Laughter*] So I'm telling you, all of you that come from Arkansas, or any of you that have any friends down there, we needed your money, and we're glad you gave it. But it's not enough.

Clarity is our friend in this election. Why did Vice President Gore move up and stay up after his speech? Governor Bush gave a beautiful speech in Philadelphia. It was beautiful. It was very well written. It was eloquent. It was compelling in a personal way, and people liked it. But it didn't have any legs. Why? Because they couldn't afford to say, "Hey, we're not for a real Patients' Bill of Rights. We're not for real Medicare drug benefits, and we do want to have tax cuts so big that when we privatize Social Security, we'll be back in debt." They couldn't say that. [*Laughter*] So they had to sort of blur everything over. Believe me, old Mike's in there running against the guy that's a master at that blurring. This seat was held by David Pryor and Ray Thornton and Beryl Anthony. This seat should be held by Mike Ross.

I'm just pleading with you. The other side is going to pour a lot of money into it, and there's going to be a lot of good backslapping

and a lot of people remembering when I showed up at your chicken supper or this, that, or the other thing. And I care a lot about that. But I know this district. They're mostly just hard-working, small business people, factory workers, farmers, people doing their best to obey the law, keep body and soul together, and figure out how to live together.

The district is about a third African-American. It is a beautiful, wonderful place. It deserves to have a wonderful Congressman. If you can give him some more money for the election, you ought to do it. If you can't, you ought to call somebody down there or go home and work. I'm telling you, clarity is our friend. If the people know what the choice really means for them in their lives, he will win this thing in a walk. But he's not going to win it in a walk, because they've got a lot of money for—[*inaudible*]—but we've got to go down and fight for clarity for 56 more days. He's been out here for 15 months. The rest of us ought to do whatever we can for him for 56 days.

Thank you very much. God bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to reception hosts Thomas F. (Mack) and Donna Kay McLarty; former Senator Dale Bumpers; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush. Mike Ross is a candidate for Congress in Arkansas' Fourth Congressional District.

Remarks on the Legislative Agenda on Hate Crimes

September 13, 2000

Mr. Holder, thank you for your leadership. Commander O'Malley, thank you for coming back and for being the embodiment of someone who has changed his position on this and been courageous enough to say so.

And Mrs. Byrdsong, I cannot even imagine the courage it must take for you to have made this journey from your home, to stand up in front of us, to say what you have said. I thank your pastor for joining you here. And I think I speak for all of us and for all Americans: We thank you for trying to turn your pain into a positive gain for America. We thank you.

I'd like to thank Justin Dart and Mary Frances Berry and so many other advocates of human rights and civil rights for being in this room today. I would like to thank the members of the Interfaith Alliance who are here and, of course, the members of our DC city council.

Many Members of Congress wanted to be here, but they are actually voting now, and in the House they're voting on this, on amendments to this very proposal. So we're here at a very important time. The first-ever vote on comprehensive hate crimes legislation is scheduled in the House of Representatives for later today after the amendments have been dealt with. That would enable us to clear the last legislative hurdle to final passage of hate crimes.

In June, with the Vice President standing watch in case a tie had to be broken, the Senate passed a strong bipartisan hate crimes bill. I was very moved by many of the things that were said there, but I want to say a special words of thanks publicly to Senator Gordon Smith from Oregon, an evangelical Christian Republican, for the speech that he gave on that occasion, reminding us that this is not a partisan issue. I hope the House will follow suit.

As I have said many times over the last couple of years, it is for me a sad and painful irony that at the beginning of a new century I have done so much to try to fill with opportunity for the American people and to bring full of hope to the rest of the world, with all the modern gadgets we enjoy, we are still bedeviled by mankind's oldest failing, the fear of the other, which so quickly can lead to distrust, then to dehumanization, then to the kind of violence that ended the lives of Matthew Shepard and Ricky Byrdsong far, far before their time.

We may not ever fully conquer the disease that seems to afflict human hearts everywhere, the compelling need to define ourselves up by defining someone else down. But at least we can do more to make sure that no one in our country is violated simply because of who they are. That's why we're here today. I would also like to point out that there is a connection between the two ways that throughout history, and if you just look

at the last century, hate crimes have manifested themselves.

Here we talk about sad people, twisted inside, who somehow felt they could fill a hole in their own lives by taking the lives of other people away, people who had somehow been convinced that they were so superior to other people, they could shoot at them, kill them. What possessed that person in California to shoot at all those little kids walking into the Jewish community school?

I saw—one person said that when he killed a Filipino postal worker, he thought he had a double success; he'd killed an Asian and a Federal employee. What makes people think that way? There are all kinds of explanations, but we know that it's profoundly wrong to believe that you can ever lift yourself up by putting someone else down.

The point I want to make, just briefly, is that it's not very far from there to the awful examples we've seen in our time of political leaders who try to get one group of people in the majority in the country to blame all their problems on another group of people in the minority. And then you have a Holocaust, or you have a Kosovo, where a whole country is just flushed out.

So this is very important. It is just not true that hate crimes are like other crimes. It is not even true that every crime is a hate crime. And that is fundamentally at the heart of this debate.

We had the first-ever conference at the White House on this 3 years ago. Since then, we've increased the number of Federal agents working on these cases, prosecuted successfully a number of quite serious ones, formed local hate crimes groups with local U.S. attorneys' offices around the Nation, and worked with more and more police officers to identify the signs of hate crimes.

This coming year, one of the things in our budget I hope the Congress will adopt involves funds for extensive training for local law enforcement officials in this area. But we have to do more. The Deputy Attorney General told you quite eloquently, precisely, and clearly why we need a Federal hate crimes law that allows the Justice Department to do so much more than it can now. Commander O'Malley told you the devastating financial consequences that can come to local law enforcement from simply trying to do the right thing without the necessary Federal support.

But underneath it all, and far more important than everything else, are the stories: the life young Matthew Shepard had and the one he might have had; the wonderful life Ricky Byrdsong had and the one he might have had. Last year, or in 1998—that's the last year we have figures—there were—listen to this—7,755 reported hate crimes, nearly one every hour of every day.

More importantly, we know this is only the tip of the iceberg. Today we have new evidence that confirms what many have long suspected, and that is that hate crimes are under-reported. A survey conducted by Northeastern University found that as many as 6,000 law enforcement agencies may have encountered hate crimes over the past year but failed to report them to the FBI.

We also learned that 85 percent of law enforcement officers responding to the survey agree with Commander O'Malley's belief that hate crimes—hate-motivated crimes are more serious than similar crimes not motivated by bias.

That's why I'm directing the Justice Department today to work with local authorities to develop a plan within 120 days to make sure we report all hate crimes so we'll know what the scope of the challenge is. It will examine a number of strategies, from pilot programs in States suspected of under-reporting, to increasing training to help local officials identify such crimes.

This is all very important, but only Congress can do what really should be done here. That's why the House must vote yes on the hate crimes legislation offered by Congressman Conyers today, and yes on sending me the final hate crimes legislation before they adjourn for the year. Both yeses are important. [*Applause*] Thank you.

I also ask Congress to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act before it's too late, so that we can continue to build on its success.

You know, over the last several decades, over and over again, when it came down to protecting the lives of innocent Americans, Congress has been willing to take bipartisan action to do the right thing. I hope and believe it will do nothing less with hate crimes

legislation and the Violence Against Women Act.

Let me just close with this. One of the cruelest aspects of the systematic hate crimes that were perpetrated by the Nazis is their attempt to prove that somehow it was justified by science, by some sort of innate superiority. One of the happiest aspects of most recent scientific developments in biology is that we can now scientifically confirm what faiths have always taught, that the most important fact of our common existence on this Earth is our common humanity.

The human genome research project has documented that we are genetically 99.9 percent the same. Furthermore, that the differences among people within the same ethnic or racial groups are greater than the genetic differences between profiles of different racial groups.

Now, this is a stunning thing. In other words, this is not an affair of the body. It is an affair of the heart, of the spirit. It is, therefore, an even more dangerous kind of infection. I don't think any of us believe we can ever root it out just by punishing people. But the most important thing is that we do have the tools we need to take a strong stand before these things spread even wider. That's what Sherialyn said, and that's why she came.

We've got a chance here to reaffirm America at its best. And I hope we can do it, because the most important thing, if we want to make the most of all this modern, wondrous economy we have, is to get rid of our oldest demons and build one America.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:48 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Commander David O'Malley, Laramie Police Department, WY, who investigated the murder of Matthew Shepard; Sherialyn Byrdsong, widow of Ricky Byrdsong; Justin Dart, Jr., chairman and founder, Justice For All; and Rev. David S. Handley, senior pastor, First Presbyterian Church of Evanston, IL.

Statement on the Need for Congressional Action on the COPS Program

September 13, 2000

Six years ago today I signed the historic 1994 crime bill into law with a vision of bringing communities and local law enforcement together to take back our streets and win the war against crime. Since enactment of this vital law, crime has dropped every year to its lowest level in over 25 years, and America is the safest it has been in a generation. One of the most important factors in our success is the Community Oriented Policing Service (COPS) program, which has funded over 105,000 police officers for our streets. Today Attorney General Janet Reno will release a report to Congress on the positive impact the COPS program has had on communities of all sizes and regions across America. By building partnerships and trust with residents, COPS officers are not only helping reduce crime but the fear of crime, as well, restoring hope and promise for the future in neighborhoods across America.

The Attorney General will also announce over $55 million in community policing grants to more than 700 communities to hire or redeploy of over 1,600 police officers, to develop 311 non-emergency hotline programs, and to install cameras in over 2,900 law enforcement vehicles to improve officer safety and promote officer integrity. Although the COPS program continues to make progress by giving communities the tools they need to fight crime, we must do more. I urge Congress to make the 21st century the safest yet by reauthorizing the COPS program for another 5 years and fully funding my $1.3 billion budget request to help put up to an additional 50,000 officers on the street and provide law enforcement and communities with more resources than ever to keep American families safe. Together, we can make America the safest big country in the world.

Statement on Action on Japanese Whaling Practices

September 13, 2000

Following Secretary Mineta's certification that Japan is undermining international whaling protections with its expanded whaling program, I am today directing that Japan be denied future access to fishing rights in U.S. waters and directing members of my Cabinet to consider additional steps we might take, including possible trade sanctions.

Strong international cooperation has allowed the recovery of many whale species once pushed to the brink of extinction. We must work to ensure that these protections are upheld. I hope that the steps we take today will encourage Japan to reverse its actions and respect the strong international consensus that has helped bring back some of Earth's most majestic creatures.

Statement on the Northern Ireland Peace Process

September 13, 2000

I was encouraged by today's historic first visit to the White House by the leaders of Northern Ireland's new Government, established under the Good Friday accord. First Minister David Trimble and Deputy First Minister Seamus Mallon conveyed to me their absolute commitment to make the new political institutions work for the benefit of all the people of Northern Ireland. Although the institutions have only been fully operating for a matter of weeks, elected representatives from across the party spectrum are working together on issues—from economic development to the environment to health and education—that hold the key to a better life for their constituents, who now hold them accountable under devolution of power.

While difficult issues relating to implementation of the Good Friday accord remain, I am convinced following today's meeting that all the parties can work together to overcome their differences and that they fully recognize the importance of doing so to ensure that these historic achievements are not lost. The ongoing violence reminds us of the need for all parties to carry out their obligations under the accord, and for those with political aims to pursue them through exclusively peaceful means.

I am grateful for the invitation extended to me to visit Northern Ireland. I reaffirm my desire to continue to support the peace process in any way we can.

Thanks to courageous and determined leadership, the people of Northern Ireland face a brighter future now than at any time in the last three decades. As those in zones of conflict around the world search for hope, they need look no further than Northern Ireland, whose leaders have proved that risks for peace are worth taking.

Statement on the Congressional Effort to Override the Veto of the "Marriage Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000"

September 13, 2000

Through 7 years of tough choices and fiscal discipline, we have changed record deficits to surpluses, paid down the debt for 3 years in a row, and put America on course to be debt-free by 2012. As today's vote demonstrates, the majority in Congress still seems to be determined to knock America off this path of fiscal discipline with a 10 year tax plan that will drain nearly $2 trillion from the surplus and drive us back into deficits.

I urge Congress to work with me on a middle-class tax cut to help Americans send their children to college, provide long-term care for elderly or disabled relatives, make child care more affordable, and provide targeted marriage penalty tax relief. If the majority in Congress is serious about paying down the debt, they should abandon the failed tax plan they continue to advocate and work with me to pass tax cuts targeted to America's families, strengthen Social Security and Medicare, create a voluntary Medicare prescription drug benefit, invest in education, and keep America on course to be debt-free by 2012. This is the best approach for America.

NOTE: The President vetoed H.R. 4810, the "Marriage Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000", on August 5.

Memorandum on Improving Hate Crimes Reporting

September 13, 2000

Memorandum for the Attorney General

Subject: Improving Hate Crimes Reporting

Unfortunately, each year our country experiences a number of hate crimes. We have all heard about the heinous incidents such as the dragging death of James Byrd, Jr., in Jasper, Texas, in June 1998. In October of that same year, Mathew Shepard, a gay college student, died after being beaten and tied to a fence. In July 1999, Benjamin Smith went on a racially motivated shooting spree in Illinois and Indiana. At the end of this rampage fueled by hate, Ricky Byrdsong, an African American who was a former basketball coach at Northwestern University, and Won-Joon Yoon, a Korean graduate student at Indiana University, were killed, and eight others were wounded. In August 1999, Joseph Ileto, an Asian American and U.S. postal worker, died at the hands of a gunman in Los Angeles. This same gunman also injured five persons, including three children, at a Jewish community center. Finally, this year there were two rampages in Pennsylvania in which several people of various ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds were killed or injured. These crimes affect the entire Nation, the communities in which they occur, and the victims and their families in ways fundamentally different from other crimes. People are targeted simply because of who they are—whether it is because of their race, religion, color, sexual orientation, gender, or disability.

During my Administration, we have worked hard to fight hate crimes. I established the National Church Arson Task Force in June 1996 to oversee the investigation and prosecution of arson at houses of worship around the country. I held the first-ever White House Conference on Hate Crimes in November 1997. At the conference, I announced that the Department of Justice would establish Hate Crimes Working Groups in the U.S. Attorneys' districts across the country. These working groups, essentially Federal-State-local partnerships, typically include representation from the U.S. Attorney's Office, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), State and local law enforcement and prosecutors' offices, educators, and community groups. The groups work to ensure close coordination on hate crimes investigations and prosecutions among responsible law enforcement agencies; promote training of police, investigators, and prosecutors in identifying and dealing with hate crimes; encourage victims to report hate crimes; and educate the public about the harm they cause. In April of this year, I held a strategy session with some representatives of these Hate Crimes Working Groups at which law enforcement officials—at the Federal, State, and local levels—reported that they coordinate closely on hate crimes investigations and prosecutions.

In 1998, the last year for which FBI figures are available, 7,755 hate crimes were reported—nearly one hate crime every hour of every day. Of these hate crimes reported, 56 percent were motivated by race, 18 percent by religion, and 16 percent by sexual orientation. However, there was certainly an underreporting of hate crimes.

Today, I announced a new report, "Improving the Quality and Accuracy of Bias Crime Statistics Nationally: An Assessment of the First Ten Years of Bias Crime Data Collection," which was funded by the Department of Justice. This report noted that over 10,000 city, county, and State law enforcement agencies now participate in the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Hate Crime Data Collection Program. Although 83 percent of participating agencies reported that no hate crimes had occurred in their jurisdiction during the previous year, follow-up surveys with line officers showed that 31 percent of those agencies had investigated one or more incidents of hate crimes. These data indicate a disconnect between what line officers believe are hate crimes and what is reported to the FBI. Extrapolating from this data, the report estimates that between 5,000 and 6,000 additional agencies may have encountered hate crimes that were not reported to the national program. In addition, the report noted that 85 percent of law enforcement officers responding to a survey believed that hate-motivated crimes are

more serious than similar crimes that are not motivated by bias.

Based on the results of this report, I hereby direct the Department of Justice to work with State and local law enforcement agencies, as well as relevant law enforcement organizations, to come up with a plan to improve hate crimes reporting, within 120 days. I understand that the Department already plans to meet with representatives of State and local law enforcement organizations later this month. In addition to this meeting, the Department should consider in its plan whether various actions, such as the following, would improve hate crimes reporting:

- Pilot programs in jurisdictions where law enforcement agencies reported zero incidents of hate crimes;
- A study to analyze the role that juvenile offenders play in the number of hate crimes committed each year;
- Training sessions by Federal law enforcement on identifying and reporting hate crimes; and
- Activities by the U.S. Attorney Hate Crimes Working Groups to work with community groups and local law enforcement to improve hate crimes reporting in their areas, including helping to bring more victims forward to the police.

In carrying out these activities, I know that you will continue your leadership on fighting and preventing hate crimes in order to make this country a safer place for all Americans.

William J. Clinton

Interview With John Harris of the Washington Post

August 8, 2000

Perspectives on the Final Year

Mr. Harris. Have these guys told you what I'm up to? I'll give you the quick version.

The President. Yes, give me the quick version.

Mr. Harris. It's a piece about year 8 of the Presidency. It's not a legacy piece, looking back at the 8 years. It's a piece about this year and sort of what you're doing on the policy front, on the political front, on the personal front.

The historic pattern in, you know, basically since World War II has not been last years of Presidencies. Most people have sort of slunk to the finish line, if they made it at all. And it seems to me that you are defying that pattern, and the China vote showed that you have continued policy relevance. I think there's a lot of interest in what you're doing politically for Democrats, particularly for the First Lady.

And I think there's a lot of interest in how you're doing personally, after—you know, by any definition the ordeal of '98, '99, sort of how do you come back and have, by any sort of objective measure, this very energetic final year?

So those three dimensions are all things that I'm interested in.

One thing I'm curious about is to what extent—how self-conscious you were at the end of last year, at the start of this year, that, look, we've got a very limited window, and was there sort of a methodical approach to organizing the limited amount of time you had left, or was it just sort of, you know, a race to the finish line? In other words, was there an acute sense of the window closing?

The President. Well, let me back up a minute and say I have—I was aware, I suppose, at some level, from the moment I got here, although I didn't have much time to think about it, that generally, Presidencies seem to wind down. And normally, it starts sometime not just in the last year but in the year before that. And occasionally, something pops up that happens that's good, but normally there is kind of a decline.

I didn't think that that was necessary but that it was something you had to have a definite strategy to avoid, because it's just not right for the country. You know, they pay us to show up for 4 years, and there's always a lot of business to be done.

And even in the political context of an election and even, clearly, the change of administration—as I always remind all my colleagues in the Congress, on both sides—no matter how much we get done, there will still be plenty of things that won't be resolved, over which there will be genuine differences, and therefore, you can have a

meaningful election. So we all had a job to do. So if you just want to focus on the last year, let's start with that.

I essentially organized this year the way I have every year from the beginning. And that is, you begin by laying out a strategy consistent with the vision we started with, based on what has been achieved already, what hasn't been achieved, and what has come up. And you articulate that in the State of the Union Address with as much clarity as possible.

Now, this year what I did was to try both to articulate what I would try to do this year and to look—in terms of not just what had been achieved over the last 7 years but in terms of the remaining long-term challenges for the country. I laid it out with great specificity. And the good thing about that is, it serves as a real organizing principle for the White House staff and for the Cabinet, for how I spend my time, both in the office with the Congress and in the country.

And it really has worked. I think one of the things that has gotten—that has led to some Presidents and some White Houses to get less than they might have out of all their days is the tendency to become overcome with the politics of the political environment or the conventional wisdom. A lot of being President is a job, like any other job. And you have control over your attitude toward it, your priorities, and what you work on. And if everybody is working on the same page and full steam ahead, a lot of things happen.

So you start with a strategy and with as many specifics as possible in the State of the Union, and then you just try to execute it. And we've had some success, as you pointed out.

Permanent Normal Trade Relations With China

Mr. Harris. Did you ever feel that the China vote was lost? I was talking to somebody, one of your advisers, who said they had come back from a meeting with one of the organized labor leaders who told him, "Look, we've got the votes. We're jamming you on this. Sorry about it."

The President. I knew that they thought they had us beat. But I didn't think so because I thought that in the end, the vote was so clearly in the national interests, and the consequences of defeat—where somebody says, "Well, let's just put it off," or, "Maybe we'll come back to it next year," or something like that—were so clearly adverse to what was good for America's future that I thought in the end they'd come around and do the right thing.

Accomplishments in the Early Years

Mr. Harris. How much easier do you think this job is in year 8 than in year 1? I mean, is there a sense of, like, look, there's no kind of curveball that's going to get thrown at me that's going to be one I haven't seen before?

The President. Well, at one level, it's much easier because I had never worked in the Washington environment before, and as you remember, the strategy of the opposition was that I would have no honeymoon—[*laughter*]—and I didn't. And I also had a country with a lot of big problems when I started, and we had to get a lot of big things done. And I tried to—maybe even too much—I tried to put a lot of things through the system in the first 2 years.

We got three of the four big things I wanted to do done. We got the economic plan that—eventually we got welfare reform, but I could tell we were going to get it. And we got started with executive actions, and we passed the crime bill. But we couldn't do health care. And then there was all this, you know, a lot of—and we were also, at the time, putting together a team in the White House, in the Cabinet, working together, and working with all the others, which the White House and the whole administration—with whom the White House and the whole administration had to work. So to try to get stuff done and put the thing together, it was very difficult.

Since then, every year I think it has gotten a little easier from that point of view. On the other hand, there are always—it never ceases to be challenging or interesting. And if you're trying to do meaningful things, there are always going to be things that are very, very hard to do. For example, one of the toughest things we're working on now is the Middle East.

But that's another thing. I think it's a mistake, just because you're near the end, rather than the beginning of an administration, not to try to do the big things, especially if they really need doing within the time frame that you have.

1994 Election/Whitewater

Mr. Harris. One of the early themes when I showed up on this beat, which I guess was '95, '96 period, was a sense among a lot of your advisers, and I think it reflected your view, that you were not getting credit for what had been done the first couple of years, either from the press or from the public, more broadly.

Do you think you'll get credit for your Presidency, at this point? Do you feel adequately appreciated?

The President. Yes. I don't worry about it as much anymore. The only reason I worried about it in those years was that I felt that Congress ——

Mr. Harris. —— those people reported back you were feeling really angry about this.

The President. Well, you know, I don't think it's possible for me to convey how terrible I felt for other people that we lost the Congress in the '94 election. And all those people that put their necks on the line and were defeated, primarily because they voted for the economic plan, and the voters hadn't felt the positive impact of it yet, and they voted for the crime bill. And they had all these fear arguments out there on what we did on assault weapons and the Brady bill—and that was really in the election cycle, and that passed—and there was no attempt to see that the 100,000 police and the gun safety measures would work. But the fear was out there—and then, of course, when we were unsuccessful in getting even a compromise initiative on health care that deflated our side's vote a little bit. And those three things together caused a lot of very good people to lose their seats, and I felt badly about that.

I never felt that—as so many people did at the time—that it meant that the administration couldn't get reelected, because I always believed that the country had serious problems, and we had to tackle them early and brave the controversy early and that if I turned out to be right about our economic strategy and we continue to make progress and we passed our education program, the beginning of it, in '93 and '94, that it would work out fine. And it did.

But I was frustrated more by what I thought was the preoccupation with other things, which seemed to me anybody who looked at the evidence would see didn't amount to anything. And now we know, after all this time, that Whitewater thing was a total sham. It was a sham from the beginning. It was a put-up deal, and everybody knows it now. But it seemed to me everybody should have known it years before they did.

So I was frustrated by it, just because I felt that the most important thing was to keep moving the country forward. In terms of personal credit, I think that—you know, Presidencies go through several incarnations, many of which occur after they're long gone. I have had the opportunity just in my service as President to read about administrations, through a lot of American history reading, including about administrations that most Americans don't know much about. And I see all the time there is this sort of constant process of reassessment about every period in our history. So I'll have to leave that to history. People will be reassessing this period after I'm not even alive anymore.

The only thing I ever wanted enough credit to do was to keep elected, to stay in office and to keep pushing the country in the direction I thought was important, and to get enough support in the Congress to do the things we had to do.

Reforming the Republican Image/Team Flexibility

Mr. Harris. When you see Republicans borrowing at least some of the image of your political model, if not necessarily the content, do you take that as a compliment in any way?

The President. Absolutely.

Mr. Harris. Or does it tick you off, or do you feel like, "How dare they steal my play book?" What is your reaction to that?

The President. No, I'm complimented by it, because I think it shows that what we did was right, you know, to change the whole nature of our political rhetoric in the Democratic Party, and that it resonates with the American people. This country has always

worked best when there was a dynamic majority for change. And it always operates out of the center, but it's not the center, a split-the-difference center. It's a center that reflects the commonsense judgment of the American people that the time has come to change, and we ought to change in this direction. So I take that as a great compliment.

It's an important beginning for them to say, "Okay, we know we can't be and we shouldn't be mean, extremist, and sanctimonious in our political rhetoric anymore." I think that's a positive thing for them.

Now, I think there is a big difference, however, which is that when I ran in 1992, I didn't just say we're going to change our party so we can say to change the country. I said, "Here's my economic program. Here's my crime program. Here's my welfare reform program. Here's my environmental program. Here's my education program. Here's the way I'm going to do Government. Here's the way we're going to change the way Government works." And we had—you know, people used to make fun of me and Paul Tsongas, in New Hampshire, because we put out these long, detailed booklets about what we'd do, and then all of a sudden, there were more people showing up for our town meetings than anybody else.

Maybe it's because I'd been a Governor for a dozen years and because I'd been through a lot of these—the policy debates, as well as the political debates. But I think one of the most important reasons that we've had some success in our Presidency was that we actually laid out in 1992 a vision and a strategy for achieving it.

There is a lot of difference between changing the rhetoric and the political positioning of a party and changing the substance of the issues. And one of the things that I thought was interesting, just reading the aftermath of the Republican Convention and what a lot of the swing voters are saying, is that I liked what I saw. They seemed like very nice people, and I'm glad they're being more inclusive, but what are they going to do if they get the job?

And I think the reason there may have been some tactic there—they said, "Well, we're ahead. We don't have to say that"—some of it was, "We haven't really changed our policies, so we can't say what our policies are. But I think that it's really important."

One of the things I think is great about Al Gore's selection of Joe Lieberman is, it sort of ratifies this kind of New Democratic direction we've taken, where we say we'll continue to have policies that are pro-business and pro-labor, that are pro-growth and pro-environment, that are for individual responsibility and a broader, inclusive American community.

I don't want to beat this to death, but I think this is very important. There is a scholar named Thomas Patterson, who used to be at the Maxwell School at Syracuse, used to do a lot of work on the media and the Presidency, who said that in 1995 ——

Mr. Harris. He's a Ben Bradley professor at Harvard, by the way.

The President. Is he there? Well, he put out a—I had never met him at the time. I have since actually met him once or twice now, but I did not know him at the time. In 1995, when our fortunes were not exactly high, he was quoted in a newspaper article saying that my administration had already kept a higher percentage of its promises to the American people than the previous five Presidencies, even though we made more commitments, more specific commitments.

All I can say is, I think that's very important. These State of the Unions have been very important. State of the Unions for us have been the equivalent of that first booklet I put out in New Hampshire. They're a guidepost, and we do the best we can on it. But you also have to take other initiatives that come up that are consistent with it.

You know, all the things we did with Executive orders, setting aside the national monuments or including making sure seniors could be in clinical trials because Medicare would cover it, all those things that they—those are things that may come up, where we've got an idea factory here, where the staff is encouraged to come up with ideas, the Cabinet is encouraged to come up with ideas. It's all consistent with that. And even then when we're reacting—you know, sometimes things just happen, and you have to react to it. You can't be so rigid in your organization that you can't change. That's the sort of whole essence of the new economy.

Hillary Clinton's Senate Campaign

Mr. Harris. Can I ask you about the First Lady's campaign? There is this sort of universal consensus that, you know, you're aware of great details, or the ins and outs of that campaign, even though you're not running it or trying not to run it. But I'm not really sure I know what you do, do. Like, what is the sort of the nature of your involvement or at least awareness of the campaign? How often are the two of you talking? What kind of input can you give? She spent a quarter century being a, sort of, contributor to your political career. Now the shoe is on the other foot. What do you do?

The President. Well, first of all, I bend over backwards not to get too involved in it. Sometimes a week or 10 days will go by, and I won't talk to the people that are running the campaign. But obviously, I talk to her every day, usually more than once a day. And I ask her how it's going, what she did. We discuss it, talk about her day, talk about how it's unfolding. I give her my best thoughts.

And then if they ask me to come to a meeting and sit and listen, I do it. But it's no—there is no organized part to it, except that we talk every day, and we talk about it.

Mr. Harris. Were you an important voice in having her hire Mark Penn, not just as the pollster, but also helping run the media strategy? At one point there was an expectation, like, David Axelrod in Chicago was, you know, almost had that job. Then it ended up being Penn. And some people attributed that to you, saying you thought that was really important because he had sort of the right formula down for Democrats to get elected.

The President. Well, I do think that, and I have a high regard for him. But I also think Axelrod is very good. Axelrod helped me in '92 and has done things for us since then. And it seemed to me that she got the best of both worlds, because Axelrod works with the New York Democratic Party and does their party thing. So I felt that the decision she made—and it was a decision she made. She came to me and she said, "What do you think about this?" And I said, "It sounds good to me." She thought it through because she wanted to find a way to have both of them involved, and because of our relationship with Mark over the years, she felt very close to him.

I think that there are a lot of good people, pollsters and political strategists, but it's important to have someone that you feel really comfortable with. And he basically—Mark has basically been a part of our whole kind of New Democrat movement. And I think she just felt a high comfort level with him.

Mr. Harris. I am curious how you—where sort of the loyal spouse ends and where the—you know, you try to help politically begins? The call you made to the Daily News was one thing. I didn't know if that was you sort of acting sort of impulsively, as a husband who was angry about that; or whether that was you saying, "Look, this is potentially a problem. I better see if I can help blunt that as a political matter." What was that about?

The President. Well, first of all, I did it—it may not have even been the right thing to do, because all it did was sort of give more visibility to a charge that was hokum, but I think hurt her for ——

Mr. Harris. Most people knew ——

The President. Most people knew it was hokum. But I think it hurt her for a few days only because it happened fortuitously—fortuitously for her adversaries—right at the opening of the Middle East peace talks, when anxiety was very high in the Jewish community. So I think that I may have been in error.

But what actually—I just wanted to make sure that since they were working the story, and I knew Mort Zuckerman and Michael Kramer quite well, and that since I had been injected into the story, that I had a very clear memory of it, and I wanted to know what did and didn't happen and what the whole background was. And so I told him.

But you know, by and large, I try to stay out of it. Congressman Lazio actually featured me in an ad or two, which I thought was——

Mr. Harris. He's got moxie.

The President. Yes, well, at least that. Senator Moynihan was really angry when he was used and said what he thought about it. But I figure the voters of New York are smart enough to figure out that I'm for her and not him. [*Laughter*] But I haven't been harshly partisan—so, you know, Tom DeLay could do the same thing because there is one

issue that Tom DeLay and I really agree on, and I bragged on him. He came to the White House, and I bragged on him. I think that's what we ought to do.

I think we can argue with each other in elections without demonizing each other, and I think when they do that, they're wrong. But I think the voters are smart enough to figure that out without my help.

Whitewater

Mr. Harris. You mentioned the Whitewater thing a little earlier, which leads to a question I wanted to ask about. Remember in September '98, when you spoke to your Cabinet, and many of them afterwards spoke to us? They said that you had said you had been—you realized, had been angry for many days of your Presidency. And I remember that struck me quite a lot, because, you know, to cover you, you do not seem most of the time like an angry person or somebody filled with——

The President. I'm not by nature an angry person.

Mr. Harris. So I was sort of astonished to learn that description. And I'm wondering to what extent do you still feel that way? Or do you think that's changed?

The President. I work on it all the time. But I think that this whole Whitewater business will be looked upon by any rational observer in history as an absurd episode in American history which didn't amount to a hill of beans—if there had been any special council law on the books at the time it came up, it wouldn't have triggered a special council—and that the coverage of it as if it were serious required people essentially to suspend all ordinary notions of proof and common sense. That's what I really believe.

And as a consequence, scores of innocent people got hurt. A lot of people got charged with criminal offenses, simply because they refused to lie, and it did a lot of damage to our political system for no good end. And I think it will be viewed as an absurd aberration in American history. I felt very badly about it. I felt very badly about the way everybody involved was treated about it. I still do. I think it was—the whole way it was done was just wrong.

Mr. Harris. Terry McAuliffe and other people who are friends of yours—I was out in Arkansas last week and saw David Leopoulous and Jim Blair, everybody——

The President. Did you see Jim?

Mr. Harris. I did, yes.

The President. How do you think he's doing?

Mr. Harris. He seemed great. I don't know him well.

The President. Did he tell you how he did in his tennis tournament?

Mr. Harris. He told me he was playing that weekend.

The President. Oh, so you saw him right before? Yes, because I haven't talked to him since then.

Mr. Harris. And I was reluctant to see him. But I said, "Look, you know, it never hurts to call," and I said, "If you don't want to, it's fine." He goes, "No, come on." I went out to dinner with him and his daughter.

The President. Which daughter?

Mr. Harris. The one that lives here, in Maryland.

The President. That's Susie.

Mr. Harris. Yes, up in Columbia, Maryland.

The President. A computer genius. She made millions of dollars and now spends all her time—she spends all her time tutoring inner-city kids in math. It's unbelievable.

Mr. Harris. She's only a year or two older than me and she's ——

The President. All of his kids are wizards. They're all in computers somewhere or another. One of them has a Ph.D. in philosophy, but she does all the data processing for a big hospital network in Chicago. And the other one works in Texas, his son.

Mr. Harris. He showed me his art, Peruvian art collection.

The President. Great stuff.

President's Current Perspective

Mr. Harris. It's amazing. Anyway, everybody is sort of the mind that you seem more relaxed, sort of more at peace than you have previously. I'm just wondering what—you know, to what extent that's the result of you seeing the pastoral counsel once a week; to what extent it's just—in some ways, it seems to me——

The President. In a funny way, I think I am. And I think part of it is, when you go through any difficult period, it either breaks you or makes you better. I just wake up every day with this enormous feeling of gratitude. I'm grateful. I'm grateful to my wife and to my daughter. I've got my family back. I'm grateful to the people who work with me, who stuck with me. And I'm enormously grateful to the American people for continuing to support what I was trying to do for them. To me, every day is a gift now.

I still get mad and frustrated and angry. And one of the things that I am doing, that I have to work on, frankly—I'll make a little confession. The only thing that I'm feeling about this last year is that I just want to keep working. I never want to sleep. My mind is working more than ever before. And when Hillary is gone, particularly, in New York, you know, I go to bed with a pile of stuff that I want to do, and I just read and read and read and read. I just want to keep going.

Mr. Harris. It does seem like you're in a sprint, you know, traveling here, fundraiser tonight, fly to Japan and then back, land here today, down to Charlottesville. Is that a conscious strategy? "Look, I've got 6 months to go or whatever. I'm just going to race to the finish line." Is that what it's about?

The President. Yes. And also, I think of it in a different way. I think, you know, I don't have a campaign to do. I don't have to live with those pressures. And if there is something out there to be done that's good for my country or that I think is the right thing to do, even if it puts a big strain on me physically, I know that I won't be under the kind of stress that I would be in if I were trying to manage a campaign and manage the Presidency; and I ought to resolve down in favor of making the effort. Because I ought to do everything I can for America as President that I can do and still function at a high level, and I can rest starting at noon on January 20th. And that's what I intend to do.

Chief of Staff John D. Podesta. Me, too. [*Laughter*]

The President. We're all going to a rest home together. [*Laughter*] You know how the President gets to take one last ride on Air Force One, and you wave to everybody, on the helicopter, and then you get on Air Force One, and you wave to everybody? I'm thinking of loading the whole White House staff and the whole Cabinet on and going to Bermuda. [*Laughter*]

The President and the Republicans

Mr. Harris. How much progress have you made in figuring out—to me, one of the big mysteries of the Clinton year, which is, you're a centrist President, not a leftwing President—I think your basic instinct is to try to get along with people—and yet, you have this intense antagonism that you excite on the right? And I've never seen that it could be entirely ideological, because you haven't fundamentally been an ideological President. Do you have a theory on it?

The President. I think I have not been conventionally ideological. That is, I haven't been—but I think there are two or three reasons for it. And I guess I should start with a little humility. You can't be liked by everybody. You know, my favorite story that I tell at least 10 times a year is about the guy that's walking along the edge of the Grand Canyon, and he slips. He says, "God, why me?" And He says, "Son, there's just something about you I don't like." [*Laughter*] So you've got to allow for that.

But I think, first of all, I have some insight into this because I was a Governor for a dozen years, so I knew all these guys. I knew the people that were engineering the campaign in '91 on. And periodically there have been stunning flashes of candor coming out of various actors on the other side.

I think, first and overwhelmingly, you have to understand that basically the Republicans believed that they had made a marriage between the establishment Republicans and the far right, the religious right, and other ultraconservative elements like the NRA and all those folks. And they thought that that coalition, particularly when it came back and gave President Bush a resounding victory over Governor Dukakis, they basically believed that they would always beat Democrats, that they would never lose the White House until a third party came along. That's what they believed. They thought they had found a formula and that they would put us in a certain box, and we would be there, and they would make us, in the inimitable words of Newt

Gingrich, the enemy of normal Americans, and it would always work.

And it didn't work. I think one of the problems that their party had was they developed a sense of entitlement to the White House. They railed against entitlements, but they thought they had an entitlement to govern, and I think it caused them a lot of trouble. You've got to give Gingrich some credit. They don't want to anymore, but the truth is that he figured out that if they came back in '94, before people felt better about what we did with the economy or what we did with crime or whether they saw any progress on welfare, with a specific plan that could both mobilize their right and hold their establishment, Republicans, they could make some gains. And they did.

And what we did in '96 and '98 is, we came back with better plans and better ideas. But a great debate was joined in America about the future of the country, and we were winning it. So I think that—but they got back in the game, and they stayed in the game, even though what we did in '98 was truly historic, what the Democrats did—and I give Gephardt and Daschle a lot of credit for it—and what our people do, because we had a program, and we ran on it. And we said, "We're interested in what we can do for you, not what we can do for ourselves."

So I think part of it was they—secondly, what were their options? If they knew the American people agreed with my political philosophy more than theirs, if they knew the American people agreed with the specifics I was advocating more than theirs, then what was left? Personal attack, discredit, delegitimize. And they never stopped, not from '91 through the '92 campaign. Then they just started the day after I took my hand off the Bible taking the oath of office; they kept on going. And it was not totally unsuccessful. That is, they succeeded in hurting me but not helping themselves.

So now they're in a different place now. They're trying to change their image and their rhetoric. But to be fair, too, I think that there are—a lot of the whole movement of the Republican Party, even beginning with President Nixon and the Silent Majority campaign, to what President Reagan said, right up to the present day, was based on a certain critique of the sixties, and what the Democrats were. You know, our notion of inclusiveness was, to them, accepting things that—even now, the leadership, we can't get them to embrace the hate crimes bill because it includes gays—and the whole idea of opposing the Vietnam war and all that.

And I think they thought—I think a lot of them genuinely felt that I represented a lot of things in the culture that they didn't like. I don't think it was all politics. I think a lot of them didn't like that.

President's Perspective on the Press and Politics

Mr. Harris. A different question, but maybe a little bit related one. Have you figured out—I mean, I think it's fair to say you had a certain amount of scratchiness in your press relations over the 8 years. Is that your view of it?

The President. Yes.

Deputy Press Secretary Jake Siewert. Last question. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Harris. And I've got a theory about why that is, but ——

The President. What is your theory?

Mr. Harris. I think—if you leave Whitewater aside, because I know you have very specific grievances about that, we've talked about—that modern political journalism makes its business sort of first and foremost to go to what are motives behind what somebody says. What's the real agenda? If this is, sort of, their reality, what's the, maybe not the contradictory reality but at least, sort of, the alternate reality? And I think that kind of reporting felt like whenever your motives are questioned or not taken at face value bugs you a lot. That is my theory.

The President. It used to bug me a lot. It doesn't bug me so much anymore. One reason is that I found that that's different from who I am. That is, I don't make a big habit of questioning the motives of people who are on the other side of arguments from me. And I have learned enough from my own mistakes in life and also from misjudging other people to know that an analysis based solely on what other people's motives are—you need to try to understand them.

But in the end, what matters in public life is what is done and does it advance the American people's—does it advance the ideals of our country, the values of our country, the interest of our people? And so, I think it's a rather hazardous thing to do.

Also, I did feel that, in a certain way, I got a little more of that than most, maybe because I was the first person of my generation to win the Presidency, and maybe because I was, in the stirring phrase of my predecessor, just the Governor of a small southern State, not really known to a lot of people, and also the fact that I had basically carried this New Democrat DLC banner. And there was, I think, a lot of suspicion to that, because there was a certain paradigm, I think, for reporters about, "Here's what the Republicans are. Here's what the Democrats are. Here's what the Republican issues are. Here's what the Democrat issues are."

And I think when you challenge that paradigm, it was easy to say, "Well, that's just a political stratagem. It's a motive for getting elected. It's not serious." But out there in the country, I don't think those paradigms ever worked very well.

I was talking to Dirk Kempthorne today, who's a Republican I admire a lot and like very much and a man I worked with on a couple of fairly important pieces of legislation when he was a Senator. And he said he really liked being Governor, and I told him he would. He asked me one time if I thought he should run for Governor. I told him I thought he would like it very well because he is a guy who thinks, and you know, we're really different on a lot of issues. If I were running against him, it would be an honor. I admire him. I like him. We could have an honest difference. And then we could make a lot of agreements and do a lot of things. That's the politics that I grew up with.

And to be fair, I also grew up with a lot of the other, of the race issue in the South; there was always a lot of politics and personal destruction around that. So I wasn't unfamiliar with the kind of things I had been exposed to.

But I think, to me, motive analysis at least has to be undertaken with a certain amount of humility.

Arkansas

Mr. Harris. That reminds me of a question I've got. What is your view of Arkansas? Are you going to go home there, at least part of the time? Skip Rutherford showed me the site where the library is going to be. I hadn't been there in a while, that whole new shopping center there.

The President. It's great. That's an important part of my life, that whole area, because it's very close to the old State House, where I declared for President and had my two election nights, a building that I basically restored to its historic—that was one of my projects as Governor, to take it back to the way it was between right when it was opened in 1836, the year of our statehood.

Mr. Harris. When you look at Arkansas, it's a place with all this sort of sentimental attractions for you. And a lot of your friends are still there. I would think, on the one hand, it's a very positive association. And it's also the place where it seems like somebody is always crawling out from under some rock. You've got this disbarment thing. Jim said, "If I were him, if they do that, I'd pull the damn library out of there and put it in Georgetown."

The President. A lot of my friends in Arkansas think that. But see, I don't have a—look, I always had adversaries in Arkansas. And when Dale Bumpers and David Pryor and I retire, they got the upper hand, because a lot of the people that we thought were coming along behind us, like David Matthews, whom you know, decided for personal reasons not to run for Governor, not to run for Senator. If David Matthews had run when Senator Hutchinson did, he'd be Senator today.

And Arkansas, I believe, was hurt by the fact that the Arkansas Gazette couldn't go on. It was one of the great progressive newspapers in America for decades. And it got in this newspaper war, and the man that won is a hardcore conservative Republican with a longstanding opposition to me. They basically intimidated all the good people off that committee. Blair probably told you what happened.

But you know, that's all true. But I think it's a great mistake to analyze a situation only in terms of the adverse factors. I mean, look

at this—this State, they elected me Governor five times; they stuck with me through thick and thin; they voted for me twice, even after the Democratic Party had lost a lot of its leverage there, and the main newspaper was in a tirade daily against us. They hung in there.

And if it weren't for them, I wouldn't be sitting here talking to you today. You know, our crowd will come back because—and we have come back. We've got this very progressive—my Congressman, Vic Snyder, is a great, progressive Congressman. He's one of the few people in Congress—he's a lawyer and a doctor, a very interesting fellow. Marion Berry, who worked in the White House for me, is our other Democratic Congressman from there. I think we've got an excellent chance to win a third seat down there. You know, you can't let the politics get—but all these rocks that turn out, you've got to understand the kind of people that they've turned up. I made enemies in my years in politics, and there are people who are disappointed. What they learned was, they got a certain set of signals here. People will assume it's true, unless you can disprove it. And you'll be rewarded for that sort of stuff.

So I think that, with all of that, the great majority of the people there just hung in there.

2000 Election

Mr. Harris. One last question. I often get the sense at these fundraisers that you are—you hear it when you're talking at these fundraisers. It's almost like, well, you wish you could make the argument or grab the Vice President or other Democrats by the lapels. "No, say it this way. This is the way to frame the argument. This is the way to frame the question." How often are you sort of befuddled by the inability of other Democrats to articulate the case the way you feel it should be articulated?

The President. Well, first of all, I think that in '96 and '98 we pretty well sang out of the same hymnal, and we did a very good job. As I said, I think you have to give Gephardt and Daschle enormous credit, and their colleagues, for what happened in '98. Only a few people understand the truly historic significance of that election. I mean, we could have lost six Senate seats and didn't lose any. And it was the first time since 1822 that a President's party had won seats in the sixth year of a Presidency, in the House.

And what I think has happened this year is, you know, we had a primary, a Presidential primary; then other things happened. And I think that one of the reasons I'm really excited about the Lieberman selection is, I think what you'll see now is a clear commitment to build on the future. We'll be able to distill it in the congressional races around three or four issues. And then I think the Vice President and Lieberman will do a great job at the convention.

I don't think that's quite fair that I'm frustrated there. I think my job is to try, in these fundraisers—the reason I talk the way I do at these fundraisers is that all these people who come to our fundraisers know a lot of other people who don't come to them and who aren't as political or maybe even moderate Republicans or whatever. And what I try to do, that I think I'm in a unique position to do because I'm not running, is to analyze the choice before the American people today in terms of what's happened and what's going to happen.

The frustration you pick up in my voice is not what the others are not doing, it's what I think is the only risk for us in this election—which I, by the way, if you've been talking to our people, you know I've always believed that Al Gore will be elected. I still do. I have always believed it. I never stopped believing it when he was 18 or 20 points behind a year ago. I always believe it. I think he's easy to underestimate because he's a very serious man who doesn't think only about politics all the time.

But if you look at that sort of bouncy, bouncy Gallup poll that's in the USA Today, today—you know, 19 down, 2 down—it shows you that the people are looking for a little meat here. They want to know what the real deal is. That's the most encouraging thing I've seen, because the thing that I've been frustrated about is when times are really good and people feel good—and nobody wants to bring them down, least of all me—everybody has got other things going on in their lives. So the temptation, first of all, is

to think, well, things are rocking along here, and this is not the biggest election I've ever had to face here, because things are going so well; and then to feel, well, because of the strategy adopted by Governor Bush and by the whole group, well, there's maybe not that much difference anyway, which reinforces that it may not be important, and it clouds everything up.

What I want to do is to have people stay up but understand that what you do with all this prosperity is as big a decision as what we had to in '92 and maybe more difficult because you have to create something. You have to imagine: What is it you want America to look like in 10 years? You actually have the ability to do it now. It's not like you've just got to turn the ship of state around. What do you want to do? And then, what are the choices?

So I think that I'm in a unique position to sort of talk to the American people about it like that, and that's what I do at these fundraisers. I try to say, this is what I honestly believe the choices are. I don't want the Democrats to be in a position of personally attacking the Republicans. I don't want us to get in the position that the other guys have been in for so much the last 8 years. I don't think we should say bad things about them. I think we should posit that they're patriots, that they love their country; they love their families, and they can do what they think is right.

But we shouldn't be fuzzyheaded here that there aren't profound differences that won't have profound consequences for how we live and how we go into the future. And I believe that, after we have our chance at the convention and then we'll have the debates unfold, I think that we'll have some clarity of choice, and then we'll see what happens.

When young people come to me and say they want to run for office, what should they do, I always give them two pieces of advice. Number one, you've got to have a reason that's bigger than yourself for wanting this job, and you've got to be able to tell people what it is in fairly short order. And number two, you have to adopt a strategy in the campaign with the following goal: On election day, everybody who votes against you will know exactly what they're doing. Because if everybody who votes against you knows what they're doing, then you don't have any gripe if you lose. Now, if everybody that votes against us this time, votes against the Vice President and Joe Lieberman, knows what they're doing, we'll have a majority of the vote.

Atonement

Mr. Harris. Can I ask a one-sentence answer, or will I be in the doghouse? One sentence?

The President. What?

Mr. Harris. Do you think a strong year, finishing up 2000 in a sprint, can that cleanse the mistakes of 1998 to some degree?

The President. No.

Mr. Harris. No? And you don't view it that way?

The President. No. For one thing, I think that the only thing that can cleanse a mistake, ever, is an apology and an atonement. And I think that my—to the extent that the promise I made to the American people to work like crazy for them every day I was President is a part of that, I think that the answer to your question may be yes.

But the reason I said no is, I think the American people accept that—you know, they know what happened. Well, they think they know what happened. They know that I did something I shouldn't have done, and I apologized for it. But I have tried to atone for it both in a deeply personal way with my family and my coworkers and friends but also in a larger sense by serving the American people. And I think they have long since been a framework of putting it behind and of looking to the future and seeing whether what I'm doing makes sense for them and their families and their future. That's why I said no.

But it is, for me—I have felt a renewed sense of rededication to the business that I have been elected to perform because they stuck with me, and it's something I'll never forget and always be grateful for.

NOTE: The interview was taped at 7:30 p.m. on August 8 aboard Air Force One and was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 14. In his remarks, the President referred to political pollster Mark Penn; media consultant David

Axelrod; Mort Zuckerman, publisher and chairman, and Michael Kramer, reporter, New York Daily News; Terance McAuliffe, chair, Democratic National Convention Committee 2000; David Leopoulous, longtime friend of the President; Gov. Dirk Kempthorne of Idaho; J.L. (Skip) Rutherford, member of the board of trustees of the Clinton Presidential Library; former Senators Dale Bumpers and David Pryor; former Gov. Michael Dukakis of Massachusetts; former Speaker of the House of Representatives Newt Gingrich; former Arkansas State Representative David Matthews; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush. The President also referred to DLC, the Democratic Leadership Council. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Memorandum on Japanese Research Whaling

September 13, 2000

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the United States Trade Representative

Subject: Japanese Research Whaling

On September 13, 2000, I received Secretary Mineta's certification of Japan under the Pelly Amendment, 22 U.S.C. 1978, for having authorized its nationals to engage in whaling operations that diminish the effectiveness of the International Whaling Commission. The Secretary has also certified Japan under the Packwood-Magnuson Amendment, 16 U.S.C. 1821(e)(2).

I direct the Secretary of State to inform Japan that the United States will not, under present circumstances, negotiate a new Governing International Fisheries Agreement (GIFA) with Japan, which has been certified under the Packwood-Magnuson Amendment. A GIFA is a prerequisite to foreign fishing inside the U.S. exclusive economic zone (EEZ) (16 U.S.C. 1821(c)). Without a GIFA, Japan will not be eligible for the allocation of any amounts of Atlantic herring, Atlantic mackerel, or any other species that may become available for harvest by foreign vessels in the U.S. EEZ, during the period in which the certification is in effect.

I also direct the Secretaries of State, the Treasury, Commerce, and the Interior, and the United States Trade Representative, (1) to identify options for ensuring that existing prohibitions against the importation of whale products under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, 16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.,* and the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.,* are fully enforced; (2) to investigate the disposition of products from the Japanese research program, to ensure that no whale derivatives enter into international commerce in contravention on obligations under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora; (3) to summarize the size and nature of economic activity in Japan related to whaling; and, (4) to continue to consider additional options, including trade measures, as warranted by developments in Japan.

I further direct the Secretary of Commerce, in coordination with all relevant agencies, to keep me apprised of developments as needed, and to report back to me on these issues prior to the end of the 60-day period triggered by his certification.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 14.

Remarks at a Breakfast With Religious Leaders

September 14, 2000

Good morning, everyone. I'm delighted to welcome you to the White House. This is the eighth, and final—[*laughter*]—for me, White House Prayer Breakfast that we have at this time every year.

I want to thank Secretary Glickman for joining us. He's sort of a symbol of our broad-based and ecumenical approach in this administration. He's the first Jewish Secretary of Agriculture. [*Laughter*] And he's helping people to understand that Jewish farmer is not an oxymoron, so that's good. [*Laughter*]

I want to say I bring you greetings on behalf of Hillary, who called me early this morning to ask what I was going to say—[*laughter*]—and the Vice President and Mrs. Gore. As you know, the three of them are otherwise occupied, but they need your prayers, maybe even more than I do. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank you, particularly those of you who have been here in past years. Each one of these breakfasts has been quite meaningful to me, often for different reasons. We've talked about personal journeys and the journey of our Nation and often talked about particular challenges within our borders, very often due to problems of the spirit in our efforts to create one America. We've talked about that a lot.

Today, because of the enormous good fortune that we as Americans have enjoyed, I would like to talk just for a few moments about what our responsibilities are to the rest of the world. There is a huge debate going on today all over the world about whether the two central revolutions of our time, the globalization of human societies and the explosion of information technology, which are quite related—whether these things are, on balance, positive or, on balance, negative.

When we had the World Trade Organization meeting in Seattle, the streets were full of thousands of people who were saying in a very loud voice, this whole deal is, on balance, negative. Interestingly enough, they were marching in solidarity, although often they had positions that directly contradicted one another. There were those who said this is, on balance, negative because it will make the rich countries richer and the poor countries poorer. And then there were those who said that this is, on balance, negative because it will weaken the middle class in the developed countries, because we don't require poor countries to lift their labor and environmental standards. And there were other various conflicts among them.

But the point is, there's a lot of ferment here and a lot of people who are, at the very least, highly ambivalent about whether the coming together of the world in the new century is going to be a good or a bad thing.

Then there's the whole question of how the coming together of the world and the way we make a living and, particularly, the way we produce energy to make a living, is contributing to changing the climate, which it is. There's more and more evidence that the world is warming at an unsustainable rate, and the polar ice cap—if you've seen the latest stories there about how much it's melting, it's incontestable that sometime in the next 50 years, we're going to begin to sustain severe, adverse common consequences to the warming of the climate if we don't do something to turn that around.

And some people believe that there's no way to fix this, if we keep trying to get richer and more global with our economy. I don't happen to agree with that, and I'm not going to talk about it today. But there's a big issue. And very few people are in denial on climate change any more. Virtually all the major oil companies now concede, for example, that it is a serious problem and that they have a responsibility to deal with it, and if they don't, it could shape the way we are all—or our grandchildren are living, in ways that are quite different and, on balance, negative.

Then there is the whole question of whether technology will offer more benefits to the organized forces of destruction than it does to the forces of good over the next 30 years.

I just came back from a remarkable trip to Colombia. I went to Cartagena with the Speaker of the House. We only get publicity around here for the partisan fights we have, but in an astonishing display of bipartisanship, we passed something called Plan Colombia, which is designed to help primarily the Colombians but also all the nations on the borders, reduce drug—narcotics production, coca production primarily, steer farmers into alternative ways of making a living, and develop an increase in the capacity of the Colombian Government to fight the narcotraffickers, and to keep drugs from coming into this country, which are directly responsible for the deaths of about 14,000 kids a year in America. And it was this really beautiful effort.

And then we got criticized, the Republicans and Democrats together, those of us that supported this, because people said, "Oh, Clinton is going down there to make another Vietnam," or we're trying to interfere in Colombia's politics or be an imperialist country. And I told everybody there that I didn't want anything out of Colombia except a decent life for the people there, with a way to make a living on honorable circumstances that didn't put drugs into the bodies of American children and children in Europe and Asia and throughout the world.

But the point I want to make is, there are a lot of people who believe that with more open borders, greater access, smaller and smaller technology—you know, you now get a little hand-held computer with a keyboard that's plastic, that fits inside of your hand, that has a screen that hooks you up to the Internet—and we know that, for example, terrorist networks in the world very often have some of the most sophisticated uses of the Internet. We know that as we get more and more open, we may become more vulnerable to people who develop small-scale means of delivering chemical and biological weapons. And all these scenarios are real, by the way. We've spent a lot of money in the Defense Department trying to prepare for the adverse consequences of terrorism, using chemical and biological weapons.

So you've got that on one side. You've got the people that say that globalization of the economy is going to lead to increasing inequality and oppression, and whatever happens is going to destroy the environment. And if it doesn't, the organized forces of destruction will cross national borders and wreck everything, anyway. That's sort of what you might call the modest dark side.

And then you've got people like me that don't buy it, that basically—I think if you look at over the last 50 years, that over a 50-year period the countries that were poor, that organized themselves properly and rewarded work and had lawful systems and related well to the rest of the world and traded more, grew much more rapidly.

If you just look at the last 10 years, with the explosion of the Internet, countries that are highly wired, even though they're poor, had growth rates that were 6, 7 percent a year higher than they otherwise would have been. And so finally, there is no alternative. It's not like we're all going to go back to huts and quit talking to each other.

So if we believe that every person is a child of God, that everyone counts, that everyone should have a certain level of decency in their lives and a certain fair chance to make something, what are our obligations? And I just want to mention three things that are before us today that I think are quite important. And a lot of you in this room have been involved in one or all three.

The most important thing I'd like to talk about is debt relief. There are many countries that, either because of internal problems or abject misgovernment, piled up a lot of debt that can't be repaid. And now every year they have to spend huge amounts of their national treasure just making interest payments on the debt, money they can't spend on the education of their children, on the development of public health systems—which, by the way, are under huge stress around the world—and on other things that will give them a chance to take advantage of the new global economy in society.

Now, there are people who don't favor this sweeping debt relief. They say that it rewards misconduct, that it creates what is known, not in your business but in the economics business, as a moral hazard. [*Laughter*] In economic terms, moral hazard is created—the idea is, if you don't hold people liable for every penny of the mistakes they made or their predecessors made, then somehow you've created a mess in which everybody will go around until the end of time borrowing money they have no intention of paying back.

And there's something to that, by the way. It's not a trivial concern to be dismissed. The problem you have is that a lot of these countries were grievously misgoverned, often by people who looted the national treasury. And when they get a good government, a new government, a clean government, when they agree to new rules, when they hook themselves into the International Monetary Fund, to the World Bank on the condition that they'll change everything they've done, they still can never get out of debt and can never educate their kids and make their people healthy and create a country that is attractive to investors to give people opportunity, which is why the Pope and so many other people urge that we use the year 2000 as Jubilee Year to have a sweeping debt relief initiative. And there's a whole thing in the Judeo-Christian religion about how the Jubilee is supposed to be used every 50 years to forgive debts, to aid the poor, to proclaim liberty to all; and there are trends—there are similar traditions in other faiths of the world, represented in this room.

So for those of you who have been working on this, I want to thank you. What I would like to tell you is, I think that it is very much in the interest of America to have big, large-scale debt relief if the countries that get the relief are committed to and held accountable to good governance and using the money not to build up military power but to invest in the human needs of their people.

We worked very hard to develop a plan. And a lot of you are involved in other—in developing countries throughout the world. There are a lot of people here, I know, that are involved in Africa, for example, where many of the countries most in need are, but you also see this in Asia and Latin America, which is a very important thing.

We developed a plan with other creditor nations to triple the debt relief available to the world's poorest nations, provided they agreed to take the savings from the debt payments and put it into health and education. The United States—I announced last year that we would completely write-off the bilateral debt owed to us by countries that qualify for this plan. That is, they've got to be too poor to pay the money back and well enough governed to be able to assure that they'll take the savings and put it into health and education. That's as many as 33 nations right now.

I'll just tell you, in the last year, Bolivia—an amazing story, by the way—the poorest country in the Andes, has done the most to get rid of drug production. The poorest country has done the most to get rid of drug production. Astonishing story. That ought to be worth it to us to give them debt relief, complete debt relief. But they saved $77 million that they spent entirely on health, education, and other social needs. Uganda, one of the two countries in Africa that has dramatically reduced the AIDS rate, has used its savings to double primary school enrollment. Honduras has qualified but not received their money yet. They intend to offer every one of the children in the country 9 years of education instead of 6. Mozambique, a country which last year, until the floods, had the first or second highest growth rate in the world, after having been devastated by internal conflict just a few years ago, because of the flood is going to use a lot of their money to buy medicine for government clinics, because they've got a lot of serious health problems that are attendant on the fact that the country was practically washed away.

Ten nations so far have qualified for the debt relief. Ten more, I think, will do so by the end of this year. We've got to make sure the money is there for them. Last year I got—the Congress was supported on a bipartisan basis the money for America to forgive our bilateral debt relief. And we have to come up with money that—for example, if somebody owes a billion dollars, even though we know they won't pay, because they can't, it gets budgeted at some figure. And we actually have to put that money in the budget before we can forgive it.

But the Congress did not appropriate the funds for the highly indebted poor countries initiative to forgive their multilateral debt relief. Most countries owe more money to the International Monetary Fund than they do to America or France or Germany or Britain or Japan or anybody else.

So if we want this to work, we have got to pass legislation this year to pay our fair share of this international debt relief initiative. Now, we have members of both parties from dramatically different backgrounds supporting this. It's really quite moving to see, because a lot of times this is the only thing these people have ever agreed on. It's really touching.

You know, we have a lot of Democrats who represent inner city districts with people who have roots in these countries, allied for the first time in their entire career with conservative, Republican, evangelical Christians who believe they have a moral responsibility to do this, because it's ordained, and then all kinds of other people in the Congress. But it's given us a coalition that I would give anything to see formed around other issues and issues here at home—anything. And it could really—if we can actually pull it off, it can change the nature of the whole political debate in America because of something they did together that they all believe so deeply in.

What's the problem? The problem is, there is competition for this money, and some people would rather spend it on something else where there are more immediate

political benefits. None of these people have any votes, we're helping. And some people do buy the moral hazard argument.

But I'm just telling you, I've been in these countries, and I know what many of their governments were like 5 years ago, 10 years ago, and I just don't think it washes. If you want people to organize themselves well, run themselves well, and build a future, we've got to do this. And I think it is a moral issue.

How can we sit here on the biggest mountain of wealth we have ever accumulated, that any nation in all of human history has ever accumulated—and we're not just throwing money away. We're only giving this money to people who not only promise to, but prove they are able to take all the savings and invest it in the human needs of their people.

So I would just say, anything that any of you can do—Bolivia is waiting for more money that they haven't gotten. Honduras is waiting for money that they haven't gotten. They're going to spend this money to send kids to school for 9 years, instead of 6. This is not a complicated thing.

And I would just implore you, anything you can do to urge members of both parties to make this a high priority. Let me remind you, we've got a budget worth nearly $2 trillion, and this money is for 2 years. So we're talking about $210 million in one year and $225 million in the second year to lift the burden off poor people around the world only if they earn it, in effect. So I just ask you all, please help us with that.

And let me just mention two other things very briefly. The public health crisis in a lot of these countries is threatening to take out all the gains of good government and even debt relief. There are African countries with AIDS infection rates in the military of 30 percent or more. A quarter of all the world's people every year who die, die from AIDS, malaria, and TB, those three things. A phenomenal number of people die from malaria, in part, because there are no public health infrastructures in a lot of these places.

So the second thing I want to ask for your help on is, we want to double or increase by $100 million—it's about a 50 percent increase—our efforts to help countries fight AIDS. We want to increase, dramatically, our contributions to the global alliance for vaccines that helps countries who are poor, afford the medicine that is there.

I just got back from Nigeria, and the President of Nigeria, who was a military leader in prison because he stood up for democracy and against a corrupt government that was there before, dealt with all these taboos that have gripped Africa and kept Africa from dealing with AIDS in an astonishing way. We went into an auditorium, and he and I stood on a stage with a 16-year-old girl who was an AIDS peer educator and a young man in his mid twenties—this is an amazing story—or maybe he's in his early thirties now. He and his wife are both HIV positive. He fell in love with a young woman who is HIV positive. Her parents didn't want them to get married. His parents didn't want them to get married. They were devout Christians. Their minister didn't want them to get married. And he finally convinced the pastor that he would never love anyone else, and the pastor gave his ascent to their getting married. Within 4 months of their getting married, he was HIV positive. She got pregnant. He had to quit his job to go around and scrounge up, because his job didn't give him enough money to buy the drugs that would free their child of being HIV positive. So he finally was let go of his job, excuse me, because he was HIV positive, and they were still afraid and prejudiced. So with no money he found a way to get the drugs to his wife, and they had a child who was born free of the virus.

So we were sitting there with hundreds of people in Nigeria, and the President is talking about this. So this guy comes up, and he tells this story and about what a blessing God has been in his life and how much he appreciates his pastor for marrying them and how much he appreciates their families for sticking with them. And then the President of the country called his wife up out of the stands, and he embraced her in front of hundreds of people. Now, this is a big deal on a continent where most people have acted like, you know, you might as well have small pox, and you were giving it out by talking to people. This is a huge deal. And the President got up and said, "We have to fight the disease, not the people who have it. Our enemy are not the people with it. We have to fight the disease." It was an amazing thing.

Now, I think these people ought to be helped, so we—but it's $100 million I want to come up with for that, and I forget how much we're giving to the Vaccine Alliance. And in addition to that, I have asked the Congress, after meeting with a lot of our big drug research companies, not just the big pharmaceutical companies but a lot of them that do biomedical research, to give us a billion dollar tax credit to encourage companies to develop vaccines for AIDS, malaria, and TB, because we have to do that, because they don't see any front-end benefit in it. And they have to—they can't justify the massive amounts of money that are needed to develop these vaccines, because they know that most of the people that need them can't afford to buy them.

So if they develop them, we'll figure out how to get the money to get them out there. But first we've got to have them developed. So I've proposed a tax credit, more money to help buy the medicines that are out there now, and a hundred million more dollars directly to help these countries fight AIDS. I want to ask you to help me get that money. It ought to be an American obligation. This is a serious global problem.

The last thing I want to say is that there was a remarkable meeting in Senegal not very long ago, where essentially an alliance of the world's developing and developed countries made a commitment to try to make basic education available to every child in the world within 15 years. And one of the reasons that kids don't go is, they're not sure it makes sense, or their parents—there are even countries—in the poorest countries where the parents, no matter how poor they are, have to pay some money for their kids to go to school—lots of problems.

So Senator George McGovern, who is our Ambassador to the World Food Organization in Rome, and Senator Bob Dole came to me with Congressman Jim McGovern—no relation—from Massachusetts. And these three people from different worlds asked me to support an initiative to try to get to the point where the wealthier countries in the world could offer every poor child in the world a nutritious meal in school if they'd show up to school.

And they reasoned that—even though there are lots of other issues; and by the way, I won't go into all that; we've got to do a lot more to help these schools in these developing countries—but they reasoned that if we could do that, there would be a dramatic enrollment, especially among young girls, who are often kept at home because their parents see no economic benefit, and in fact a burden, to having their daughters go to school. But there are a lot of young boys that aren't in school in countries, too.

So we, thanks to Dan Glickman, got $300 million up, and we are doing a test run. And we're going around to countries that want to do this. And with $300 million—listen to this—we can feed 9 million school children for a year in school. But you don't get fed unless you come to school.

Now, for somewhere between $3 billion and $4 billion, we could give a—if we can get the rest of the world to help us do this, we could give a nutritious meal, either breakfast or lunch, to every school-aged child in every really poor country in the entire world for a year.

Now, you don't have to do anything about that now. I just want you to know about it, because we have to go figure out how to do this. And let me tell you why. Dan has got to figure out, how is this stuff going to be delivered to remote areas, or is it going to be in dried packages then hydrated and heated? How are we going to do this without messing up the local farm economies? The last thing we want to do is destabilize already fragile farmers. There are practical things. But we have many countries that are interested in this.

When I was in Colombia on the drug thing, the President's wife asked me about this program. She said, "Can we be part of that, or are we too well off?" You know, she said, "We're not really all that rich, with all these narcotraffickers taking the money." We were talking about it.

But the point I want to say is, we have reaped great benefits from the information revolution and the globalization of the economy. We, therefore, have great responsibilities. We have responsibilities to put a human face on the global economy. That's why I

think we're right to advocate higher environmental and labor standards, try to make sure everybody benefits.

We have a responsibility to lead the way on climate change, not be stuck in denial, because we're still the number one producer of greenhouse gases. Although shortly, unless we help them find a different way to get rich, China and India will be, just because they've got more folks.

And in the short run, we have a very heavy responsibility, I believe, to broaden and simplify this debt relief initiative; to lead the assault on the global diseases of AIDS, TB, and malaria that take out a quarter of the people who die, most of them very prematurely before their time every year; and to do more to universalize education so that everybody, everywhere, will be able to take advantage of what we're coming to take for granted.

Now, we've had a lot of wonderful talks over the last 8 years, but I think that I do not believe that a nation, any more than a church, a synagogue, a mosque, a particular religious faith, can confine its compassion and concern and commitment only within its borders, especially if you happen to be in the most fortunate country in the world. And I can't figure out for you what you think about whether these sweeping historical trends are, on balance, good or bad. But it seems to me if you believe that people are, on balance, good or bad or capable of good, we can make these trends work for good.

And I'll just close with this. There is a fascinating book out that I just read by a man named Robert Wright, called "Non Zero." He wrote an earlier book called "The Moral Animal," which some of you may have read. This whole book is about, is all this stuff that is happening in science and technology, on balance, good or bad, and are the dark scenarios going to prevail, or is there some other way?

The argument of the book, from which it gets its title, is basically an attempt to historically validate something Martin Luther King once said, "The arc of history is long, but it bends toward justice." It's pretty hard to make that case, arguably, when you look at what happened with World War I, with Nazi Germany and World War II, with the highly sophisticated oppressive systems of communism. But that's the argument of this book, that the arc of history is long, but it bends toward justice.

The argument is that the more complex societies grow and the more interconnected we all get, the more interdependent we become, the more we have to look for nonzero sum solutions. That is, solutions in which we all win, instead of solutions in which I win at your expense.

It's not a naive book. He says, "Hey look, there's still going to be an election for President. One person wins; one person looses. There's still going to be choices for who runs the company or who gets the pulpit." [*Laughter*] There will be choices. It's not a naive book. But he says that, on balance, great organizations and great societies will have to increasingly look for ways for everyone to win, in an atmosphere of principled compromise, based on shared values, maximizing the tools at hand. Otherwise, you can't continue—societies cannot continue to grow both more complex and more interdependent.

So I leave you with that thought and whatever it might mean for you in trying to reconcile your faith with the realities of modern life. And again I say, as Americans, we have, I think, a truly unique opportunity and a very profound responsibility to do something now on debt relief, disease, and education beyond our borders.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:57 a.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria; Pope John Paul II; former Senator Bob Dole; and Nohra Pastrana, wife of President Andres Pastrana of Colombia.

Remarks on Departure for the Hay Adams Hotel and an Exchange With Reporters

September 14, 2000

Patients' Bill of Rights

The President. Thank you so much. I want to begin, obviously, by thanking Dr. Anderson, the AMA, and the physicians who are here behind me from various medical organizations. I want to thank Ron Pollack, the

director of Families USA, who has been such a long and tireless champion of health care.

As is often the case when I get up to speak, everything that needs to be said has pretty well been said, but I hope to bring it into some sharper focus in terms of what will have to happen now in the next few weeks if we're going to actually get a real and meaningful Patients' Bill of Rights.

Time is running out in Congress, and there is no more important piece of unfinished business. You see these numbers up here—18 million a year. We're trying to pass a minimum wage law. It will affect 10 million people a year. We're very proud here that we reached across party lines to pass the family and medical leave law. It has affected about 25 million people in the first 5 years for which we have statistics.

I have already provided the protections of the Patients' Bill of Rights to 85 million Americans who are covered anyway by Federal health plans. And yet, you see that the remaining Americans, nearly 200 million of them, have the experience that leads 18 million of our fellow citizens to suffer delay or denial of care over a year.

Now, what are the rights in the Patients' Bill of Rights. Let me just state them one more time. We should never forget: The right to the nearest emergency room care; the right to see a specialist when recommended by your physician; the right to know you can't be forced to switch doctors in the middle of a treatment such as chemotherapy or a period of pregnancy; the right to hold your health care plan accountable if it causes you or a loved one great harm.

Now, as I said, these are protections we have provided to 85 million Americans who get their health care through Federal plans. Fact: What did it cost to provide these protections? Less than a dollar a month. That's a fact. Even the Republican majority's Congressional Budget Office concedes that the costs to cover all Americans would be less than $2 a month. And only congressional legislation can provide all Americans and all plans the patient protections they deserve.

Last fall, thanks to the leadership of Congressman Norwood, a physician and a Republican, and Congressman Dingell, a Democrat from Michigan, the House of Representatives passed such a bill with a majority of 275 Members, including 68 Republicans. Nearly a year later, I am confident we now have the votes to pass the very same bill with the same protections in the Senate if—big if—we can get it up to a vote.

The bill's vital signs, in other words, are growing stronger, but it's still a near-run thing. If it were a tie, I know someone who would like to break it. And as Al Gore always says, whenever he votes, the people win.

But this is not about politics. I was glad that Dr. Anderson said what he did. If you took a survey in any community in America except Washington, DC, there would be almost no difference in the opinion on this legislation between Republicans, Democrats, and independents.

Now, let me remind you what the daily toll is. Ron's got the running total up there, but nearly 50,000 Americans every day face a delay or denial of care—nearly 50,000. Every hour, more than 2,000 people fail to get the treatment they need. We can't turn back the counter, but we sure don't have to run it up.

And this is not about statistics. This is about real people with real problems who deserve real care so they can get on with real life instead of the politics of Washington, DC. That's what this Families USA tour is all about. It's about—let me just mention two—people like Joan Bleakley, who lost her sight in her left eye, in part because her HMO forced her to wait 3 weeks before seeing a neurologist; people like Doug Bolden—you will remember him if you went with me to Missouri to the Patients' Bill of Rights event down there—a big, burly emergency room nurse, whose patient was forced by his HMO to leave one hospital and travel more than 50 miles to another, suffered a heart attack and died along the way because he wasn't entitled to health care at the nearest emergency center.

And believe me, these are not isolated examples. I've heard many, many more, and you've got the numbers here to back it up. So again, what this is about is whether the Senate leadership will let the votes be counted and allow a free and fair vote on Norwood-Dingell. The American people need to be reminded. The rules of the Senate, which

were set up to avoid measures being dealt with too rapidly, give everything but our annual budget the option of being subject to a filibuster, which takes 60 votes, not 51, not a majority—60—to pass.

Now, there is no question that this has been debated forever. We do not need any more time for a debate. And the people who aren't for this bill ought to just stand up and tell the American people why they're not for it and why they think the doctors, the nurses, and 300 other health care provider and consumer organizations are wrong, and the HMO's and the insurance companies are right. And then, they ought to let everybody vote.

But it is an abuse of the filibuster to deny the majority of the United States Senate, representing an even bigger majority of the American people, a chance to have their way on an issue this fundamental to democracy.

We don't need any more time to debate this. They don't need to put on the brakes to look at it again. This thing has been hanging around for 2 years now, and it's been debated in and out. It's time to listen to the doctors, the nurses, the patients, the other consumer and provider experts, to listen to a majority of Members of Congress, including the Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives, who would vote for this bill today. The bill should not be held up or watered down.

Again, I am willing to reach agreement. We reached an honorable compromise on one major provision with opponents of the legislation in the Senate, which everyone could live with. But we cannot abandon our commitment to a bill that covers all Americans—all Americans—with the right to the specialists they need, the nearest emergency room care, the right to keep a physician during a course of treatment, the right to hold health care plans accountable, the right, in short, that allows doctors, not people who have no training in medicine and are concerned only with the bottom line to make these decisions; and also, a system that provides access to important clinical trials. In other words, a strong, comprehensive, enforceable Patients' Bill of Rights.

We can do this. If we just let the Senate vote, we can put progress over partisanship, health care over special interests, and restore trust and accountability to our health care system. We should do it now. But every single American should know what's going on.

In order to prevail on legislation that has the support of more than three-quarters of the American people, including 70 percent or more of every political group in America, we have to do one of two things: We've got to persuade the leadership of the Senate to let a majority vote on this, and if a majority's for it, to pass it; or we have to find 9 or 10 more votes between now and the time they go home to break a filibuster that is, in my judgment, an abuse of the filibuster system. There is no debating this. Everybody knows what the deal is. Everybody what the differences are.

Meanwhile, I will keep negotiating. I will keep trying, but I will not abandon the people who are part of these numbers up here, because I've heard too many of their stories.

Again, I thank the doctors; I thank the nurses; I thank Families USA; and I thank all the American people. We can do this, and we can do it in a nonpartisan way, if we can just get the roadblocks out of the way.

Thank you very much.

Wen Ho Lee

Q. Mr. President, could you take a question? I was wondering, Mr. President, if you share the embarrassment that was expressed yesterday by the Federal judge in New Mexico about the treatment of Wen Ho Lee during his year of confinement under Federal authorities?

The President. Well, I always had reservations about the claims that were being made denying him bail. And let me say—I think I speak for everyone in the White House—we took those claims on good faith by the people in the Government that were making them, and a couple days after they made the claim that this man could not possibly be let out of jail on bail because he would be such a danger of flight or such a danger to America's security, all of a sudden they reach a plea agreement which will, if anything, make his alleged offense look modest compared to the claims that were made against him.

So the whole thing was quite troubling to me, and I think it's very difficult to reconcile

the two positions, that one day he's a terrible risk to the national security and the next day they're making a plea agreement for an offense far more modest than what had been alleged.

Now, I do hope that, as part of that plea agreement, he will help them to reconstitute the missing files, because that's what really important to our national security, and we will find out eventually what, if any, use was made of them by him or anybody else who got a hold of them.

But I think what should be disturbing to the American people—we ought not to keep people in jail without bail, unless there's some real profound reason. And to keep someone in jail without bail, argue right up to the 11th hour that they're a terrible risk, and then turn around and make that sort of plea agreement—it may be that the plea agreement is the right and just thing, and I have absolutely no doubt that the people who were investigating and pursuing this case believe they were doing the right thing for the Nation's security—but I don't think that you can justify, in retrospect, keeping a person in jail without bail when you're prepared to make that kind of agreement. It just can't be justified, and I don't believe it can be, and so I, too, am quite troubled by it.

Q. Mr. President, can you explain to me, are you thinking in terms of clemency for him, for Wen Ho Lee?

The President. I'd have to look at that. It depends on, if he's in fact—he has said he's going to plead guilty to an offense which is not insubstantial, but it's certainly a bailable offense, and it means he spent a lot of time in prison that any ordinary American wouldn't have, and that bothers me.

Visit of Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee of India

Q. Mr. President, tomorrow morning, right here on this lawn, you are going to welcome the Prime Minister of India who spoke today on Capitol Hill, and he's calling for stronger U.S.-India security relations and also fighting against terrorism around the world, especially across the border from Indian border—across-border terrorism. So what do you think, sir, coming out from this historical visit and, also, following your visit in March that you've been in India?

The President. Well, first, I am delighted that the Prime Minister of India is coming here after my trip there, and I was honored to be the first President in over 20 years to go. They're the world's largest democracy. We need to have a better and closer and more constructive relationship with them, and I hope that this will be the next step in that, and I think we'll make some specific agreements.

The United States is strongly opposed to terrorism in any form, and I still hope that, if not while I'm here, then in the future, because of the groundwork we've laid, the United States can play a positive role to a peaceful resolution of the Kashmir dispute, which has been at the core of the difficulties between India and Pakistan for more than half a century now.

If you look at how well—I will say this again—if you look at how well the Indians, the Pakistanis, and the Bangladeshis who have come to America have done, the extraordinary percentage of them that are involved in the hi-tech economy, the professions, building our country across a broad range of areas, it is tragic to think of what this conflict has done to hold back the people who live on the Indian subcontinent, who are still all of them living on around $500 or less a day, on average, and who have proven by their stunning success in this country, that they have the ability to be at the cutting edge of the 21st century.

So I hope they can lay this burden down, and I hope we can help them, and in the meanwhile, of course, we'll have to oppose terrorism in all its manifestations.

Thank you very much.

President's Upcoming Visit to Vietnam

Q. Mr. President, could you explain to the American people about Vietnam? Why you've decided to go?

The President. [*Inaudible*]—another press conference with the Prime Minister tomorrow, and I will answer some more questions then. But I've got to leave.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:07 p.m. in the South Portico at the White House. In his remarks,

he referred to Dr. Edgar Ratcliffe (Andy) Anderson, executive vice president, American Medical Association.

Remarks to the National Campaign Against Youth Violence Luncheon

September 14, 2000

Thank you. Let me, first of all, say I'm glad you're here, and I'm glad that all of you who have made contributions to this endeavor to make sure it succeeds. I came by, overwhelmingly, just to say thanks, and a special word of thanks to you, Jeff, for taking this on when it would have been easy to take a pass, and to you, Steve, for taking this on when it would have been easy to take some more established way of being philanthropic and civic, with a more guaranteed but a much more limited return. I guess AOL didn't get where it is by looking for guaranteed but limited returns. [*Laughter*] So I thank you very much. [*Laughter*]

I'm almost done being President, and so I'm thinking a little bit not so much about the past but about why I and my administration did certain things when we did them and why I thought this was worth trying to do.

And one thing is, I really believe that ideas and dreams have consequences. If you have a bad one and you implement it in the most aggressive way, it still won't have a good outcome. And if you have a good one but you don't implement it very well, you won't have a very good outcome. But if you have a good one and you do it, you do everything you can to realize it in a smart way, it has results.

And I think that one of the things Presidents are supposed to do is to imagine things that everybody wants but is afraid to say out loud they might do. I always thought we could balance the budget. And then once we did, I realized we ought to say we could make America debt-free. If I had said any of that in 1992, people would have said, "You know, he seems like a very nice person, but we really should"—[*laughter*]—"have somebody who's a little more well-grounded."

And that brings me to this issue. This is a good news/bad news story. The good news is, crime is down 7 years in a row, violent crime at a 27-year low; juvenile crime has been dropping after going up, and juvenile violence has been dropping, after going up for many years. The bad news is, we still have the highest rate of violence committed by and committed against young people of any industrialized nation.

So anybody who's satisfied with the trend, I think, is wrong. But we should be encouraged and empowered by the trends, because it shows we can do better. But just like we had to start out when we had a deficit of $290 billion a year and we'd quadrupled the debt in 12 years, we had to first of all say, "Well, we're going to cut in a half in a certain number of years, and then we'll get rid of it." And then we realized we could get rid of it, so we said, "Well, why don't we go after the debt, too, and keep interest rates down and keep the economy going?"

Well, now, it's not like we don't know what to do here. And it's not like we don't know what works. And we've got all this evidence. So I think our goal should be to make America the safest big country in the world and the safest big place in the world for a child to grow up and live. That should be our goal.

Now, if that's our goal, the first thing we've got to do is, do what Steve says, and get everybody involved from all sectors of society. And the second thing we have to do is, do what Jeff said; we have to have a strategy. And the strategy he outlined, you know, to educate, replicate—or whatever word he used—and generate leadership—[*laughter*]—that's about as good as it gets. [*Laughter*] How did I do? Did I do pretty good?

So what I'd like to do, just briefly review what's been done that I have some notes on to say thanks and then talk about where we go from here. Because I want you to know, I wouldn't have asked you to do this if I didn't think you could make a big difference.

We had a meeting like this a few years ago on teen pregnancy and got a lot of people together, and the committee just took off with it. And teen pregnancy's dropped dramatically. Now, did that committee do it all? No. Were there economic and other factors that helped? Of course. Did they make a big difference? You bet.

We started a few years ago with five people in a room to have a Welfare to Work Partnership to try to prove that the welfare reform

bill could work. And now, we've got 12,000 companies in that partnership, and they've hired hundreds of thousands of people off the welfare rolls. They have very good retention rates. They're making wages way above the minimum wage. They're doing very well. The welfare rolls are half of what they were when I took office. Did those 12,000 companies do that by themselves? No. Did the welfare reform law alone do it? No. The economy had a lot to do with it. Every one of you, if you never hired anybody off welfare, if you increased your own employment, made a contribution to creating an economy which reduced the welfare rolls. But did those 12,000 companies make a difference? You bet they did. And that enabled us to have the lowest welfare rolls in 30 years.

So that's how you need to look at this. If the economy went into a basket, would it be harder for you to succeed at this? Of course. And if Government had stupid policies, would it be harder for you to see? Yes. And if we pass our after-school initiative and more than double the number of kids that can be in after-school programs, will it be easier for you to see? You bet.

But can you make a decisive difference in making America the safest big country in the world? Absolutely, because this is the only group that's focusing on everything in trying to come up with a strategy specifically directed at this issue. And that's the way I think you need to look at this.

But you ought to always have in your mind that you are laboring to make your country the safest big country in the world and the safest, big, complicated society in the world for a little child to grow up in. Nothing else is worth dreaming of. And when you think about that, it helps to organize everything that you do. And when you don't impose on yourself the burden of being fully responsible for the success or failure of the endeavor but asking yourself where you can add at the margins to make it a real success to reach the ultimate goal, and how in a big society like ours, nothing ever gets done as well as it can be done unless there is a group of people like this that represent everybody in a society, doing this in partnership, then it ought to be highly energizing for you, and I hope you will continue to do it.

First, I want to thank you for the public service announcements. I want to thank ABC, NBC, AOL, Univision, LearningGate, the NFL, anybody else that would care to do it. Anybody who tells you they don't work is crazy. Why do you think politicians are spending all this much money advertising in an election year? [*Laughter*] If you don't think they work, why doesn't everybody just abolish their advertising budget?

It does work. It makes a huge difference. Ask Barry McCaffrey the role it has played in our efforts to reduce drug abuse among young people. So it does.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Bob Silberman for his leadership in this concert that's being introduced this fall. Those guys have produced one or two concerts, and I think it ought to be pretty great, and I hope I can see it unfold.

I want to thank Ronnie Coleman, the U.S. attorney from Memphis, and Ira Lipman from Guardsmark for their leadership and the remarkable things that have occurred in Memphis in such a few short months in implementing their city-by-city initiative.

I want to thank Francine Katz and Anheuser-Busch for helping to make similar things happen in St. Louis. Those are two cities that I know quite well from long before I ever thought I'd be sitting here doing this—standing here doing this.

I want to thank AOL for the work that it's doing in our schools. And I want to thank Tommy Hilfiger, Teen People, and Time-Warner for helping with all the things that are going to be done to connect young people to one another, the parades, the concerts, the assemblies, the television summits.

And finally, I would like to thank the Director of my White House Council on Youth Violence, Sonia Chessen, for leading our Federal efforts, and Assistant Surgeon General Susan Blumenthal over here for her dedication. We're doing everything that we can.

And I want to say one thing about what Steve said about the entertainment industry. There are two realities here, and both of them ought to get out there. First of all, the entertainment industry, in the last 8 years—I went to Hollywood the first time and asked

them to help us deal with violence and inappropriate exposure to material to young children in December of 1993 in a big deal that we had at CAA. We had hundreds of people there. I said, "Look, you've got to help us on this. This is a problem. Don't be an ostrich. Don't deny this. Let's just figure out how to do this."

And I would just like to say since then, we have seen remarkable efforts at content rating systems for television, for video games, Internet parental controls. This year all new televisions will be sold with a V-chip.

Now, as Hillary reminds me all the time, that since we have separate rating systems, it's hard to make sense of them all, and it would be nice if we had some way of kind of integrating them all. But it's not like nothing's happened here. Some good things have happened, and some real efforts have been made.

Now, what's the problem? As I said the other day, this FTC study is very disturbing, because it says some of the people who are making movies and other material rate them and say kids shouldn't look at them and then market it to the very people they say shouldn't be looking at it.

And the movie business is something I understand the economics of a little bit more, and one real problem of the movie business is, less than 10 percent of the movies make money in the theaters when they're first shown. So you wind up with a situation where people are making these movies imagining, "How am I going to package them when they're in the video stores? How can I sell it to one of these cable networks that will show it at 3 o'clock in the morning, three weekends in a row? Will there be a foreign market for this sort of thing?"

How does all this affect what they do? It doesn't justify it. I'm not saying that. I'm just trying to explain the fact that what I think we have to do is to take Steve up on his offer and implore—I can understand why the media executives didn't want to go to that congressional hearing yesterday and just get beat up on. But on the other hand, I don't think anybody should run away from this. I think they ought to say, "Look, here's where we were 8 or 10 years ago. Here's where we are now. Here's the progress we've made. Okay, so, this is being done, and it's wrong, and we're going to stop it, and here's how we're going to deal with our situation."

But I think what we need to see is the positive and the negative, but it is unrealistic to expect that we can get where we need to go if the major entertainment media are not involved. They have to be involved. They have to buy onto this. And they have to understand that in the end, the most successful companies have a big interest in living in a safe society and a good society.

And that's the last thing that I want to say. I think we need a curious blend of commitment to a unifying and integrating vision and one that is individually empowering. The great thing I like about the whole business about the Internet and all these new companies springing out of the minds of these young people who think about things I can't even imagine, is that, in the most immediate sense, it's both individually empowering, and it's bringing us closer together.

The best book I read in the last few months is a book called "Non Zero," by Robert Wright. He wrote another book a few years ago called "The Moral Animal" that was a bestseller. I will oversimplify, at the risk of being criticized by the author, the argument of the book.

He basically offers an historical and semi-scientific analysis to support one of the most eloquent assertions of Martin Luther King, which is that the arc of history is long, but it bends toward justice. And his argument is that, notwithstanding the fact that we had modern society horribly disfigured by the Nazis, that we had modern organizational techniques and military power horribly abused by communist and other totalitarian regimes, that on the whole, if you study human history, as societies grow more complex in their interrelation, and more interdependent both within and beyond their borders, people in positions of authority and citizens at the grassroots level are forced to look constantly for more non-zero sum solutions, hence the title of the book—solutions in which everybody wins. Now, this is—the guy—it's a very interesting book and not naive. I mean, he know—he acknowledges, even in the most sort of cooperative societies, you've got an election. One person wins the

Presidency; the other one doesn't. One person gets to be head of AOL; somebody doesn't. Choices get made all the time.

But the argument of the book is far more sophisticated. It is that to succeed, even in positions of leadership, where there is a competition for the position, the measure of success is not so much whether you got you want at somebody else's expense, but whether you got what you wanted because you enabled other people to achieve their dreams and to do what they want.

And I guess one of the things that bothers me about so much of the rhetoric I hear about young people today, especially when they do things they shouldn't do, and they grow up in disconnected ways—and you don't have to be poor to grow up in an isolated, disconnected way, as we've seen in Columbine and other places—is that it is—yes, it's important to tell these kids what they shouldn't do, but it's also much more important, on a consistent, loving, disciplined way over a long period of time, to give them lots of things to say yes to.

And I think the idea that we are moving toward a world where more and more, we will find our own victories in other people's victories, because our interdependence forces us to seek non-zero sum solutions, is a very helpful way to think about dealing with most social problems and, frankly, some economic challenges, like global debt relief and things like that.

So I just ask you to think about that. This is a big deal. And I know you can get frustrated in the beginning, because it's amorphous—everything big in the beginning, it makes a difference at the margins, where it makes all the difference is amorphous. But I urge you to stay with this. And if you want me to help after I'm out of office, I'll do that, because I believe in this.

But when you get discouraged, remember: When this Welfare to Work Project started, if anybody had told me that within 4 years, they would have 12,000 companies and hundreds of thousands of people hired, it would have been a hooter. Nobody would have believed it. No one seriously believes when that Teen Pregnancy Partnership met, a lot of them didn't believe in their heart of hearts that if they did this for 4 or 5 years, they could play the role that they've played in the dropping rates that we've seen.

And I can tell you, nobody in Congress who voted in 1993 to cut the deficit in half really thought that it would spark the avalanche of changed budgetary conditions. I cannot guarantee your success, but I can guarantee you'll be rewarded if you try. And if we think about it in this way, that we're trying to find ways for all of us to live our dreams by empowering more people to live theirs, then I think that the chances of your prevailing are quite high, indeed.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:40 p.m. in the Concorde Room at the Hay Adams Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Jeff Bleich, executive director, National Campaign Against Youth Violence; Veronica Coleman, U.S. attorney, Memphis, TN; Ira Lipman, founder and president, Guardsmark; Francine Katz, vice president, consumer education, Anheuser-Busch, Inc.; Robert Silberman, chief executive officer, SFX Entertainment; and fashion designer Tommy Hilfiger. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of Steven Case, chairman and chief executive officer, America On-Line.

Proclamation 7338—National Hispanic Heritage Month, 2000

September 14, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

American society today embraces a remarkable breadth of cultures, and Hispanics are an integral part of this diversity. The Hispanic American community is a collage of distinct groups, including people with roots in Central and South America, Mexico, the Caribbean, and Spain. Hispanics have been an important part of the history and heritage of the Americas since the earliest days of European colonization, and today Hispanic Americans are the youngest and fastest-growing minority community in our Nation. Devoted to family, faith, country, and hard work, they bring unique perspectives and experiences to our national community and character.

The vibrant Hispanic influence can be seen in all aspects of American life and culture, from distinctive cuisine to colorful festivals, and from the rhythms and melodies of traditional music to the contagious beat of today's most popular songs. Throughout our Nation, Hispanic men and women have distinguished themselves in every endeavor and, with our cultural and linguistic ties to our trading partners throughout the Western Hemisphere, Hispanic Americans are crucial to maintaining our Nation's competitiveness and prosperity in the global economy of the 21st century.

Not long ago I had the privilege of awarding the Presidential Medal of Freedom, our Nation's highest civilian honor, to Cruz Reynoso, a man who has devoted his life to promoting civil rights and championing equal opportunity for all our people. A son of Mexican immigrants, he has lived the American Dream, going to college and working his way up to become the first Hispanic American to serve on the California Supreme Court. A force for positive social change in our Nation, he is just one of many talented Hispanic Americans enriching our national life.

Cruz Reynoso's success underscores what we already know: education and equal opportunity are the keys to ensuring that people of Hispanic heritage can take full advantage of America's promise. My Administration has focused on improving educational opportunities for Hispanic children through the Hispanic Education Action Plan, as well as by reducing class sizes across our Nation, greatly expanding the Head Start program, working to turn around failing schools, and making college more affordable through tax incentives and scholarships. By expanding the Earned Income Tax Credit, raising the minimum wage, and moving people from welfare to work, my Administration has also helped expand economic opportunity for Hispanic American working families. We have brought the Hispanic unemployment rate to its lowest level on record and the Hispanic poverty rate to a 20-year low. We have also worked hard to create an Administration that truly reflects America, with the most Hispanic appointees and the most Hispanic judicial nominees in our Nation's history.

Even as Hispanic Americans grow in number and influence in our country, they have not forgotten their roots; they have not forgotten the pain of discrimination, of being ignored or left behind. Instead, millions of courageous and compassionate Hispanic men and women across our country are working to create a just and equal society, uniting around a firm commitment to build One America in this new century.

In honor of the many contributions that Hispanic Americans have made and continue to make to our Nation and culture, the Congress, by Public Law 100–402, has authorized and requested the President to issue annually a proclamation designating September 15 through October 15 as "National Hispanic Heritage Month."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim September 15 through October 15, 2000, as National Hispanic Heritage Month. I call upon all Americans to observe this month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fourteenth day of September, in the year of our Lord two thousand, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-fifth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., September 18, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on September 19.

Proclamation 7339—National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week, 2000

September 14, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Rooted in the segregated South of more than a century ago, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) for decades were the sole source of higher education for African Americans. Generations of African

American educators, physicians, lawyers, scientists, and other professionals found at HBCUs the knowledge, experience, and encouragement they needed to reach their full potential. Over the years, HBCUs have compiled an enviable record of achievement, educating almost forty percent of our Nation's black college graduates. Today, building on that tradition of excellence in education, HBCUs confer the majority of bachelor's degrees and advanced degrees awarded to black students in the physical sciences, mathematics, computer science, engineering, and education.

And HBCUs have accomplished this record in the face of daunting challenges—including limited financial resources and a relatively high percentage of disadvantaged students—without resorting to high tuition fees. The faculty and staff of HBCUs have created a nurturing environment for their students, set high academic standards and expectations, and served as inspiring role models for the young people around them. As a result, the dropout rate at HBCUs is much lower than for African American students at other educational institutions, and enrollment remains high.

In addition to educating many of our Nation's most distinguished African American professionals, HBCUs reach out to improve the quality of life in surrounding communities. Whether renovating housing, providing job training, instituting Head Start and senior citizen programs, mentoring elementary and high school students, or teaching nutrition, the students and faculty of HBCUs share their time, talents, and educational resources to make a positive difference in thousands of lives. Just as important, HBCUs serve as living repositories of African American history and heritage, preserving the words and artifacts of proud generations of African Americans and reminding us of the crucial part these men and women have played in the history of our Nation.

For well over a century, HBCUs have made their mark as vital institutions of higher learning. They have educated millions of young people, and today they maintain their lead role in preparing African Americans and students of all races for the challenges and opportunities of this new century.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim September 17 through September 23, 2000, as National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week. I call upon the people of the United States, including government officials, educators, and administrators, to observe this week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities honoring America's Historically Black Colleges and Universities and their graduates.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fourteenth day of September, in the year of our Lord two thousand, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-fifth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., September 18, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on September 19.

Proclamation 7340—National POW/MIA Recognition Day, 2000

September 14, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the onset of the Korean War and the 25th anniversary of the end of the war in Vietnam. For many Americans, these milestones bring difficult memories; for former prisoners of war and the families of those still missing in action, these anniversaries evoke particularly painful memories and emotions.

In both of these conflicts, hundreds of thousands of brave Americans left their homes and families to defend freedom and democracy in the face of communist aggression. Thousands lost their lives in battle, and the fate of 10,000 Americans is still unknown—they are missing in action. We know

that many Americans held captive were subjected to unspeakable horrors, but throughout maintained their honor, strong faith in our Nation, and indomitable spirit.

There are approximately 50,000 courageous former POWs living among us, including those held captive during World War II. Many still cope with the physical and emotional effects of their captivity. We owe a profound debt of gratitude to these quiet heroes who served our Nation so well and sacrificed so much. And to the families of those still missing in action, we pledge our unwavering commitment to achieve the fullest possible accounting for their loved ones and to seek the recovery, repatriation, and identification of the remains of those who have died.

On September 15, 2000, the flag of the National League of Families of American Prisoners of War and Missing in Southeast Asia, a black and white banner symbolizing America's missing service members and our unshakable resolve to ascertain their fate, will be flown over the White House, the U.S. Capitol, the Departments of State, Defense, and Veterans Affairs, the Selective Service System Headquarters, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the Korean War Veterans Memorial, national cemeteries, and other locations across our country—a powerful reminder to the world that we will keep faith with those who so faithfully served America.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim September 15, 2000, as National POW/MIA Recognition Day. I call upon all Americans to join me in remembering former American prisoners of war who suffered the hardships of enemy captivity and those missing in action whose fate is still undetermined. I call upon Federal, State, and local government officials and private organizations to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fourteenth day of September, in the year of our Lord two thousand, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-fifth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., September 18, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on September 19.

Remarks at an IMPAC 2000 Reception

September 14, 2000

Thank you very much. Well first of all, I want to thank all of you for supporting this endeavor, and I want to thank, as David did—Ken, thank you. I have—you have come a long way since we had that dinner. I think it was what we ate that night that did it. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Martin for all the work that he's done, and as your predecessor and also as Patrick Kennedy's predecessor. He was 7 feet tall when he started this job. And thank you, Vic Fazio, my longtime friend. I want to say a special word of appreciation to David Bonior. I did not know him very well when I got elected President, and one of the things that I will always treasure about these last 8 years is the relationship that he and I developed. I like him, and I admire his wife so much, and I feel about him a little bit the way I do about Nancy Pelosi. I love them when they are with me, and I love them when they are not—[*laughter*]—because, you know, both of them are so convicted, and they believe things, and they care about things, and they stick their necks out. And it's especially hard for him because he's in a district where he has to pay a price for every vote of conscience he casts, and he does it anyway. I want to thank you.

Probably more than anyone in America, I know how important this endeavor is. That's why I showed up tonight, besides the fact that I told Ken I would. [*Laughter*] When we had a majority in the Congress, we passed the economic plan that started this whole roll we've been on: the crime bill that played a major role in getting us the lowest violent crime rate in 27 years; the Brady bill, which has kept guns out of the hands of half a million felons, fugitives, and stalkers; the AmeriCorps bill, which has now given way over 150,000 young people a chance to serve in their community and earn money to go

to college; the family medical leave act, which has helped about 25 million Americans to take some time off when a newborn baby was in the family or a parent was sick, without losing their job; and the beginning of one of the lesser known achievements that we've made together, which is a systematic attempt to reform Federal education policy, to concentrate on standards and results and effective investment in reform.

And I know what a difference it makes. This is an unusual and, in effect, a really kind of a wonderful time in my life. Earlier this year, I got to cast what well may be my last vote as a citizen of my native State for Al Gore for President, in the Democratic primary, and Tuesday I got to vote for my wife for the first time, which was an immense thrill.

And last night, when I watched the debate, I realize now what she went through all those years watching me. Is he going to fall over? Is he going to smile? Should he slug back? Should he just keep smiling? [*Laughter*] It's amazing, it's really been—so, now, my family has a new candidate, my party has a new leader, and I have become the Cheerleader in Chief, and I like it.

But I just want to say, all of you know how important this is, or you wouldn't be here. But what Ken said is really worth remembering. I think we're going to do well in these elections if we can continue to clarify the choices, because the American people want this prosperity to continue, but they don't want us to be in idle. They want us to take on the big challenges out there.

I think we have an excellent chance, and I've worked as hard as I could for the Senate candidates, for the House candidates, for the two committees, as well as to help our party and our nominees. But what I can tell you is that in spite of all the good things that have happened, the challenges that are out there are really big, and they cannot—and no American should expect President Gore, Vice President Lieberman, and a Democratic House and Senate to deal with them all in a year.

You know, when all the baby boomers retire, which will start in about 8 years, for the ones that take early Social Security, and go on for 18 to 20 more years, there will only be two people working for every one person on Social Security, although the Congress, thank you very much, took the earnings limit off Social Security. And now more people will be able to work in their later years, and that's good.

We have to—and with all these advances in health care, we're going to have huge challenges to figure out. How do we redefine aging in America? Yes, how do we save Social Security? How do we save Medicare? How do we add a prescription drug benefit? It's unconscionable that it doesn't exist already; we would have it now, if we had a Democratic Congress.

But how are we going to deal with a country, that is, in terms of age distribution, radically different from anything we've ever known and will be for 20 years, maybe 30 years, and then it will all start to get back to a normal distribution? We've got the most diverse student population we've ever had. It's a wonder, and we have actually learned how to turn around failing schools.

We know how to do it now, and it took probably 15 years of serious effort. But I was in a school in New York the other day, a grade school where, 2 years ago—listen to this—2 years ago 80 percent of the kids were doing reading and math below grade level in Harlem. Two years later 76 percent of the kids are doing reading and math at or above grade level—in just 2 years.

We know how to do this. But America has never succeeded, ever, in guaranteeing quality education for all of our kids, and now we've got the most diverse group of kids we've ever had. Just across the river in Alexandria, there are children from 180 different national and ethnic groups, whose parents speak over 100 different languages as their first language. This is great for us in this global economy, if, but only if, we can figure out how to give all these kids a world class education.

We've had more millionaires and more billionaires in the last 8 years than in any time in history, and I like that, and I hope the next administration can keep it going. Maybe I can become one of them. But we still have too many people working hard for too little and having a really hard time making ends meet.

What kind of tax policy should we have for them? What kind of laws should we have to make sure that as more and more parents are working, they can work and still have time for their kids and save enough to make sure their kids can go to college? These are big questions, and this just scratches the iceberg. I didn't get into all the global questions.

The point I'm trying to make is, it would be tragic if we have a very good election this time, and just because of the distribution of the Governorships, which we can't get a majority of back until 2002, just because there aren't many up this year, and because we didn't do a good job in the legislative races, and because we weren't legally prepared, we lost what we won, notwithstanding the fact that a plain majority of the American people agree with the direction in which we want to take the country.

Now, if they disagree with us and they want to vote us out, that's their perfect right, but we shouldn't lose the Congress if a majority of the people are still with us. That's the important thing. We Democrats would never say we should stay in office whether they're for us or not, because we want to jiggle the lines around, but we should have an honest, open, legal, constitutional redistricting process so that if we can win this time and if we can maintain the confidence of the country, we can stay in the saddle because that's what the people want.

So this is profoundly important, and I spend a lot of time—I try to spend a significant amount of time every single week I was President, thinking about what America would be like, not just a month or a year from now but 5 and 10 and 20 years from now. And that's very, very important.

So I just want you to know, these Members here, I believe in them. Nothing good I achieved, including when they were in the minority, would have been possible if it hadn't been for them. In spite of all the good things that have happened in this country, I really believe that the next 8 years can be even more exciting, even more interesting, even more productive if we just stick with the philosophy that says we want to make sure everybody has a chance, that everybody matters, and we all do better when we work together. That's basically what we Democrats believe.

And you've made it possible, if the American people stick with us, to make sure that they can continue to do their job. That is very, very important.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:50 p.m. in the Lafayette Room at the Hay Adams Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Representative Ken Bentsen, chair, IMPAC 2000 National Democratic Redistricting Project; former Representative Vic Fazio; and Representative Martin Fost, chair, Democratic caucus.

Remarks at a Dinner for Hillary Clinton

September 14, 2000

Thank you very much. Vernon has got this microphone here. It's not on. It's feeding to the press. And if I know Vernon, he's already fed the press, which may mean that I will get a little bit of slack from them if I say anything I shouldn't.

Let me begin by saying this is my second home. Usually, when I'm a surrogate for Hillary—and I try to do this as much as I can, because that way she can be out getting votes. I'm glad to do it, but tonight I really got the better end of the deal. Vernon and Ann have been so wonderful to us, and we have had these seven—soon to be eight Christmas Eves together, with Dwight and Toni and the rest of their family.

And he's always letting me bring all my family here. And sometimes, that's a pretty large and rowdy bunch. I have two young, impish nephews who, from time to time—[*inaudible*]—grandchildren. And I'm very grateful for their friendship, and I want to thank Dwight and Toni and Ann and Vernon one more time for being there for our family tonight.

We've had an interesting talk around the table tonight about everything in the wide world. But I'd just like to say a couple of things. This is a rather interesting time in my life. I'm not running for anything for the first time in 26 years. [*Laughter*] My party has a new leader. My family has a new candidate. I cast what may well be the last vote

of a long and rich life in my native State of Arkansas for Al Gore for President.

And Tuesday, I got to vote for my wife for the first time, in a little school in Chappaqua, New York. And it was the most extraordinary experience. You know, I was happy as a kid on Christmas morning. It was amazing. We got to go in and shake hands with all the election officials. And I go into this little voting booth, and I realized what I was doing, and it was just an unbelievable feeling. So for me, personally, this is a source of great pride.

And I was very proud of her last night, because I thought she gave a good account of herself in a difficult and challenging format. It should have been difficult and challenging. These jobs are not being given away. Candidates ought to be tested. But I was very, very proud of her. And apparently, the people who saw the debate liked her pretty well, too. And I always believe you can trust the people. People almost always get it right if they have enough information and enough time to digest it. So I felt good about that.

But what I would like to say to all of you relates more to you than to her and to this campaign. I appreciate what Vernon said. I thought when I ran for President in 1991 and 1992, we needed to change not only the content of our policy but the way we did our politics and the way we related to each other as citizens. We needed to adopt a more unifying language and rhetoric and attitude toward one another, because we're growing more diverse in a world that's growing more complicated and more interconnected. And we can't get much done if all we want to do is to figure out how to segment the election in every political season in a way that divides the American people against one another so that, hopefully, we have at least one more vote than the other side.

That's not the way the world works its best. It's not the way the best companies are run, not the way the best nonprofits are run. It's not the way people want to run their families or their communities. It's not to say that we shouldn't have vigorous debates, but I thought that the country had been disadvantaged by a harsh and exceedingly personal political style that, I thought, needed to go away for good.

So we set about trying to turn the country around and change the policy and change the politics. And the result proves that a lot of sunshine and a lot of storms have been pretty good for the American people. We'll leave it to the historians to judge how good and what role we had in it, but I feel very grateful. I have a heart full of gratitude.

But the point I want to make tonight—and we discussed this at our table—is that I think this is an election that's at least as important as the election of 1992, and in some ways it presents as big, if not a bigger challenge to people, because what you do when times are good is sometimes harder to judge than what you do when times are tough.

The people took a chance on me in 1992. And we were laughing outside, and I have no idea how many people were in that polling place. "Can I really vote for this guy? He's only 46 years old, a little State. I've never been there. I'm not quite sure, you know? They say all these bad things about him. Aw, heck, times are tough. I'm going to give him a chance." People felt, "Well, it's not that big a risk. I mean, after all, we're in tough shape here."

Now, the country's in good shape. People have a sense of well-being that they have earned. Current trends are going in the right direction. The important thing in this election, I think, is for people to be quite clear about what they want out of this and what they want for their country.

I've always believed that if we could, all of us who feel as I do, if we could just bring clarity to this election, to get the American people to sit down and take a little time to think, "What would I like my country to look like in 10 years? What is it that I should do with this truly magic moment? What are the big challenges; what are the big problems; what are the big obstacles? What are the big changes, and who can manage them best?" I've always thought that we could all come out okay in this election, because very often, the person for whom you decide to vote depends in large measure on what you think the election is about in the first place.

So, I think the Vice President and Senator Lieberman are doing very well. I think Hillary's doing very well, but I don't think any

of these elections are over yet, because I think the debate is still stewing out there. People are trying to come to grips with what it all means. I'd just like to say a couple of things, first about Hillary. One of the things that—not much gets me mad anymore, I'm feeling pretty mellow—but one of the things that still kind of steams me is when I hear somebody say, "Well, why is she doing this?" She wouldn't be doing this if she weren't his wife and the First Lady."

You can ask Vernon. The truth is, if she hadn't decided to spend the last 30 years helping me, helping other people, being a public servant as well as a private lawyer, she could have been doing this 25 years ago. She chose to be a citizen rather than a candidate. She chose to do things like be on the board of the Children's Defense Fund and found the Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families and start our neonatal nursery down there and be the chairman of the board of a legal services corporation before she was 30 and did other things where she could serve and not ask for anything.

This is the first time in 30 years she's ever asked anybody to do anything for her. So when people say to me—well they don't say it to me, to my face, but I hear it all the time. It's sort of—that's just not true. I've never known anybody that I thought was more qualified to serve as a Senator who wasn't one already than her, because she knows how to organize things. She knows how to get things done. She knows how to work with people who disagree with her.

She's worked for 30 years on issues that are central to this country's future, not just children and families and health care and education but also some of the big issues in New York: How do you bring economic opportunity to economically distressed places? We had to make a living doing that in Arkansas for a dozen years.

So, I think she's superbly well qualified. She's been to all 62 counties in the State. She's the only person running, I think, for the Senate in New York this year that's done that. If you saw the debate last night, you know she's thought a lot about these issues.

But the second thing I want to say, in a larger sense, is that there are big things we know that we're all going to have to deal with as people, that our elected officials will be at the center of. We know right now we've got to deal with the aging of America, all us baby boomers retire, two people working and one person retired.

We know right now that in the world economy we live in, education is more important than ever, and we have the most diverse and largest student body we've ever had, a little picture of the changes in America. I'll just give you just a sample.

There's a new movie out starring Denzel Washington. I don't even know if its premiered yet, and it's about the integration of T.C. Williams High School and the football, over the river there in Alexandria. T.C. Williams High School today, just three or four decades later, is a magnificent school, still. It has one of the best antiviolence programs in America, by the way, but it is part of the most diverse school district in America, where there are people from 180 different racial and ethnic groups, whose families speak over 100 different native languages, in one school district.

It's a whole different world out there. How are we going to give all these kids a world-class education? The truth is, we know how to turn around failing schools, so we're going to do it. I was at a school in Harlem, in New York, a couple weeks ago, that 2 years ago had 80 percent of the kids reading and doing math below grade level. Two years later, it has 76 percent of the kids doing reading and math at or above grade level.

This can be done everywhere in America. The question is whether we're going to do it. How are we going to do that? What should the Federal Government's role be? What should we focus on? So there are things we know. Then there are all these things that are imponderable. When will global warming change our lives? See the polar ice caps are melting? What does that have to do with you? If you're from Illinois, what's it going to do to agriculture? Why? Will it bury the sugarcane fields in Louisiana? Now that we've saved the Florida Everglades, will they be overrun with water? How could we deal with that in ways that grow the economy and create jobs for working people, instead of take jobs away?

Don't you want somebody in the Senate and somebody in the White House that's curious and thinks about that kind of stuff? The world is growing closer together. What are our responsibilities to deal with the AIDS epidemic in Africa, growing even more rapidly in India now, and soon to have the most rapid growth of all in the states of the former Soviet Union?

What are our responsibilities for that? When you all—when new mothers can bring home their babies with a little gene card that tells them what their genetic makeup is likely to be, what their life expectancy is likely to be, and what the probability of a girl getting breast cancer in her thirties is, a little baby girl, coming home from the hospital, or a man having a debilitating stroke in his forties, because he's got a little genetic crook—what are our responsibilities there? How are we going to protect the privacy of that information and still get them the kind of—on the kind of regime that will be drastically minimize the chances that those bad things will happen and increase their life expectancy?

How are we going to bridge the digital divide that exists in the world so that poor kids, not just in America but all around the world, get the same chance that others do? What are you going to do if somebody decides—figures out how to get a terrorist group a biological weapon that can be carried in a plastic case that can be not—that won't be detected in airports.

Something like this could all happen. This is just some of the questions. If we had all night, I could give you a thousand questions. I think about this all the time. So, quite apart from the fact that I think we're right, and they're wrong on how big the tax cut should be, whether we should pay down the debt, what's our obligation to the poor areas in America, whether we should raise the minimum wage, whether we should have the Patients' Bill of Rights, whether we should have a Medicare drug benefit; we need to elect people this year who are curious and think about the future and who have the capacity to deal with these big things and imagine how it's going to effect our little children and grandchildren, because I'm convinced that for all the good things that have happened in the last 8 years, all the best stuff's still out there.

But I'm also convinced that the future is not about to stand still, and therefore it will be more important than ever to have people who not only have very clear and unambiguous political values and common commitments that are clear to all of us at elections but people who are really curious in the best sense and learning and flexible and care about this.

I have never known anybody that I thought had a better combination of mind and heart and of constancy and ability to work with other people than Hillary—ever—not anybody. I've never known anybody that I thought has thought about the future with a greater capacity to predict than Al Gore—not anybody.

These are not the things that you necessarily think about in political campaigns. You know, they may not—it's hard to make a 30-second ad on those two things. But I'm telling you, that's the kind of stuff we need to be thinking about, because all the best stuff's still out there, but there are a lot of profound challenges out there.

I went down to Colombia last week, and we're trying to help Colombia, and also Bolivia and Ecuador and the countries around there, you know, root out the scourge of cocaine, get the farmers to do something else for a living. Fourteen thousand kids die in America every year directly from drug overdoses, as a consequence of their drug habits.

They can lose their democracy down there. Nobody really knows exactly how to save it all, but I can tell you one thing. We won't get it done by just shouting at each other. We're going to have to work with people and think about it.

Just the last thought I'll leave you with. The most important thing about the whole human genome project to me is that the people who did it figured out, with the most sophisticated computer technology available, that we're genetically 99.9 percent the same. And that the genetic differences within different racial and ethnic groups, within the group, among individuals, are greater than the genetic differences between any two racial groups, as a profile.

There is a book that's out that I've been kind of touting lately, that I'm very interested in. It's called "Non Zero," written by a man named Robert Wright. I don't know if any of you have seen it, but he wrote a book a few years ago called "The Moral Animal," which got a lot of interest.

Essentially, the argument of "Non Zero" is this: The world is—it is a scientific and historical argument. When Martin Luther King propositioned that the arc of history is long, but it bends toward justice, and essentially what the argument is that we have to become more just as a society, if we want to survive, as we grow more complex and more interdependent.

He's not naive. I mean, he understands that science was abused by Nazi Germany, modern organizational techniques, and military capacity was abused by communists, totalitarians, dictatorships. But he basically argues that if you look at it over the whole sweep of history, it is a good thing that we are growing, A, more complex, and B, more interdependent, because it forces us to try to find solutions in which we all win, instead of solutions in which some of us win at everybody else's expense.

As I said, he's not naive. If you have a race for President, one of these guys is going to lose, and one of them's going to win. You know, somebody's going to win, somebody's going to loose the race for Senate. But he argues that the leadership style that is required for this time is that we work together to try to find principled compromises but not say you'll split the difference. Things that are always on the edge of change, so that we can all win.

And what I've tried to do is to modernize the Democratic Party but rooted on very simple ideas: Everybody counts; everybody deserves a chance; people that need help ought to get it, to be empowered to make the most of their lives; and we all do better when we work together—very simple ideas. But you have to have people who can take those simple principles in a very complicated world and make it work for ordinary people.

I don't know anybody I think can do that better than Hillary, and I know I'm biased, because I know we spent 30 years together. I'm just telling you I've seen hundreds and hundreds of people in public life, in both parties, and most of them were better than most folks thought they were. Most people in public life I've known have been honest, hardworking, and did what they actually thought was right 95 percent of the time. But I've never known anybody I thought could do it that well.

So I think that she would do a great job for New York, and I think she will win, only if she can continue to bring clarity to the message, and your presence here tonight and your support for her guarantees that she'll be able to be heard in her own voice, rather than somebody's clever transfiguration of it. And you should be very proud of that. I hope you'll always be proud you came to this dinner tonight.

But the stakes are far bigger than another Senate race, even far bigger than another President's race, and they are just as important, if not more important, than what we did in '92, because we now have the future to run ourselves, and we've got to do a good job of it.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:10 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Vernon and Ann Jordon; and Dwight Bush, chief financial officer, Sato Travel, and his wife, Toni.

Remarks at a Welcoming Ceremony for Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee of India

September 15, 2000

It is a special honor to welcome to the White House the Prime Minister of the world's largest democracy.

Prime Minister Vajpayee, America always has had a great fascination with India, for its rich history, culture, great religions. And increasingly, we are fascinated by India when we think in terms of the future.

We see in India today a rising economic leader, making breathtaking strides in information technology; an emerging environmental leader, promoting ambitious goals for energy efficiency; a pioneering health leader, recently immunizing 140 million children against polio; a leader in our community of

democracies, reminding the world that freedom is not a western value but a universal longing.

Mr. Prime Minister, it is not only India's democracy but India's manner of achieving democracy that will forever inspire America.

On my recent trip to India, I was profoundly moved by the visit that my daughter and our party and I had to the Gandhi Memorial. Tomorrow I will be proud to join you as you dedicate another Gandhi Memorial right here in Washington, DC. It is altogether fitting that both our nations honor him.

Martin Luther King used Gandhi's teachings to show America that, while we held principles of equality we knew to be right, we permitted practices of inequality we knew to be wrong, and we have been changing for the better ever since.

Mr. Prime Minister, from very different histories, India and the United States have forged a common bond, arising from our common commitment to freedom and democracy. Our challenge is to turn our common bond into common achievements. Today we will continue our work in areas where the world needs both America and India to lead if we are to defeat AIDS, reduce poverty, protect the global environment, and open the global economy.

We will discuss our common desire to seek peace through dialog in South Asia. We will talk about our common interests in slowing the spread of nuclear weapons and the broader consequences of proliferation in South Asia. At the same time, we welcome India's commitment to forgo nuclear testing until the treaty banning all nuclear testing comes into force.

No matter our differences—and two such large and diverse countries will always have some differences—as long as we are thinking, if we speak with care and listen with respect, we will find common ground and achieve common aims.

Prime Minister Vajpayee, in your speeches you talk of India's ability to cherish its own marvelous diversity. In your poetry, you write of the importance of unity, saying that people of many faiths can have one dream in every eye.

In America, we too have a dream of unity amidst our diversity. If people as diverse as we can affirm our common humanity and share common dreams, surely we should and can embrace common endeavors. Mr. Prime Minister, I thank you again for the wonderful welcome you and your people accorded to me, the members of my family, and my delegation on our unforgettable trip to India.

I hope this, too, will be a great trip for you and that you will feel the warmth of America's welcome in return. But more than anything else, I hope this is the beginning of a long line of common endeavors.

Thank you for coming here, sir, and welcome to America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:54 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House, where Prime Minister Vajpayee was accorded a formal welcome with full military honors. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of the Prime Minister.

Remarks Prior to a Discussions With Prime Minister Vajpayee and an Exchange With Reporters

September 15, 2000

The President. Let me just briefly say, again, how very pleased I am to have the Prime Minister and his party here in the United States. He went to the United Nations. He was up on the Hill yesterday, talking with the leaders of the Senate and the House. It's great to have him here in the White House.

I think we have worked hard together to move our relationship from one of too little contact and too much suspicion to one of genuine efforts to build a long-term partnership that is in the interests of the people of India and the people of the United States. And I'm encouraged, and I'm very appreciative of Prime Minister Vajpayee's efforts to lead this transformation.

So I want to welcome you again, and thank you for that, sir.

Prime Minister Vajpayee. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I am grateful to you for your kind words and warm hospitality. The parade was really very impressive. But now we have some work to perform.

With your visit to India, a beginning has already been made. We have to pursue that path. Administrations have been working on different issues, and I understand that some agreements have already been arrived at.

As we discuss this, I'm sure differences will be reduced, and a common ground will emerge. The Millennium Summit was a wonderful idea. But the only regret is that the speakers had only 5 minutes. [*Laughter*]

The President. Although, if they had longer, we would still be up there. We wouldn't be down here talking. [*Laughter*]

Prime Minister Vajpayee. [*Inaudible*]—only of summit of religious and spiritual leaders were also good idea. Have them come together and discuss things and find out that there are more things in common than the rituals.

India-U.S. Relations

Q. Mr. President, can you say that you have written a new chapter in the U.S.-India relations to—in this Oval Office during this visit of the Prime Minister of India?

The President. You could say that. I'm not supposed to say such things. [*Laughter*]

Let me say, what I hope we have done is moved our relationship in a new direction. It began, I think, with the great opportunity that the Prime Minister gave me to come to India, to speak in the Indian Parliament Building, which is one of my most memorable experiences as President, and obviously, to see your country and its people. I thank you.

But I think that we should look at this as a long-term effort that—I can speak for myself—I hope very much goes well beyond my Presidency and our service together. I don't think it should be another 20 years before an American President goes to India. I think we should have a regular, sustained partnership. We should identify our common interests. We should be forthright about the places where we still have differences, and we should set about trying to resolve them in a very matter of fact, open and honest way.

But if you look at the way the world is going, it's inconceivable to me that we can build the kind of world we want over the next 10 to 20 years unless there is a very strong partnership between the United States and India.

Q. When the next President is in the Oval Office in November, there's a great deal of concern that the kind of milestones that you have achieved, Mr. President, with India—what about the continuity, either if Mr. Gore comes in or if Mr. Bush comes in, in terms of Indo-U.S. relations?

The President. Well, you know, the way our system works, the election is held in November, and then about 9½ weeks later there is a formal transfer. And there is a period of transition there where we have a chance to talk to the new administration. It certainly will be a priority of mine to make the argument that this should be continued.

Now, since the Vice President has been a part of this administration and an intimate part of all of our foreign policy decisions, I know how he feels about it, and I know he will support it. But I would hope this would become an American commitment that would go beyond political parties, and I believe it will.

Oil Prices

Q. Mr. President, you said last week in New York that oil prices were too high, and you raised the prospect that they could trigger a recession somewhere in the world. There have been protests across Europe about these high prices. And here at home, Americans are facing fuel bills 30 percent higher than last year.

What's the economic risk to the United States and should Americans be worried about a recession here?

The President. Well, I think in the short to medium term, the answer to your second question is no. We have worked very hard over the last 25 years to be a more diverse economy and a less energy-intensive economy in a lot of our production. So we have withstood this oil price fight very much better than we did when it happened before. That's in the short term.

Now, what we need to do is watch the situation closely. The market is still sorting out what to do with the recent OPEC announcement. And I think there will be an evaluation of what the production schedules are, who does what in the various countries, how

quickly. And that will have an impact on what happens to the price and whether we can get it down.

Meanwhile, I'm spending a great deal of time on this, keeping all my options open, looking at the specific problems of various regions of the country and the general problem of the oil prices. I hope that before they go home, the Congress will reauthorize the strategic petroleum reserve. I think that's quite important.

And I will say again that I've had blocked in Congress for a few years now my proposals for tax incentives for businesses and individuals to buy energy conservation or alternative energy products, which I believe would dramatically accelerate our energy independence. So I hope that that will pass, as well.

But we just have to watch this. The OPEC announcement and the actions that have been taken since then are not enough, I think, for the market to fully sort out what it's going to do. But I assure you, I'm spending a lot of time on it, and I will do everything I can to minimize the impact of any adverse impact on the American people.

Wen Ho Lee

Q. Mr. President, if you always had doubts about whether Wen Ho Lee should be in jail, why didn't you share those with us until yesterday? And what do you say to Asian-Americans who are concerned that his ethnicity may have played some role in the fact he was detained for so long?

The President. First of all, I don't believe that. I don't think there's any evidence of that. Let's look at the facts here.

He has admitted to a very serious national security violation. And the most important thing now is that he keep his commitment to the Government to work hard to figure out what happened to those tapes, what was on the tapes, to reconstitute all the information. That's very important.

In America, we have a pretty high standard, and we should, under our Constitution, against pre-trial detention. You have to meet a pretty high bar. I had no reason to believe that that bar had not been met. I think the fact that in such a short timeframe there was an argument that he needed to stay in jail without bail, and then all of a sudden there was a plea agreement which was inconsistent with the claims being made, I thought—that raises a question, not just for Chinese-Americans but for all Americans, about whether we have been as careful as we ought to be about pre-trial detention.

And that's something that—you know, in a Government like ours, that was basically forged out of the concern for abusive executive authority, we sometimes make mistakes, but we normally make mistakes the other way, where we're bending over backwards. So that was my narrow question. Our staff has talked to the Justice Department about it. I'm sure I'll have a chance to talk to the Attorney General. It would have been completely inappropriate for me to intervene. And I don't believe she intervened. This was handled in the appropriate, normal way.

But I want you to understand, there was a serious violation here. He has acknowledged that. We have to get to the bottom of what was on all the tapes. But the narrow thing that I want to illustrate here is that when the United States, whenever we hold anybody in prison who can't get bail or who is interned for a long period of time before being charged and convicted and sentenced, we need to hit a very high threshold. That is the specific thing I wanted to focus on. And I think that there ought to be an analysis of whether or not that threshold was crossed, in light of the plea bargain.

But the American people shouldn't be confused here. That was a very serious offense, and we've got to try to reconstitute what was on the tapes. That's the number one thing we have to do for the national security now.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, on the Middle East, is there any reason for hope now?

The President. I think my answer to—specific answer to your question is you should wait; we should all wait and see. Everybody is working hard; no big breakthroughs; no reason for hope; no reason for despair. They're after it. They know they're on a short timeframe, and they're working it. But I have nothing to report, and I'm staying up with it. But we're working on it.

But you should be encouraged only by the fact that they are working. But there are no breakthroughs, no reason for hope, no reason for despair.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:42 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

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.

September 9

In the morning, the President met with Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel in New York City. Later, he traveled to Flushing Meadows, NY, where he attended the U.S. Open tennis tournament. In the afternoon, he traveled to New York City.

September 11

In the morning, the President traveled to Scarsdale, NY, and in the afternoon, he traveled to Danbury, CT. In the evening, he traveled to New York City and Chappaqua, NY.

The President announced his intention to nominate Toni Fay to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

The President announced his intention to nominate Melvin E. Clark, Jr., to be a member of the Board of Governors for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The President announced his intention to nominate Elwood (Elgie) Holstein, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, at the Department of Commerce.

The President announced his intention to nominate Michael Prescott Goldwater, Hans Mark, and Lynda Hare Scribante to be members of the Board of Trustees of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation.

September 12

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton visited the Douglas Grafflin Elementary School, where they voted in the New York Democratic senatorial primary. Later, the President returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to nominate Nina Archabal, Betty Bengtson, Ron Chew, Henry Glassie, Mary Hubbard, Naomi Shihab Nye, and Vicki Ruiz to be members of the National Council on the Humanities.

September 13

The President announced his intention to nominate Edward Francis Meagher to be Assistant Secretary for Information Technology at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The White House announced that the President will travel to Philadelphia, PA, on September 17, to California on September 23–25, and to Texas on September 27.

The White House announced that Prime Minister Guiliano Amato will make an official working visit to the White House on September 20.

September 14

The President announced his intention to nominate Sheryl R. Marshall and Thomas A. Fink to be members of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board.

The President announced his intention to nominate Paulette H. Holahan to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The President declared a disaster in California and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by an earthquake on September 3.

The White House announced that the President will attend the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) eighth economic leaders meeting on November 15–16 in Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei. After the meeting, the President will travel to Vietnam to meet with President Tran Duc Luong.

September 15

The White House announced that the President will travel to Flint, MI, on September 21.

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 September 12

Steven E. Achelpohl,
of Nebraska, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Nebraska, vice William G. Cambridge, retired.

Joel Gerber,
of Virginia, to be a Judge of the U.S. Tax Court for a term of 15 years after he takes office (reappointment).

Stephen J. Swift,
of Virginia, to be a Judge of the U.S. Tax Court for a term of 15 years after he takes office (reappointment).

Submitted September 13

Richard W. Anderson,
of Montana, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Montana, vice Charles C. Lovell, retired.

Submitted September 14

Nina M. Archabal,
of Minnesota, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2006, vice Nicholas Kanellos, term expired.

Betty G. Bengtson,
of Washington, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2006, vice Ramon A. Gutierrez, term expired.

Ron Chew,
of Washington, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2006, vice Robert I. Rotberg, term expired.

Melvin E. Clark, Jr.,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2002 (reappointment).

Toni G. Fay,
of New Jersey, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2001, vice John Rother, term expired.

Thomas A. Fink,
of Alaska, to be a member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring October 11, 2003 (reappointment).

Henry Glassie,
of Indiana, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2006, vice Martha Congleton Howell, term expired.

Michael Prescott Goldwater,
of Arizona, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation for a term expiring October 13, 2005, vice William W. Quinn, resigned.

Elwood Holstein, Jr.,
of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, vice Terry D. Garcia, resigned.

Mary D. Hubbard,
of Alabama, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2004, vice Theodore S. Hamerow, term expired.

Stephen B. Lieberman,
of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, vice Edward N. Cahn, retired.

Hans Mark,
of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation for the remainder of the term expiring April 17, 2002 (reappointment).

Sheryl R. Marshall,
of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board

for a term expiring October 11, 2002 (reappointment).

Naomi Shihab Nye,
of Texas, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2006, vice Bev Lindsey, term expired.

Vicki L. Ruiz,
of Arizona, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2006, vice Harold K. Skramstad, term expired.

Lynda Hare Scribante,
of Colorado, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation for a term expiring October 13, 2005 (reappointment).

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 September 12

Transcript of a press briefing by Deputy Press Secretary Jake Siewert and Assistant Press Secretary for Foreign Affairs P.J. Crowley

Statement by Press Secretary on the upcoming visit of Prime Minister Guiliano Amato of Italy

Announcement of nomination for the U.S. Tax Court

Announcement of nomination for U.S. District Judge for the District of Nebraska

Announcement: Offical U.S. Delegation to the 2000 Olympic Games

Released September 13

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Transcript of a press briefing by Chief of Staff John Podesta, Commerce Secretary Norman Mineta, NOAA Administrator Jim Baker, and NOAA Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Affairs Rollie Schmitten on U.S. action on Japanese whaling

Statement by the Press Secretary on release of declassified documents relating to Chile during and prior to the Pinochet era

Fact sheet: President Clinton Directs U.S. Actions in Response to Japanese Whaling

Announcement of nomination for U.S. District Judge for the District of Montana

Released September 14

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Statement by the Press Secretary: President Clinton Travels to Brunei and Vietnam

Announcement of nomination for U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Released September 15

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Transcript of a press briefing by Assistant Press Secretary for Foreign Affairs P.J. Crowley, Near East and South Asian Affairs and National Security Council Senior Director Bruce Riedel, and Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs Rick Inderfurth on the President's meeting with Prime Minister Vajpayee of India

Acts Approved by the President

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.