Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, October 13, 1997
Volume 33—Number 41
Pages 1487–1554

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Bill Vetoes
Campaign finance reform legislation—1488, 1506
Democratic National Committee dinner—1539
Internal Revenue Service reform—1543
Middle East peace process—1508
National Association of Police Organizations' "Top Cops"—1534
New Jersey
Democratic gubernatorial candidate Jim McGreevey, reception in West Orange—1517
Democratic National Committee reception in Florham Park—1522
Departure—1510
Metropolitan Baptist Church in Newark—1512
Pennsylvania
Democratic National Committee dinner in Philadelphia—1528
Young Democrats Council and Saxophone Club reception in Philadelphia—1526
Radio address—1487
Virginia, dinner honoring Democratic gubernatorial candidate Don Beyer in Arlington—1489
Welfare reform—1510
White House Conference on Climate Change—1493, 1496

Bill Signings

Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1525
Designating the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington Field Office Memorial Building, statement—1503
National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, statement—1535
Oklahoma City National Memorial Act of 1997, statement—1536
Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998, statement—1544

Bill Vetoes

Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998, line item vetoes
Message transmitting report—1503
Remarks—1501
Partial birth abortion legislation, message—1545

Communications to Congress

See Bill Vetoes

Communications to Federal Agencies

Brazil-U.S. agreement on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, memorandum—1537
Switzerland-U.S. agreement on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, memorandum—1525

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

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

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Oval Office—1501, 1508
Roosevelt Room—1506
South Lawn—1510

Message

Yom Kippur, message—1537

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Israel, President Weizman—1508

Proclamations

Child Health Day—1504
Columbus Day—1547
General Pulaski Memorial Day—1538
German-American Day—1505
Leif Erikson Day—1538
National Children's Day—1548

Proclamations—Continued

National School Lunch Week—1546
White Cane Safety Day—1546

Statements by the President

See also Bill Signings
Campaign finance reform legislation, Senate action—1510
Crime statistics—1487
Fast-track trading authority legislation, House action—1524
Terrorist organizations, action against—1524

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1553
Checklist of White House press releases—1552
Digest of other White House announcements—1549
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1551

Week Ending Friday, October 10, 1997

Statement on Crime Statistics

October 3, 1997

Today the Federal Bureau of Investigation released its final crime statistics for 1996, and the results are good news for all Americans. We are finally—and decisively—tipping the scales of justice in favor of law-abiding Americans. Overall crime is down for the fifth year in a row, with the biggest reductions coming in violent crime (6 percent)—and especially murders (9 percent). Reported rapes, robberies, assaults, and all types of property crimes are down from the previous year. Even the arrest rate for violent juveniles, which had skyrocketed for 7 years, has now gone down for 2 years in a row.

For 5 years, my administration has worked with police, prosecutors, school principals, and community leaders on a tough, smart crime strategy to attack violent crime. Together, we have fought for more police in our communities, fewer guns on our streets, tougher punishment for violent offenders, and better opportunities for our kids. Today's crime statistics show that, armed with these tools, we are moving in the right direction.

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 3 but was embargoed for release until 9 a.m., October 4.

The President's Radio Address

October 4, 1997

Good morning. Today I want to talk about our responsibility for raising our children and strengthening our families. Six years ago yesterday, when I announced that I would seek the Presidency, I said that our greatness depends upon our ability to create opportunity for all, get responsibility from all, and build a community of all Americans; and that the role of Government was to give our people the tools and establish the environment that would enable them to build that kind of America. I also said that nothing would ever replace the fundamental role of citizens' responsibility.

That is nowhere more important than when it comes to the family. The family is the cornerstone of our society. It unites us across all our faiths. This week, for example, Jewish parents at Rosh Hashana say a blessing for the family and over their children. The United States Catholic Conference has noted, "The most important work to help our children is done quietly—in our homes and neighborhoods, in our parishes and community organizations. No government can love a child and no policy can substitute for a family's care, but clearly," the Catholic Conference has noted, "families can be helped or hurt" by the actions of government.

Here we have tried to help families. From improving our schools to helping parents reconcile the demands of work and childrearing, to expanding access to college and health care, to punishing domestic violence, families have always been at the heart of our concerns. We have worked hard to help parents take responsibility for their children and even to require that as much as we can.

We passed the family leave law to allow parents to take some time off to care for sick children or welcome new babies. We've raised the minimum wage and increased the earned-income tax credit so that Americans who work full time will be able to raise their children out of poverty. We cracked down on deadbeat dads, increasing child support collection by 50 percent. We're building a new system of welfare that promotes work and responsible parenting. And we're doing everything we can to punish domestic violence and to reduce it. And of course, the strong economy we have helped to build has created millions of high-paying jobs, bringing dignity, stability, and opportunity for millions of families.

This has been an important concern of all the members of our administration for a long time. Even before we took office, the Vice President and Tipper Gore had begun holding their annual family conferences in Nashville, exploring all the various challenges facing our families in their efforts to stay together and raise their children. And the First Lady has been working on these issues for 25 years. Soon she'll be holding a national conference here on child care to help people get affordable, accessible quality child care. And she's raised some brave questions, like whether we ought to toughen our divorce laws to make it more difficult for parents to walk away from their children.

But the most important work always is done in the hearts and homes of individuals. And it's clear to everyone that in recent decades too many parents, especially men, have not taken their responsibilities seriously enough to their families, their children, and themselves. And there are serious consequences. We know, for example, that the simple failure to pay child support is one of the chief reasons women and children are on welfare. And this week, the Vice President and Secretary Riley released a report showing that when fathers do take an active role, their children do better—much better—in school.

The need for men to take responsibility for themselves and their families is something that unites Americans of all faiths and backgrounds and beliefs. A couple of years ago we had a million man march in the District of Columbia which highlighted the importance of African-American men building families and raising their children and taking responsibility. There were many people who had a lot of political differences with some of the speakers, but no one questioned the need or the sincerity of the hundreds of thousands of men who came from all across America to reaffirm their personal responsibility for their children.

Today, thousands of members of a Christian men's organization, Promise Keepers, are meeting on The Mall in Washington. Again, there are those who have political differences with some of the statements which have been made by some leaders of the organization. But again, no one can question the sincerity of the hundreds of thousands of men who have filled football stadiums across our country and who are willing to reassume their responsibilities to their families and to their children and, therefore, to our future. Their presence here is yet another example of the Nation's understanding and attention to the need to strengthen our families. There is nothing more important.

When all of us, men and women, take responsibility for raising our children and passing on our values, our families are strengthened. And when our families are stronger, America is stronger.

When I think of how many parents there are out there like my mother, who sacrificed to raise their children, when Hillary and I look with bittersweet pride at our own daughter going off to college now, I'm more acutely aware than ever of the special responsibilities and the wonderful rewards of parenthood. For me, there has been no job, even the Presidency, that is more important. And that should be true for all mothers and fathers. The future of our children is truly in our hands.

Thank for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.

Remarks on Campaign Finance Reform Legislation

October 4, 1997

For 5 years now we have watched the bipartisan effort to reform our campaign finance laws die at the hands of a filibuster in the United States Senate. I hope this year will be different. Republican Senator John McCain and Democratic Senator Russ Feingold have a strong bill that would curb the power of special interests and increase the confidence of the American people in our campaign finance system.

But this Tuesday, their opponents will try once again to kill this bipartisan bill, which has the support of every Democratic Senator and a number of Republicans. They'll try it by using a ''poison pill'' amendment that will guarantee that reform dies one more time.

Make no mistake, a vote for this killer amendment is a vote to block meaningful reform.

NOTE: The remarks were recorded at 11:10 a.m. on October 4 in the Oval Office at the White House for later broadcast.

Remarks at a Dinner Honoring Democratic Gubernatorial Candidate Don Beyer in Arlington, Virginia

October 4, 1997

Thank you. Well, Don, I can say yes to almost everything you asked for. [*Laughter*] I don't know about the car deal. We'll have to negotiate that. [*Laughter*] Everything else, put me down for a ''yes.'' [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the warm welcome and thank you for being here for Don and Megan. Thank you for inviting me. I want to begin by expressing my enormous admiration and gratitude for the friendships of two people in this audience with whom I served as Governor, Chuck Robb and Gerry Baliles, two of the greatest Governors Virginia ever saw.

In addition to everything Don said, I also would be remiss if I did not thank Gerry for his leadership of the special commission I established on the future of the airline industry. When we started, every airline company in America but one was losing money. We were in terrible shape. But it is a very different situation today, thanks in no small measure to the recommendations that Gerry Baliles made several years ago that we have implemented. And the country is in your debt, and we thank you, sir.

And I also want you to know from my point of view, I'm not sure there is a person in the United States Senate, given his background, his constituency, the battles he's been through, that when he was really needed, showed more consistent personal courage as a public figure than Chuck Robb has these last 5 years. And I am very grateful to him for that.

I think the most battle-hardened veterans of war would tell you that there are many different ways of displaying courage and very few people can display them in every way you should in life. Everyone knew what a great battlefield record Chuck Robb had, but I have seen him stand up under withering personal attacks. I have seen him take votes that people in much safer constituencies than his would not take. I have seen him honorably and in a friendly manner disagree with his President when he thought I was wrong, and every time I knew he was doing exactly what he thought was right. And you should be very, very proud of that.

I want to compliment your whole Democratic team. I was glad to see Bill Dolan out there, and I miss L.F. Payne in Congress, but it will be nice seeing him in State office in Virginia. And thank you both for running, and thank you for being a part of this.

Let me say that I have been especially enthusiastic about Don Beyer's campaign for Governor, for what I think are good reasons. But I think the stakes are also very high. Everybody knows that in general Virginia has been a Republican State that able Democrats have been able to beat the odds in on occasion in the last 20 years. I have enjoyed a lot of friends and a lot of support from this State for which I am very grateful.

But I want you to understand why I think this governorship is important to the future of the country. And if you'll give me a few minutes, this is not exactly a political speech, but you have just a—not very long before the election, and I want you to understand what I believe the significance of this election is to the children of this State, to the future of this State, and perhaps for the message it might send to our whole country as we move into next year when there will be 36 Governors' races like this throughout the country.

It was—just 2 days ago marked the 6th anniversary of my formal entry into the race for President on October 3, 1991. I can't believe it was so long ago. [*Laughter*] At that time, I had been Governor for quite a long while, and I was Democrat by heritage, instinct, and conviction. I was extremely frustrated by the state of play in our national debate because I thought there was too much hot air, too much rhetoric, too much sort of tired, old fights replaying themselves over and over again in Washington that had very

little to do with the future that I was struggling to build for our people in our State.

And I said, ''Look, I have a vision of what our country should be like in the 21st century, and I don't think we're moving there. I believe that we ought to be a nation in which everyone who takes the responsibility for doing so should have an opportunity to make the most of his or her own life. I believe we ought to be a country in which we are coming together across the lines that divide us into one America, not being divided for short-term political gain. And I believe we ought to be a country that continues to lead the world for peace and freedom and prosperity. And if we are going to be that kind of country, that means we have to take a new direction. We have to favor policies that are pushing the future, not the past. We have to lead, not follow. We have to work for unity, not division. We have to work for people, not power politics. And we have to work in a way that supports progressive change, not the status quo.''

And that means that we have to do things very differently. It also means that we need a different kind of Government, a Government that doesn't try to do everything but doesn't pretend it can do nothing. That's the new Republican message, basically: Government is the enemy and people don't need any help.

My view is that the role of Government is to give people the tools to make the most of their own lives and to try to create the conditions in which they can succeed in doing that. That's what I believe.

For almost 5 years now we've been implementing that approach. And uncomfortably for our opponents, there is now a record on which people can make a judgment. And I'm really proud that America is better off today than it was 5 years ago, much better off. We believed that we could have an economic policy that reduced the deficit and balanced the budget and still have money left over to invest in our future, in our children, in education. We believed that we could expand trade in ways that both were free and fair. And the results have given us the strongest economy in generations.

We believed we could fight crime in ways that were tough but also smart, to try to keep kids out of trouble as well as punishing those who got into trouble. And we believed we ought to put 100,000 police on the street, and we ought to take the assault weapons off the street. And I saw a lot of good people—and we didn't think it would kill anybody if they had to wait a while to buy a handgun until we checked out whether they had a criminal record.

Now, the results are in and crime is dropping. And I believe that new approach is one of the reasons every single law enforcement group in this State endorsed Don Beyer for Governor, because they know—[*applause*].

We believe we had to end the culture of poverty and welfare dependency in a way that was not just tough but was also pro-family. But it was one thing to require people to go to work, but you had to do it in a way that also supported our fundamental and most important job, which is the raising of our children. So we could be tough on work, but we had to be good to children. And that's why we said no when the people in the other party tried to take away the guarantee of health care and nutrition to our children, and why we said, ''If you want to require people to go to work, make sure they have job training and make sure they've got child care when they go to work so their kids will be all right, and then we'll be successful.''

That approach has given us the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history and the lowest percentage of Americans on welfare since 1970. After 20 years of immigration and a lot of people from all over the world who were on low income, we still have the lowest percentage of our people on welfare we've had since 1970. So it worked.

We also reduced the size of the Government by 300,000 people, got rid of 16,000 pages of regulation, and gave more authority back to State and local government, forged more partnerships with the private sector. All that worked.

And now we are looking to facing the future. And that's where the Governors come in. The job of Governor is now more important than it was 5 years ago. Why? Because Governors have more responsibility. And what is their responsibility? Well, if we know what the right path is on crime, if we know what the right path is on welfare, if we are

practicing fiscal responsibility, what does it take to create that vision in the lives of the American people, to create opportunity for all responsible people? What does it take to bring us together across the lines that divide us? What does it take to keep America strong, leading the world?

Well, among other things, it takes an unlimited commitment, in my judgment, to the proposition that we have to preserve our environment while we grow our economy. That means Don Beyer should be Governor of Virginia.

Our administration has passed the Safe Drinking Water Act. We've cleaned up millions of tons of chemicals from the air. We're tightening air pollution regulations. We are working very hard across a whole broad span of things. We have cleaned up more toxic waste dumps in 4 years than the previous administrations did in the last 12, and we're going to clean up 500 more.

But there are still some things that the States have to do, and that we have to work in partnership with the States on. The *pfiesteria* thing is one issue. The Chesapeake is another. It matters who the Governor is. I'm telling you, if you care about the environment, it is not enough to vote for Members of Congress and for the Presidency on environmental issues. It really matters what the environmental philosophy of the Governor of Virginia is, and it will have a lot to do with your future. That's the first thing.

The second big issue: One of the major contributions of the Democrats in Congress to this balanced budget agreement was the biggest expansion in health care for children since Medicaid was enacted in 1965: $24 billion to provide enough money to insure 5 million more children in America, and almost all of them in working families who don't have health insurance. About half the kids in the country don't have health insurance.

How are we going to do that? In a partnership with the States. You need a Governor who believes that these kids ought to have health insurance and who will be devoted to implementing that program in the proper way. Virginia has a lot of people who are working hard to raise their children. They show up for work every day. They pay their taxes; they ought to see that their kids have health insurance. It will not happen unless this legislation which we passed is actually made real in the lives of the children of Virginia. And it will matter a very great deal who the Governor is. That's another reason to be for Don Beyer for Governor of Virginia.

The third reason—and in my judgment, even though it's not the last point I want to make, it is still the overriding point—is the question of education. Virginia has been devoted to the cause of education for a long time—perhaps the best system of higher education in the United States, certainly one of the four or five best systems in the country, in Virginia. You know that.

We also know that our system of K through 12 education is not as good as it ought to be. And there's a lot of ferment and debate in America about that. Don asked me to veto any attempt to divert public school money to the private schools. That's my speech. I agree with that. I'm all for more choices for people within the public schools, and I understand why people make other choices, and I like privately funded scholarship programs for private schools. But the truth is that most of our public schools today are underfunded, not overfunded. You will not make education better for the vast majority of people by further weakening the funding level. They should be held accountable. Standards should be raised. We should improve them.

But what are we going to do? There are a lot of things that I could talk about. We could stay here until dawn talking about education. But I'll just mention two that Don has made important. One is technology. We now know that, properly implemented, technology in our schools can, for example, do things—we know that it will help the brilliant kids who already know more than their parents do about computers. [*Laughter*] We know that. But what we now know is, that properly implemented in the early grades, technology can help children who have learning problems, can lift reading levels, can lift comprehension levels. We know that.

And in our budget we have funds that would put us on the way toward making sure we hook up every library and school classroom to the Internet by the year 2000. He wants to have one computer for every five students. That is the future of America.

That's another good reason to be for Don Beyer for Governor of Virginia.

You already heard Don express his opinion about the standards issue, whether we should have national standards and a national exam. And you know that his opponent is against it. Let me tell you, if there was ever an example of the conflict between ideology and reality, this is it. There is not a single major country in the world, except the United States, that does not have national standards for what constitutes adequate knowledge in the dominant language of the country, in mathematics, in science, and a number of other things—only the United States.

Now, we have said, ''Well, we don't want to do that because we've always had local control of the schools. We don't want the Federal Government to engage in some power grab.'' And that's the sort of ideological hit we're taking for doing this. Let me remind you that the first call for national standards and national exams to measure them came at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville in 1989, endorsed by President George Bush—I stayed up all night long writing that national education goals statement—endorsed by Republican and Democratic Governors alike. The Republican Governors were insisting on it.

I got elected. We said, ''Let's do it.'' All of a sudden they said the Federal Government is trying to take over the schools. [*Laughter*] Mathematics is the same in Virginia and Vermont. [*Laughter*] Language is the same in Michigan and Maine. This is crazy.

Furthermore, our plan simply says that the States can voluntarily participate or not. The local school districts can voluntarily participate or not. The Federal Government's sole role in the bill that Chuck Robb voted for that passed 87 to 12 in the Senate is to pay for the development of the test to be supervised by the bipartisan or nonpartisan national board established by Congress, with Republican and Democrats and educators on it, already supervising tests given in 40 States but to only selected students. So that every fourth grader could take a reading test. If the kids have not been here long enough, obviously they shouldn't be held to a knowledge in English that they couldn't possibly make. So that's not a problem; we're not going to unfairly discriminate against the children of immigrants.

Nothing in this test can be used to hold back kids. This test is designed to say: If you don't know what you need to know, here is a roadmap; here's what you should know; here's what you don't know; here's what your teacher, here's what your schools can do to make sure you get up to snuff. I think the kids that are the most disadvantaged kids in the country have the biggest stake in the success of this national standards program. How will we ever get all our public schools up unless there are high standards by which we can measure them?

Now, if there was ever an issue which ought to determine—with no other issues taken into account—the outcome of a Governor's race in any State in America, it should be the education standards issue. And in Virginia, which is proud of itself, from the time of Thomas Jefferson, in leading the country in education, surely you ought to send a message to the country that Virginia will vote for national standards of excellence for all our children in the next election and not against it—surely.

And there's one last issue I want you to think about, because I think it sends a big message to the country. We are in the process of becoming a truly multiracial, multiethnic democracy in a way that no other nation is. Now, India is bigger than we are and, believe it or not, they have even more languages spoken within their border. Russia has many, many different languages spoken, many different ethnic groups. But the difference is, almost all the people who are in different groups live only with their own group on their own piece of land, and they're not nearly as blended as we are. With all of our problems of segregation, we are clearly becoming the most integrated, multiracial, multiethnic, multireligious democracy in the world.

And as I'm sure virtually everyone is this room knows, based on the best evidence we have, the most diverse school district in the United States is Fairfax County, Virginia—in the entire country. Look around this room. We've got all different kinds of people, all different backgrounds. In a global economy, in a global society, where the real threats to

our future are threats that can cross national borders, terrorist groups, drug traffickers, international criminal gangs, people robbing accounts through clever uses of computers, whether we can work together and live together and solve our problems together will determine our success as a nation.

I think the person who is elected Governor of Virginia sends a clear signal about what this State, which was at the base of our founding and wants to be in the vanguard of our future, believes about whether we can build one America. And that's another big reason to be for Don Beyer for Governor of Virginia.

I worked with Chuck Robb. I worked with Gerry Baliles. I worked with Doug Wilder. I want to work in a new way with Don Beyer. But I want you to do it, not for me and not because we really want to say our new Democratic Party is accepted in Virginia but because we're building a new America for the 21st century, because we have within our hands the capacity to build a future better than any past the United States has ever had, able to put all of you in this room and all the people you represent together in an incredible kaleidoscope of opportunity, achievement, and common endeavor.

But it really will matter who your Governor is; what the priorities are; whether we are for the future, not the past; change not the status quo; unity, not division; people, not politics. That's what Don Beyer represents. You've got a few weeks to go out and make sure that he wins on election night, and I want you to do it.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:35 p.m. in Chesapeake Hall at the National Airport Hilton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Mr. Beyer's wife, Megan; William D. Dolan III, Democratic candidate for attorney general of Virginia; L.F. Payne, Jr., Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor of Virginia; and L. Douglas Wilder, former Virginia Governor.

Opening Remarks at the White House Conference on Climate Change

October 6, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for your remarks and your remarkable leadership to help us keep our Earth in the balance. Thank you, Father O'Donovan, for letting me come home to Georgetown one more time to discuss a matter of immense importance to America and its future. I thank the Members of Congress and the members of the Cabinet and the administration who are here, all those who have agreed to serve on the panels, and all you who have come to be part of this important day.

Six years ago last Friday—I can hardly believe it, but it was 6 years ago last Friday that I announced my intention to run for President, challenging America to embrace and to vigorously pursue a vision of our country for the 21st century: to make the American dream alive for every person responsible to work for it, to keep our country the world's strongest force for peace and freedom and prosperity, to bring our people together across all the lines that divide us into one America.

Shortly afterward I came here to Georgetown to this great hall to outline specific strategies and new policies to achieve that vision, rooted in our values of opportunity and responsibility, faith and family and community, designed to help Americans seize the opportunities and solve the problems of this new age. It was clear to me that our new direction had to be rooted in some basic guideposts, that we had to be oriented toward the future, not the past; toward change, not the status quo; toward partnership, not division; toward giving all a chance, not just the few; and finally toward making sure America leads, not follows.

We tried to develop a new approach to Government, where we didn't claim to do everything and we wouldn't tolerate doing

nothing, but instead we focused on giving people the tools to make the most of their own lives and creating the conditions that would allow them to succeed.

And we had new policies, the economic policies and trade policies, education policy, crime and welfare, policies toward the working poor, policies to bolster families and help them balance work and childrearing, policies in health care and foreign policy and, yes, policies in the environment.

In the last 4 years and 8 months, I think it's fair to say that, together, we have made real progress toward that vision for the 21st century. We stand at the threshold of that century stronger than most people thought was possible back in 1991, with our economy thriving, our social fabric mending, our leadership in the world strong. We have a solid foundation of achievement on which to stand as we take on the remaining challenges to build that bridge to the 21st century.

We are back here at Georgetown today because global climate change clearly is one of the most important of those challenges, and also one of the most complex, crossing the disciplines of environmental science, economics, technology, business, politics, international development, and global diplomacy, affecting how we and all others on this planet will live, support our families, grow our food, produce our energy, and realize our dreams in the new century.

That's why we've put together this White House Conference on Climate Change, bringing together experts and leaders with a wide range of knowledge and a wide range of views. People of goodwill bring to this conference many honest disagreements about the nature of the threat we face and how we should respond. That is healthy in a democracy like ours. My hope is that we will take advantage of this forum to actually talk with each other rather than past each other. For it is our responsibility to work together to achieve two vital and compatible goals, ensuring the continued vitality of our planet and expanding economic growth and opportunity for our people.

Despite the complexities of these challenges, we have good reason to be optimistic, beginning with our 220-year record of making all manner of difficult problems solvable and importantly, a very good record in the last generation of environmental progress. For in the last generation alone, we came together to heed Rachel Carson's warnings and banned DDT and other poisons. We cleaned up rivers so filthy they were catching on fire, phased out lead in gasoline and chemicals that were eating a hole in the ozone layer. We worked with citizens to conserve the headwaters forest of Northern California, restore the Florida Everglades, protect Yellowstone National Park from the assaults of mining, in each case proving that environmental stewardship does not have to hamstring economic growth.

Indeed, in tackling the difficult task of cutting sulfur dioxide emissions with an innovative system of permit trading, the United States is well ahead of the schedule we set for ourselves and well below the projected cost in cleaning the environment. I believe we find that same common ground as we address the challenge of climate change.

Before we begin our discussion today, I think it's important for me to explain the four principles that will guide my approach to this issue. First, I'm convinced that the science of climate change is real. We'll hear more about this today from our first panel. But for me the bottom line is that, although we do not know everything, what we do know is more than enough to warrant responsible action.

The great majority of the world's climate scientists have concluded, if we don't cut our emission of greenhouse gases, temperatures will rise and will disrupt the global climate. In fact, most scientists say this process has already begun. I might add that I had nothing to do with scheduling this conference on the day which is predicted to be the hottest October 6th that we have ever had in Washington, DC. [*Laughter*]

I know not everyone agrees on how to interpret the scientific conclusions. I know not everyone shares my assessment of the risks. But I think we all have to agree that the potential for serious climate disruption is real. It would clearly be a grave mistake to bury our heads in the sand and pretend the issue will go away.

The second principle is that when the nations of the world meet in December in

Kyoto, Japan, we must be prepared to commit to realistic and binding goals on our emissions of greenhouse gases. With 4 percent of the world's population, we enjoy more than 20 percent of the world's wealth, which helps to explain why we also produce more than 20 percent of the world's greenhouse gases. If we expect other nations to act on the problem, we must show leadership.

The third principle is that we must embrace solutions that will allow us to continue to grow our economy as we honor our global responsibilities and our responsibilities to our children. We've worked far too hard to revitalize the American dream to jeopardize our progress now. Therefore, we must emphasize flexible market-based approaches. We must work with business and industry to find the right ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We must promote technologies that make energy production and consumption more efficient.

There are many people here today from companies that are addressing the climate change in innovative ways, taking steps that will save money for American families even as we reduce the threat of global warming. For example, a number of leading electric utilities, including AEP, Southern Company, Niagara Mohawk, and Northern States Power, are working with homeowners to promote a new technology called geo-exchange, using geothermal pumps to heat and cool homes far more cheaply than traditional systems while reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 40 percent or more. Ballard Power and United Technologies are leading pioneers in developing fuel cells that are so clean, their only exhaust is distilled water.

Right now, Ballard is working with Chrysler, Mercedes Benz, and Toyota to introduce fuel cells into new cars. Both of these technologies represent the kind of creative solutions that will make our job easier.

The fourth principle is that we must expect all nations, both industrialized and developing, to participate in this process in a way that is fair to all. It is encouraging that so many nations in so many parts of the world are developing so rapidly. That is good news for their people, and it is good for America's economic future. But as we've seen right here at home, rising energy demands that accompany economic development traditionally have meant large increases in greenhouses gas emissions. In fact, if current trends continue, emissions from the developing world will likely eclipse those from the developed world in the next few decades.

But they have an opportunity to pursue a different future without sacrificing economic growth. The industrialized world alone cannot assume responsibility for reducing emissions. Otherwise, we'll wind up with no reduction in emissions within a matter of a few decades. In Kyoto, therefore, we will ask for meaningful but equitable commitments from all nations. Second, we must explore new ways for American businesses to help these rapidly growing countries to meet their developmental needs with cleaner and more efficient energy technologies.

Today I hope we can take a step forward in putting all four of these principles into effect. We have studied this issue long enough to know that there are sensible options for action. It is our job now to pull them together into a coherent plan.

Nearly three decades ago when the Apollo astronauts first went to the Moon, we gained an entirely new perspective on the global challenge we face today. For looking down on Earth from the vantage point that revealed no political boundaries or divisions, the astronauts had the same chilling sensation. They were simply awestruck by how tiny and fragile our planet is, protected from the harsh void of space by an atmosphere that looked as thin and delicate as the skin of an onion. Every astronaut since has experienced the same insight, and they've even given it a name, the Overview Effect. It has instilled in each new astronaut a passion to convince people we must work together on Earth's behalf. Rusty Schweickart has said, ''You realize that on that little blue and white thing, there is everything that means anything to you, all history and music and poetry and art and death and birth and love, all of it on that little spot out there you can cover with your thumb.''

To the best of my knowledge, only one person here has actually experienced the Overview Effect firsthand, Dr. Mae Jemison, a former shuttle astronaut and current international development expert who will partici-

pate in our third panel discussion this afternoon. Nonetheless, I challenge everyone in this room to rise to a vantage point high enough to experience the Overview Effect. It will enable us to reach common ground.

Let me say when the Vice President was talking and Father O'Donovan was talking, I was looking around this old hall that I have loved for so long, and I found it utterly amazing that I first came here 33 years ago. I was reading this morning up at Camp David the list of people who were going to be here today, and I found it utterly amazing that a few of you I first talked to as long as 20 years ago about the need to build an alternative energy future for America. And I find it completely amazing that five-eighths of my Presidency is behind me.

I make these points for this reason: If you think about the benchmarks in your own life, it doesn't take long to live your life. And what seems at the beginning of your life a very long time, seems to have passed in the flash of an eye once you have experienced it. These great developments, such as the one we're here to talk about today, occur over many life spans. And popular democracies are far more well-organized to take advantage of opportunities or deal with immediate crises than they are to do the responsible thing, which is to take a moderate but disciplined approach far enough in advance of a train coming down the track to avoid leaving our children and our grandchildren with a catastrophe.

So I ask you to think about that. We do not want the young people who sat on these steps today, for whom 33 years will also pass in the flash of an eye, to have to be burdened or to burden their children with our failure to act.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:30 a.m. in Gaston Hall at Georgetown University. In his remarks, he referred to Father Leo J. O'Donovan, president, Georgetown University; and Apollo astronaut Russell L. Schweickart.

Remarks During the White House Conference on Climate Change

October 6, 1997

[*The first panel discussion on the science of global warming and climate change is joined in progress.*]

The President. Isn't there some evidence already that malaria in nations and areas where it presently exists is becoming more prevalent and moving to higher climates?

[*At this point, Diana Liverman, chair, National Academy of Sciences Committee on Human Dimensions of Climate Change, confirmed increases in malaria in developing countries and in the United States due to climate change and population mobility.*]

The President. Let me ask you one other question, because—let me go back to what I said in the beginning. This is one of the most difficult problems of democracy because we get 100 percent of the people to agree that it exists, and only 10 percent of the people have experienced it and another 10 percent of the people can imagine it and, therefore, are willing to deal with it. You still have to have 51 percent in order to develop any kind of political consensus for doing anything, I think, commensurate with the need.

So would you say—I have—and I know this happens to a lot of people—but I had a number of people—I had a young Congressman in to see me the other day who was a member of the Republican Party, and he said, "You know, in my State we've had 3 100-year floods in 10 years." I met a man over my vacation who said that he was moving away from the place he had lived for a decade because it was a completely different place than it had been just 10 years ago. It was hotter; there were more mosquitoes; it was a very different and difficult place. Do you believe that these anecdotal experiences are likely related to climate change, or are they just basically people's imagination?

[*Dr. Liverman cited surveys on perceptions of climate change which correlated with observed temperature changes.*]

The President. Dr. Karl, do you want to say anything?

[*Thomas Karl, senior scientist, National Climatic Data Center, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, mentioned statistics showing record precipitation in six States in 1996. The Vice President commented on budget increases related to flooding and other disasters, and then asked about the predicted heat index for Washington, DC, in the next century.*]

Dr. Karl. I think it's up to 105 or 110. I don't know the exact numbers, but——

Dr. Liverman. It's under 100 now, and it's going to go to about 105 on average, they think, during the summer months.

The Vice President. Well, we'll get some more on that. [*Laughter*]

The President. We certainly will. [*Laughter*] One reason I believe this is occurring is that James Lee Witt is the only member of my Cabinet who is actually disappointed when his budget goes up. [*Laughter*] And he's had a lot of disappointments these last 5 years.

I'd like to now call on Donald Wilhite to talk about the relationship—we've heard about increased precipitation, and I'd like to ask him to talk about drought and the apparent paradox in drought patterns and increased precipitation patterns and what implications this might have for American agriculture, which is a terribly important part of our economy. And we have all been counting on it being a very important part of our export economy for the indefinite future.

[*Donald Wilhite, director, National Drought Mitigation Center, University of Nebraska, discussed the impact of drought on U.S. agricultural production.*]

The President. I want to ask a question and try to make sure that we are all as clear as we can be based on what is known about two apparently contradictory things, that is that the total volume of precipitation has increased virtually everywhere and the number and severity of droughts has increased across the country.

Now, Dr. Karl said earlier that part of the explanation is that the precipitation we're getting is coming in bigger bursts. But what I would like to do is have somebody offer basically a line of explanation that everyone in the audience, and hopefully those who will be following these proceedings, can understand. Why did it happen at the same time that we had more drought and more floods? How could we have more droughts when the aggregate amount of precipitation on an annual basis was increased? And I think it's important that people kind of get why that happens.

[*Dr. Wilhite explained that increased intense precipitation led to very high runoff, and increased temperatures led to increased evaporation and soil drying.*]

The President. So I think that's important. When the temperatures warm, they dry the soil and create the conditions for the floods simultaneously.

Dr. Wilhite. That's correct.

The President. And because these floods don't—wash away the soil, rather than sink down into the soil, you get very little benefit out of them, and farmers lose a lot of topsoil.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. Let me ask you a follow-up question, and perhaps someone else would like to answer. But I think it's important again, and forgive—for those of you in the audience who know a lot more about this than I do, you will have to forgive me, but I'm also trying to imagine how this is going to be absorbed by our Nation and by people who will be following this.

It appears that we are headed into a powerful El Niño, and I wonder if one of you would just simply very briefly explain what that is and whether you believe there is a link between the power of the El Niño and climate change.

[*Robert Watson, Director for Environment, World Bank, and Chair, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, explained the effects of the El Niño phenomena on temperature and precipitation patterns throughout the world. The Vice President then noted the similarity between attitudes toward global warming and past skepticism concerning the detrimental effects of tobacco.*]

The President. We've got to wrap up the first panel and get on to the next one, but I'd like to ask—I think I'd like to ask, John, you to respond to this. If anyone else wishes to, you're welcome to. I think there is a more sophisticated question to be asked—although the Vice President is right, there still are some people who claim that this scientific case that I have been completely persuaded by has not been made. I think the more difficult argument, John, goes something like this: Look, you put all this stuff in the atmosphere and it stays there for 100 years at least, and maybe longer, and so what's the hurry? And in a democracy, it's very hard to artificially impose things on people they can't tangibly feel, and so why shouldn't we just keep on rocking along with the kind of technological progress we're making now until there really is both better scientific information and completely painless technological fixes that are apparent to all? Why shouldn't we just wait until all doubt has been resolved and hopefully we have even better technology—and because, after all, the full impact of whatever we do if we start tomorrow won't be felt for decades and maybe even for a century?

Number one, if that's true, how quickly could we lower the temperature of the planet below what it otherwise would be, and, number two, what about the argument on the merits?

[*John Holdren, member, President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, and professor, Harvard University, used graphs to demonstrate the need to reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere as soon as possible in order to avoid unmanageable degrees of climate change in the future.*]

The President. But I do want to make the following points: Number one, we can't get to the green line unless there is a global agreement that involves both the developing and the developed countries. Number two—however, that's not an excuse for us to do nothing because if we do something, it will be better than it would have been otherwise because we're still the biggest contributor and will be until sometime well into the next century. And number three, based on everything we know, it will be easier in some ways, particularly if they get the financial help they need, for developing countries to choose a different energy future in the first place than it will be for the developed countries to make the adjustments, which is not to say we don't have to make the adjustments but to say that—I have read a lot of the press coverage and people saying, oh, well, we're just using this for an excuse or we're not being fair to them or we don't want them to have a chance to grow. That is not true.

The United States cannot maintain and enhance its own standard of living unless the developing nations grow and grow rapidly. We support that. But they can choose a different energy future, and that has to be a part of this. But it's not an excuse for us to do nothing, because whatever we do, we're going to make it better for ourselves and for the rest of the world than it otherwise would have been. But I think it's important to point out what John showed us there on the green line. The green line—it requires—to reach the green line, we have to have a worldwide action plan.

[*Following conclusion of the first panel discussion, the second panel discussion on the role of technology in reducing greenhouse gas emissions is joined in progress.*]

The President. Let me just say before we go on to the transportation sector, these presentations have been quite important. I remember 20 years ago, more or less—maybe a little less now, I can't remember exactly when—the Congress voted, or the Federal Government at least required—it might have been a regulatory action—that the new powerplants not use natural gas anymore and that we phase out of them because we grossly underestimated how much natural gas we had. And we thought we could go to clean coal because we didn't want to build nuclear plants, for all the reasons that were clear.

And one of the biggest problems we face now in trying to make a reasoned judgment about how quickly we can reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and by how much, is the need not to be unfair to electric utilities that have billions of dollars invested in Government-approved powerplants that they have not yet fully amortized. Therefore, insofar—and this

applies both to buildings and to the utilities themselves, about which these two speakers have spoken. You can either conserve more in the production of electricity, or you can have the people who consume it conserve more, or you can change the basis on which the plants work, which is the most expensive way to do it. Therefore, insofar as we can do more in terms of how much electricity people use or how much waste heat you recover, either one of those things is a far preferable—far preferable—alternative than to change the basis on which plants that have already been built are being amortized and will generate huge amounts of saving at lower costs if we can do it.

At the end of this session, we'll get around to sort of the skeptical economist's take on the technological fix. We'll get around to that later. But I just think it's important that we focus on this specific issue, because if our goal is to minimize economic dislocation, then having conservation by the end-users, the people who have the buildings, for example, whether they're manufacturers or residential buildings or otherwise business buildings, and having recovery of waste heat are clearly, I think, the preferable alternatives and clearly the less expensive alternatives.

I'd like to call on Mary Good now, who was the Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology in our administration for 4 years and now is the managing member of Venture Capital Investors. I want her to talk a little bit about the potential for technological advances to reduce emissions in the transportation sector and to focus particularly on the partnership for new generation vehicles that we've been working on with the auto companies and the UAW since this administration took office. And Mary had a lot to do with it.

There is also a huge debate here about how much we can do how quickly. And we have to make the best judgment about this in determining what to say about where we are in Kyoto, because transportation, as Secretary Peña said, occupies such a large part of this whole equation. So, Mary, have at it. Tell me what I should say in Japan on my visit.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. I just wanted to make two brief points. The leaders of the Big Three auto companies and the UAW came in to see us last week, and they said they're going to meet their partnership for the next generation vehicle goal. The real problem is, once they develop a prototype, how quickly can it be mass-produced, and how will people buy it, and will they buy it at present fuel prices? We'll come back to that at the end. But one related question to that is, given Americans' buying habits and consumer preferences, don't we have to include these light trucks and even heavy trucks in this partnership for the next generation vehicle? Don't we have to achieve significant fuel efficiencies there as well, if we have any hope of succeeding here?

The only other point I want to make, Mary, is, you know I'm big on all kinds of fast-rail research, but I hope tomorrow's headline isn't "Clinton Advocates More Research on Levitation." [*Laughter*] I don't need that.

Ms. Good. We'll have to explain it to them better.

The President. I'd like to call on Michael Bonsignore now to talk about the energy savings available through the use of more high-efficiency products and systems, and also the potential for environmental technology exports. What he has to say and how applicable and expandable you believe it is has a lot to do with whether this transition we're going through will be an economic plus, a drag, or a wash. I personally have always believed it would be a plus if we did it right. But I'd like to ask Michael to talk about that.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. We need to wrap up; we're running a little bit late. But I wanted to just give everyone an opportunity to comment on this. Mason was the only person, I think, who explicitly said that in order to make this transition we need to raise the price of carbon-based products. One of the difficulties we're having within the administration in reaching a proper judgment about what position to stake out in Kyoto relates to how various people are responding, frankly, to the recommendations and the findings of the people coming out of the energy labs, because they say, hey, look, what we know

already shows you that we have readily available technologies and courses of action which would take a huge hunk out of—right now, with no great increased cost—a huge hunk out of any attempt to, let's say, flatten our greenhouse gas emissions at 1990 levels. We just heard about it today. Look what you could do with powerplants. You can recapture the waste heat, two-thirds of that. You can make buildings and manufacturing facilities and residences much more energy efficient. You can make transportation much more energy efficient. Besides that, we've got all these alternative sources of fuel for electricity and transportation. I mean, it's all out there; this is what we know now. And then sooner or later, we're going to have the partnership for the next generation vehicle.

So the question is always, though, who will buy this stuff? Right now, you can buy light bulbs—every one of us could have every light bulb in our home, right now, every single one of them—we'd have to pay 60 percent more for the light bulb, but it would have 3 times the useful life. Therefore, you just work it out; we'd pay more up front, we'd save more money in the long run, and we'd use a whole lot less carbon. And why don't we do it? Why do we have any other kind of light bulbs in our homes?

And that is the simplest example of the nature of the debate we are now having. That is, in order to get from here to where we want to go, do we have to either raise the price of the product—there are only three or four things you can do: You can raise the price of the product to the consumers; you can lower the price of the alternative thing you wish to be bought by the consumers; you can create some new business opportunity through some market permit trading, other market option, or otherwise change the business environment the way we do electric deregulation, for example; or you can somehow increase the awareness of consumers of what their options are and the consequences of that and hope that they will behave in a different way. I think those are the four categories of possibilities.

And if you choose an ambitious target, then, if the requirement is more—to reach the target is almost exclusively on the front end—that is, you have to raise the price to the consumer or to the business involved—the businesses may be a consumer—if it happens too quickly, you're going to do economic damage on the one hand. And on the other hand, there is no way in the world this Senate will ratify our participation in Kyoto, so we'll be out there—it will be a grand gesture, but it won't happen.

Therefore, we have got to know how much we can do through a combination of price—you might be able to get some price changes, particularly going back—Mike said this, too, on the real price of energy—particularly if it was not a net tax increase, you wouldn't have to have a net—there are a lot of other ways to do this. But we have to be able to get something out of either lowering the cost of the alternative, creating new business markets, or increasing consumer awareness of what is right there for them now and what the consequences are. We can't do it all on the front end and expect realistically—if all we do on the Consumer Price Index, raising the price of coal, raising price of oil to the real consumer, and that's all we do, we are not going to get what we want to do in the time allotted to get it because it either won't pass the Senate or it won't pass muster with the American people.

So we have to be able to access what the Energy Department tells us is there for all to see in other ways. And I don't know if any of you want to comment on that, but this is not a question of whether you're brave or not or all that, it's really a question of what we can get done and what realistically is going to happen in America.

But I'm plagued by the example of the light bulb I have in my living room at the White House that I read under at night, and I ask myself, why isn't every light bulb in the White House like this? I use this when—I get so tickled—I go in and turn it on and I measure how much longer it takes to really light up, but I know it's going to be there long, you know? [*Laughter*] And I say, why am I so irresponsible that I have not put this in every light bulb? Why are we not all doing this?

So when you get right down to it, now, this is where the rubber meets the road. We have to make a decision, a commitment; it has to be meaningful. I'm convinced that the

Energy Department lab people are absolutely right, but the skeptics on my economic team said, there will not be perfect substitution, they're not going to do it.

So if you want to say anything about that, you can. But when you get right down to it, that's where—all the decisions are going to be made based on our best judgment about what kind of markets we can create for the private sector, what kind of substitution there is, and whether we can—how quickly we can move to alternative energy sources that people will actually access.

[*The discussion continued.*]

The President. I strongly agree with that, pushing that. And again, I say that does not let us off the hook to do things here at home, it just makes good sense. It's easier for—we should give these other countries a chance to choose an alternative path.

I never will forget a couple of years ago—I know we've got to wrap up—but I had a fascinating conversation with the President of China a couple of years ago, and we were discussing what our future would be and whether we wished to contain China. And I said, "I don't wish to contain China." I said, "The biggest security threat China presents the United States is that you will insist on getting rich the same way we did." And he looked at me, and I could tell he had never thought of that. And I said, "You have to choose a different future, and we have to help. We have to support you. And that does not in any way let us off the hook. But it just means that we have to do this together."

Well, this has been fascinating. You guys have been great, and I thank you a lot.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 11 a.m. in Gaston Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Michael Bonsignore, chairman and chief executive officer, Honeywell, Inc.; Mason Willrich, chairman of the board, EnergyWorks, L.L.C.; and President Jiang Zemin of China.

Remarks on Signing Line Item Vetoes of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998, and an Exchange With Reporters

October 6, 1997

The President. Good afternoon. Today we take another step on the long journey to bring fiscal discipline to Washington. Over the past 4½ years, we've worked hard to cut the deficit and to ensure that our tax dollars are used wisely, carefully and effectively. We have reduced the deficit by 85 percent even before the balanced budget legislation passed. The balanced budget I signed into law this summer will extend our fiscal discipline well into the next century, keeping our economy strong.

But to follow through on the balanced budget, Government must continue to live within its means, within the framework established in the agreement. The line item veto, which all Presidents of both parties had sought for more than a century, gives the President a vital new tool to ensure that our tax dollars are well spent, to stand up for the national interests over narrow interests.

Six days ago, I signed into law the Military Construction Appropriations Act, a $9.2 billion measure that is vital to our national defense. Today I'm using the line item veto to cancel 38 projects inserted into that bill by the Congress that were not requested by the military, cannot make a contribution to our national defense in the coming year, and will not immediately benefit the quality of life and well-being of our men and women in uniform. The use of the line item veto saves the taxpayers nearly $290 million and makes clear that the old rules have, in fact, changed.

I want to stress that I have retained most of the projects that were added by Congress to my own spending request. Congress plays a vital role in this process, and its judgment is entitled to respect and deference. Many of the projects I have chosen to cancel have merit, but should be considered in the future. This is simply the wrong time.

The projects I have canceled are all over the country, in the districts of lawmakers of both parties. These are tough calls involving real money and hard choices. I canceled the projects that met three neutral and objective criteria:

First, the Department of Defense concluded that these projects were not a priority at this time, after conducting its own rigorous, massive planning process. Judgments about our defense needs made by military professionals must continue to be the basis of our national defense budgeting.

Second, the projects I am canceling do not make an immediate contribution to the housing, education, recreation, child care, health, or religious life of our men and women in uniform. Our fighting forces and their families make extraordinary sacrifices for us, and I have a longstanding commitment to improve their living conditions. I have, therefore, left untouched a number of extra projects not requested this year because they fulfill that commitment in enhancing the quality of life of our men and women in the service.

Third, I am canceling projects that would not have been built in fiscal year 1998 in any event, projects where the Department of Defense has not yet even done design work. In short, whether they're meritorious or not, they will not be built in the coming year in any event.

In canceling these projects, I was determined to do nothing that would undercut our national security. Every penny of our defense dollars should be used to maintain and improve the world's strongest system of national defense.

Also, under the balanced budget, however, we have the added obligation, again I say, to ensure that taxpayer funds are expended wisely. The use of the line item veto here will ensure that we focus on those projects that will best secure our strength in the years to come.

Let me say finally that the work of protecting taxpayers in reforming the Government must continue. I will scrutinize the other appropriation bills, using appropriate criteria in each instance, and will exercise the line item veto when warranted. And I will continue to fight for bipartisan campaign finance reform.

Tomorrow the Members of the Senate must decide: Will they move forward with a bipartisan campaign finance reform bill, or be derailed by a partisan poison pill? The American people will be watching. If they make the right choice, this can, indeed, be a banner week for reform in our Government.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President——

The President. John, [John Donovan, ABC News] let me just sign this, and then I'll come back to answer questions.

[*At this point, the President signed the message to Congress on the line item vetoes of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998.*]

Videotapes of White House Coffees

Q. My question is about the videotapes that were released and your staff telling us that they really did not know about the existence of these tapes until this week. How could your staff not know about the existence of these tapes?

The President. Oh, I think that probably they never discussed it with anybody in the White House Communications Agency. You'd have to ask them. But I can tell you, as soon as I became aware of it, I instructed them to be turned over to the appropriate committees as soon as possible.

We have fully cooperated with these committees. We've given over 100,000 pages of documents to the Senate committee alone, I believe. And we'll continue to do so. But I think you could just ask the people involved what happened, but my guess is that the White House Communications Agency just took some footage and that the rest of the staff was unaware of it or didn't think of it, and they didn't think about it either.

So now you have it, and people can view it and draw their own conclusions.

Q. Mr. President, are you disturbed by this belated discovery? Are you concerned? Have you asked what——

The President. No, because I don't think there's any—I don't believe for a moment that any of the career military people in WHCA in any way deliberately didn't say anything about this. I think it was just an accident. And so I think that that would be

my guess. And all I can tell you is, as soon as I found out about it late last week, I said, "Get this out and let's go on." And you can view the tapes and draw your own conclusions.

Q. The question isn't really whether the WHCA people tried to withhold them, but whether people like your counsel and other officials involved who realized these videotapes existed didn't turn them over.

The President. Oh, I'm sure that Mr. Ruff didn't do that. I talked to him—he called me as soon as he knew about it—or one of the assistant counsels came down——

Q. When was that?

The President. I think it was Thursday afternoon. Came down and told me, and that's the first I knew about it. And I don't think they had known about it for very long. And I'm sure they took a little time to figure out exactly what was covered, how much they needed to do, and reviewed the materials, and then turned them over, which is what should have been done.

Stand-Clark-Squillacote Espionage Case

Q. Sir, are you concerned about the Soviet espionage arrests that happened in Virginia today, that date back to the cold war? And just how widespread is this problem, sir?

The President. Well, let me say I have been briefed about it, and it appears to me that the law enforcement authorities have done their job in trying to uncover a problem. We'll have to wait and see. We can't presume people's guilt. But I think that the only responsible thing is for me to refer you to the Justice Department because they made those judgments.

Assassination Attempt on Khaled Meshal

Q. Mr. President, one other matter. On this apparently failed assassination attempt by Israeli agents in Jordan, what was your reaction to that? And are these not precisely the kinds of actions that serve to undermine confidence in the peace process?

The President. Well, since the Government of Israel and the Government of Jordan have made no comment about this, I think it is inappropriate for me to make any comment. I will say this—you know the policy of the United States for our own conduct is, and has been I believe for more than 20 years under Presidents of both parties, that we do not engage in assassinations. But I can make no comment on what others did or did not do when it has not been confirmed by either of the governments in question.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:25 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Kurt Alan Stand, James Michael Clark, and Theresa Marie Squillacote, who were accused of spying for East Germany since 1972; and Khaled Meshal, Hamas leader who was attacked in Amman, Jordan, on September 25. The Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998, H.R. 2016, approved September 30, was assigned Public Law No. 105–45.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Line Item Vetoes of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998

October 6, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel the dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the "Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998" (Public Law 105–45; H.R. 2016). I have determined that the cancellation of these amounts will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 6, 1997.

NOTE: The report detailing the cancellation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 7.

Statement on Signing Legislation Designating the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington Field Office Memorial Building

October 6, 1997

Today I am pleased to have signed into law H.R. 2443, a bill that would designate

the new Washington, D.C., field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as the ''Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington Field Office Memorial Building.'' The new building is so named in honor of the five FBI agents who have been killed in the line of duty while assigned to the FBI's Washington field office: William H. Christian, Jr., Martha Dixon Martinez, Michael J. Miller, Anthony Palmisano, and Edwin R. Woodriffe.

Naming the FBI's new field office in honor of these brave and courageous FBI employees is a reminder to us all of the difficult and dangerous job that FBI agents do—day in and day out.

In establishing this permanent memorial, we do well to remember—and be grateful for—the lives of all Federal, State, and local law enforcement personnel who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the performance of their duties.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 6, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2443, approved October 6, was assigned Public Law No. 105–52.

Proclamation 7033—Child Health Day, 1997

October 6, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

For children, childhood seems to last forever; but for adults—particularly for those of us who are parents—it passes in the blink of an eye. The little girl smiling at us from her tricycle and the little boy running to catch the school bus will soon be driving away to their first jobs. One of the greatest gifts we can offer our children while they are still in our care is a healthy start in life.

We are making tremendous progress as a nation in helping more children get that healthy start. This year I signed into law historic legislation to extend health care coverage to millions of uninsured children. This $24 billion initiative over 5 years is the largest investment in children's health since the creation of Medicaid in 1965. On October 1, the Federal Government and the States began a partnership to help provide meaningful health insurance to children whose families earn too much for Medicaid but too little to afford private coverage.

This new initiative will take an enormous step toward improving the health of our Nation's children. In 1995, approximately 10 million of them were not covered by health insurance, and they were either ineligible for or not enrolled in publicly financed medical assistance programs. Last year, another 800,000 uninsured children joined their ranks. These children are less likely to receive the primary care services they need to maintain good health, and they are at risk of receiving lower quality care. Too often they become trapped in a tragic downward spiral—poor health keeps them out of school, keeps them from pursuing their studies with energy and enthusiasm, and often keeps them from acquiring the knowledge and self-esteem they need to reach their full potential. With this new children's health initiative, we can provide millions of children the coverage they need to grow up healthy and strong.

We are making progress in other areas, as well. Thanks to advances in medical research and our increasing knowledge about prevention and the importance of good nutrition, many childhood diseases and illnesses can now be averted. Funding for childhood immunization has doubled since 1993, and immunization rates are at an all-time high. In addition, we recently announced an important Food and Drug Administration regulation requiring manufacturers to do studies on pediatric populations for new prescription drugs—and those currently on the market—to ensure that our prescription drugs have been adequately tested for the unique needs of children. We have dramatically increased participation in the Women, Infants and Children Supplemental Nutrition Program, providing nutrition packages and information and health referrals to more than 7 million infants, children, and pregnant women. With the enactment of the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill last year, we have helped millions of children keep their healthcare coverage when their parents change or lose jobs.

We are also taking strong actions to prevent our children from smoking. Each day 3,000 children become regular smokers and 1,000 of them will die from a tobacco-related illness. Last year, my Administration issued guidelines to eliminate easy access to tobacco products and to prohibit companies from directing advertising towards children.

To acknowledge our profound responsibility to nurture the health and development of America's children, the Congress, by joint resolution approved May 18, 1928, as amended (36 U.S.C. 143), has called for the designation of the first Monday in October as "Child Health Day" and has requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this day.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Monday, October 6, 1997, as Child Health Day. I call upon my fellow Americans to join me on that day, and every day throughout the year, in strengthening our national commitment to the well-being of our children.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 7, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 8.

Proclamation 7034—German-American Day, 1997

October 6, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

America has always drawn its strength from the millions of people who have come here in search of freedom and the opportunity to live out their dreams. Men and women of different nationalities, different races, and different religions have made their own rich and unique contributions to our national life.

From their arrival at Jamestown in 1607 until the present day, Germans have been among the largest ethnic groups to make their home in our country. Like so many others, the earliest German settlements in America were founded by men and women in search of religious liberty. William Penn invited a group of German Mennonites to Pennsylvania, which was to remain a center of German settlement during the Colonial period. Other German communities were founded in New Jersey and New York, as well as in Virginia's Shenandoah Valley, the Carolinas, and Georgia. In the 19th century, German pioneers began to settle in the Midwest and West, and today a quarter of our Nation's population can trace its ancestry to German origins.

Germans and German Americans have profoundly influenced every facet of American life. Great soldiers, such as General Baron von Steuben in our Revolutionary War and General Norman Schwarzkopf in the Gulf War, have fought to preserve our freedom and defend America's interests. Scientists such as Albert Einstein and Wernher von Braun have immeasurably broadened our horizons, as have artists like Albert Bierstadt, Josef Albers, Ernestine Schumann-Heink, Lillian Blauvelt, and Paul Hindemith. And generations of German Americans, with their energy, creativity, and strong work ethic, have enriched the economic and commercial life of the United States. All Americans have benefited greatly from the labor, leadership, talents, and vision of Germans and German Americans, and it is fitting that we set aside this special day to acknowledge their many contributions to our liberty, culture, and democracy.

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 Monday, October 6, 1997, as German-American Day. I encourage all Americans to recognize and celebrate the many gifts that millions of people of German ancestry have brought to our national life.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:47 a.m., October 7, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 8.

Remarks on Campaign Finance Reform Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

October 7, 1997

The President. Thank you very much, Ann, for your work. And I want to thank all the other groups here represented for your labors. I thank Congressman Shays and Congressman Meehan for their work in the House. And I hope we'll have something important for them to do here in just a few days.

I also want to say a lot of the issues that need to be raised have obviously been clearly articulated in the Vice President's statement and by Ann, and all of us know them. But I think it's important to try to put this into some context. This problem has been building up for years. For years the cost of political campaigns have been escalating, as the cost of communicating with people through mass media has gone up and other costs have increased. And that has led to a fundraising arms race that has overwhelmed and consumed both parties and candidates all over our country.

For years, there have been efforts to do something about this, bipartisan efforts. And every year of my first term, bipartisan efforts for reform were met by obstruction, opposition, and delay, and specifically died a filibuster in the United States Senate. For years, there were interests and there are interests who actually benefit from the present system; we have to acknowledge that. And they like it the way it is, and they would like to keep it. They have been able, until today, to smother campaign finance reform in the shadows, away from the clear light of public evaluation.

That is what has changed this year. This year there is a highly public and increasingly clearly understood moment of truth in Washington. Today, the Members of our Senate have it within their power to strike a blow against politics as usual, and a blow for a better future for America. They can pass the first significant campaign finance reform in a generation and give voters the loudest vote in the country, clearly and unambiguously.

The lines are sharply drawn, I will say that this is much clearer than it has been in years past. Those who are fighting to preserve the status quo have made their position crystal clear. They have said they will use every procedural device they can muster in both Houses to keep this from happening. They seek to use ''poison pill'' amendments, proposals that would worsen the current system in the name of reform, and if all else fails, the filibuster is always there to block the majority will.

But this is also clear: The tide of reform is coming in. The one million signatures Ann mentioned is one example of that. It's not just the President who supports McCain-Feingold legislation. It's not just groups that labor here in the vineyards year-in and year-out. The public supports it. And I believe when the voting comes, a majority of the Senate will support it if they are simply allowed to vote on it. All we need now is a fair vote—yes or no, up or down—reform or the status quo. The American people are entitled to that. They are entitled to see that this legislation does not die by procedural maneuvering or ''poison pill'' amendments.

The choice is plain. A vote for the filibuster is a vote to keep the soft money system. A vote for the filibuster is a vote for less disclosure, for weaker enforcement, for back door campaign spending by so-called independent groups. A vote for the filibuster is a vote to kill bipartisan campaign finance reform. And I hope and believe that will be a vote that will be difficult to explain to the American people.

I know some Senators favor provisions that aren't in this bill. This legislation is a principled compromise. Those of us who support spending limits and free television time had

to agree to drop those to get a bill. And I think they're very important, and it killed me to have to drop those. I hated it. But this bill is better than having no reform. So everybody has had to give up something to get this bill in a position where people of both parties in good conscience could vote on it and where we had a chance to pass it. So for those who complain about that, they're not alone. Those of us who favor even stronger and more sweeping legislation had to give up something, as well.

There are many other worthy ideas being advanced, and that's all to the good. But the irreducible fact is, only McCain-Feingold, and its counterpart legislation in the House sponsored by Congressmen Shays and Meehan, is a vehicle which can move us forward. That is the bottom line, and the one that I hope we can convince the United States Senate to embrace. We need to put aside partisanship, reject pressure and join in an effort to find common ground here and the Senate has got to take the lead.

I will say again: This is our best chance in a generation. The debate is now clear, unambiguous, out in the open. I will fight as hard as I can for as long as it takes to keep it right there. And if all of you help, then I think we can fulfill our obligation to renew and strengthen our democracy for a new century.

Thank you very much.

1996 Campaign Financing

Q. Mr. President, given the fact that your former senior aide, Mr. Ickes, is on the Hill today and may lay out the tactics of your last campaign, that he admits were some potential errors in judgment, and given the revelations of the past few days about the belated disclosure of the coffee tapes, do you think it's hard for people to follow you as a standard bearer for campaign finance reform?

The President. No. It may be hard for you, but I don't think it's hard for people. I'm not ashamed of the fact that I did the best I could within the present system. I knew we would be out-spent badly in 1996, but we weren't out-spent as badly as we would have been if I had laid around and done nothing.

I'd like to ask you to go back and review what the reports were that you gave the American people in '95 and '96 about what the Republican majority in Congress was telling people when they raised money from them, things that I was never accused of saying. I never told anyone they had to contribute to me in order to do business with the White House. I never asked anybody not to do anything with the other side.

And we didn't raise nearly as much as they did, from any category, but we were able to continue to fight against what I thought was bad for the country and to fight for what was good for the country. That's why, in this balanced budget amendment, we've got provisions that will insure 5 million children who don't have health insurance, and open the doors of college to all. That wouldn't have happened if the election tuned out the other way. And I'm not sorry that I did what was available under the existing system.

But I have always been for changing the system. I'm just not for unilateral disarmament. And I expect that Mr. Ickes will go forward and answer the questions and do a good job today. That's what I expect him to do.

Q. Mr. President, you say that you're not in favor of unilateral disarmament, but wouldn't this be a time to stake out a leadership position, sir, and swear off soft money and challenge the Republicans to do the same?

The President. No. No, because if I did that, they would do what they're doing now. They would laugh. They would be happy. They would go into the next election, they would out-spend our people even more. In the last 10 days of the last election cycle in the 20 closest races—almost all of which were lost by Democrats—they were out-spent 4-, 5-, 6-to-1—in the last 10 days, even under the present system. And you know, I thought about that a lot. It would be easy for me to do too, because I don't have to run again. And then I could get some of you to say nice things about what I did. It's not up to me. I don't have to run again. I could easily do that.

But I'd like to remind you that there are other issues at stake here. There are other issues at stake here. In 1995, I fought a battle

to keep the guarantee of medical care and nutrition—basic nutrition—to children who are poor from being taken away from them. And I could not have won in that battle if I didn't have enough allies in the Congress to sustain my veto. In 1993, because of the composition of the Congress, we passed a budget bill that reduced the deficit by 85 percent before the balanced budget bill had passed. I could not have done that if there hadn't been those people in the Congress to do that.

So, I am committed to this campaign finance reform. But there are other issues, and we have to have allies. People give money in these elections based on what they honestly believe should be done. I don't question the sincerity of those who financed Mr. Gingrich and the Republican revolution. But I disagreed with it. And we had an argument. And we have to have enough capacity to stake out our position, and if we don't have—we have to fight for the things we believe are important, just as they fight for the things they believe are important.

It's a simple thing. The cost of communications have overwhelmed the capacity of the system as it was intended to operate. The FEC created this soft money loophole. It has become the way of getting access to virtually unlimited communications. We have to close the loophole. And we have to close it for all on a fair basis. For me, I could give it up easily, but I don't think it would be right for me to put the people that agree with me about what's best for America at an even greater disadvantage than they're going to be. And it doesn't affect me personally, but that's been my position.

Q. Thank you Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Ann McBride, president, Common Cause; and Harold Ickes, former Deputy Chief of Staff to the President.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President Ezer Weizman of Israel and an Exchange With Reporters

October 7, 1997

Middle East Peace Process

President Clinton. Good morning, everyone. I'm delighted to have President Weizman here, and we had a nice dinner last evening, and we're going to have further talks today about what we can do in the United States to further the peace process. And certainly we are grateful for all that he has done as President and throughout his entire career. It's a great honor to have you here.

President Weizman. Thank you very much.

President Clinton. Thank you.

Jonathan Pollard Espionage Case

Q. Mr. President, thank you. In light of the recent swap between Israel and Jordan, there has also been talk raised again about Jonathan Pollard. I was wondering if you believe justice was served when he received his life sentence, and do you believe he will spend his life sentence in prison?

And to President Weizman, will you be raising this issue today with the President?

President Weizman. You were talking too fast. What did you say?

Q. The question of Jonathan Pollard—will you be raising it with President Clinton today?

President Weizman. It's always in our minds.

Q. Mr. President?

President Clinton. Well, I receive—when Mr. Pollard applies for clemency, I receive recommendations from both my Justice and National Security Advisers, and I take into account what they recommend, and then I take action. And that's what I'll do if it comes up again.

Assassination Attempt on Khaled Meshal

Q. Good morning. Thank you, Mr. President. What is your reaction to the attempted assassination attempt in Jordan and Mr.

Netanyahu's apparent contention that it was a legitimate tool of government?

President Clinton. The United States law is different on that, and our policy is different on this. I believe that, certainly for us, we have the right law. We don't—it's illegal for the United States Government to engage in assassination attempts. But I think that it's very important for countries to fight terrorism. I think that Israel's struggle against terrorism is important, but it's also important to consider the consequences on people who are your allies of whatever actions you take.

I think the important thing now for me is to try to get this peace process back on track. That's really the only way to ultimately get rid of terrorist problems in the Middle East. We've got to keep doing that. And then we can all—have all governments working together against terrorists.

[*At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.*]

Q. President Clinton, can I ask you a question?

President Clinton. Let me first say that we are profoundly honored to have President Weizman here. We are grateful for his visit and for his work for peace as President and for, indeed, his entire career. I've looked forward to this for a long time. We had a grand dinner last night, and I'm looking forward to our visit.

Please ask your question.

Q. What do you think about this Israeli failed assassination attempt in Jordan?

President Clinton. I believe that it's important to fight terrorism, but I think it's important to consider in the fight the consequences on all your allies in that fight and what the ultimate conclusions will be. The people that are involved have dealt with it as best they could, and so I think the important thing for me now is to get the peace process back on track and to go forward.

American law is very different, you know. We don't—it's against the law in America for the Government to promote any kind of assassination, and I agree with that for us. But I think the most important thing for me is to get this peace process back on track.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, I understand that you were considering last night the possibility of inviting both Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat to a 2-month summit at the North Pole? [*Laughter*] Is it on the agenda?

President Clinton. You got a good leak. Let me say what I said last night. I said that I would go anywhere or do anything that I thought would be most effective in promoting the peace process, and if I thought it would help I would get parkas for all of us and we could all go to the North Pole and stay there until we had a peace agreement. And I will reiterate that in public.

But what we are going to discuss today, and what I am continually assessing, is what is the best way for the United States to promote the peace process, without pretending that we're a party that can make the peace, and what is the most effective thing for us to do.

But what I said was that I would do anything, including go to the North Pole, if I thought it would help make peace, and I will reiterate that in public. I would do that. At least it would cool things down. [*Laughter*]

Q. Are you optimistic about the peace process? Because people in the Middle East are not.

President Clinton. In a funny way, sometimes when things get really bad, they have a way of getting everyone's attention about the bigger issues. And it may be that some of the difficulties of the last 6 months will create an environment where everyone is more aware of the ultimate consequences. And perhaps we can therefore actually have a chance to get it back on track that is greater than the chance we've had for the last several months. I just hope so.

Thank you. We need to visit.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:48 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Senate Action on Campaign Finance Reform Legislation

October 7, 1997

Today was not the end of this fight for campaign finance reform but the beginning. The Republican leadership and a minority of the Senate used procedural maneuvers to block the obvious will of a majority of United States Senators to support bipartisan campaign finance reform legislation. I will fight for this measure as hard as necessary, for as long as necessary. And I call on all Senators to realize that the bipartisan McCain-Feingold measure is our best chance to move forward with reform.

Remarks on Departure for Newark, New Jersey, and an Exchange With Reporters

October 8, 1997

Welfare Reform

The President. Good morning. I ran for President with a challenge to our country to replace the broken welfare system with one that expands opportunity, demands responsibility, and reflects our values of faith, work, and families.

Since I took office, we've worked hard to make this vision a reality. First, by working with 43 States to launch innovative experiments in welfare reform, and then by enacting a welfare reform law that challenged all our States and all people involved in the system to do far more to move from welfare to work.

Today we received yet another piece of evidence that welfare reform is working far better than anyone had predicted it would. We learned that welfare rolls have continued their unprecedented decline, dropping by another 250,000 people in the most recent month alone, one of the largest monthly drops ever. Altogether, we have seen our welfare rolls shrink by more than 1.7 million people since I signed the welfare reform law and by more than 3.6 million people, or 26 percent, since I took office.

This is a truly historic achievement for America. It shows that we can accomplish great things when our policies promote work and reflect our values. We're building an America where all families have the chance to center their lives around work, family, and responsibility.

But we have more to do to ensure that all those who can work are able to work. The private sector here must do more to take the lead. The balanced budget law I signed last August not only repealed unfair cuts that targeted legal immigrants but also created a $3 billion welfare-to-work program and increased incentives for businesses to hire former welfare recipients.

For our part, we've set a goal of hiring 10,000 people off the welfare rolls to fill existing jobs in the Federal Government. Later today the Vice President, who has led this initiative, will report on our progress in doing our part.

We are working hard here to change lives to empower all Americans to seize the new opportunity of a new century. I am very encouraged by these welfare numbers. We now have the smallest percentage of our people on welfare in about three decades after the biggest drop in the welfare rolls in history. This proves that this system can work. But to get to the rest of the people, we have to have more help in creating these jobs, the businesses have to take advantage of the tax credits, and the municipal governments and others have to take advantage of the $3 billion fund. But this is great news for America today, and I must say I am very, very pleased.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

1996 Campaign Finance Inquiry

Q. Mr. President, Senator Thompson says that it's time for you to take personal responsibility for the campaign finance irregularities and relieve Janet Reno of her responsibility and simply ask for an independent counsel on your own. How do you respond to Senator Thompson on that?

The President. Well, I think that, first of all, I have assumed responsibility. We set up a system that has given Senator Thompson 100,000 pages of documents. And I was surprised that these films had been subpoenaed and not turned over. I think there is a logical reason for it. I'm frustrated whenever there has not been absolutely full compliance, but

I think it's in everyone's interest that the films be turned over, and I would urge you to watch them if you haven't. I think they will reinforce the fact that no one has done anything wrong here. So I would just urge—there's been a lot of talk about these films; everybody ought to watch them and see what they show. That's what they're for.

The other thing I would say is, again, I'd say that question is a legal question, notwithstanding the best efforts of some to turn it into a political question. And I don't think there is any lack of evidence that the Attorney General, when she thought it was warranted, has asked for special counsels.

Q. Mr. President, what about Senator Thompson's charge that you and your administration are just trying to run out the clock since his hearing mandate expires at the end of the year and that you've delayed, stonewalled, and otherwise put barriers in the way of the investigation?

The President. He knows better than that. I think he may be disappointed in the results of the hearings. He now has more evidence. If he wants to have more hearings, he's got them. But let Senator Thompson comment on what's in those films. He has 100,000 pages of documents. They have the evidence. If there is any more, we'll do our best to get it to them. They have the films. Let them discuss what's on the films.

Q. Mr. President, do you worry about the credibility of your administration in view of these mistakes, and do you think that you have hurt the Vice President in all of this campaign fundraising frenzy that's resulted in this?

The President. No. I don't worry about our credibility. You know, it's interesting that we have come to this point after all these hearings, and they're not talking about any wrongdoing by the President or the Vice President as uncovered in the hearings. They're talking about why they didn't have access to films which reinforced the fact that we didn't do anything wrong.

What I hope—the only thing I ever hope in this is that we get through the smoke to the facts. Now, I have said—and it's interesting that we're discussing this—I have said all along and now for nearly 5 years that the campaigns have become too costly and require too much time to raise money and require too much money to be raised and that, inevitably, will raise some questions. And the only answer is to reform the campaign finance system.

Yesterday there was yet one more attempt to kill any campaign finance reform. That is the real story there lurking in the weeds. I actually think it's probably pretty good strategy for those who are trying to kill campaign finance reform to try to talk about these films of events in the White House which were legal and which I want everybody to watch.

I think it's in everybody's interest to get whatever evidence is relevant out here. But once we get all the relevant evidence out, we need to really look at what's going on here. And what's going on here is that under the smokescreen about all these films, which everybody can now freely watch, there was yet one more attempt yesterday which I hope won't be successful to deal the death blow to campaign finance reform. And they've done it every year in the Senate; they've done it every year with a filibuster. This year, they're prepared to use a filibuster and two or three other tactics because they raised more money, more big money, and more money from other sources than the Democrats, but both parties are going to have problems and questions raised, and raise too much money and spend too much time raising it until we reform the campaign finance laws.

The big story yesterday was, one more time, they're doing their very best to kill it, and they're hoping that they can stir up all this business, I think, about these films. Now, I'm not defending the fact the films should have been turned over. But I think you've been given, I think, a pretty good background on what happened. I think there is a logical explanation. I don't like it. I'm frustrated when there's not complete compliance, but when we gave 100,000 pages of documents to Senator Thompson's committee, I think that's pretty good evidence of our good faith. We have tried to do no inappropriate things to resist his need to discover evidence. We want him to know the facts.

Yes, go ahead.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, yesterday there was the first meeting in 8 months between Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat. No statements were made. What have you heard about that meeting, and how do you see it in light of the latest events in the Middle East?

The President. The most important thing is that it occurred, and it occurred not a moment too soon. We've had some difficult developments in the Middle East. I am pleased that Ambassador Ross was able to put it together. As I said with President Weizman yesterday, it may be that the developments of the last few days have been so troubling and so difficult that it has gotten the attention of both sides and clarified the necessity for them to get back to talking with each other and to get this peace process back on track. I hope—I hope that is what happened. That is certainly what I have tried to do, certainly what Ambassador Ross is trying to do there. So the fact that they met is encouraging. I think it would be better for me at this moment to let them characterize the nature and results of the discussions they had.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:10 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador Dennis B. Ross, Special Middle East Coordinator.

Remarks at Metropolitan Baptist Church in Newark, New Jersey

October 8, 1997

Thank you all for that warm welcome. Thank you, Reverend and Mrs. Jefferson, for making us feel at home in the Metropolitan Baptist Church. Thank you, Senator McGreevey, for your introduction and your passionate commitment to the families and the children and the future of this State.

Thank you, Mayor James. Thank you, my great friend Congressman Donald Payne. Thank you, Audrey West, for your work here in the Head Start program. And thank you, Linda Lopez, for having the courage to get up here and give a speech today. You did very well. I thought you did very well.

Mr. Mayor and Congressman, I'm delighted to be back in Newark, a city that is earning its reputation as a Renaissance City every day. I hear story after story of Newark's coming back—a new performing arts center, a new sports complex in the historic Ironbound district, most importantly, a new spirit that I sense in this room and that I saw in this church and its facilities for caring for children when I walked in the door.

You know, I have been in a lot of buildings in my life. Sometimes I think the job of a President or a Governor is going into buildings of all kinds. [*Laughter*] And after you have a little experience with walking into buildings, you get the feel of what's going on there before anybody tells you. When I walked in this building and I saw the posters of the children on the walls, I saw the pride people take in maintaining it, I saw the care that had gone into designing it, I knew that the spirit of the Lord had moved you to do the right thing for our children. And I thank you for that.

I'm feeling a little nostalgic now, not only because my daughter just went off to college, because this is the 20th anniversary of my first public office, when I was attorney general of my State, but also because last week it was 6 years ago that I first announced for President.

Now, sometimes young people come up to me all the time and they say, ''I want a career in public life. Should I do it?'' And I always encourage them. I tell them that no matter what they may read or hear from time to time, the overwhelming majority of people in public life, from both parties and all philosophies, are honorable, good people who work hard to do what they believe is right, and it is a noble endeavor. And we spend sometimes so much time finding fault with ourselves we forget that we wouldn't be around here after 220 years if we didn't have a pretty good political system supported by a wise and caring citizenry. But I always tell them, the most important thing before you run for office is not to decide what office you want, but what you would do if you got it.

You remember there was a—about 20 years ago, Robert Redford was in that great movie, ''The Candidate,'' you remember

that? And he won and said, ''Now what?'' If that's going to happen to you, don't run. I was encouraged. I was listening to Senator McGreevey talk, and I thought—it's the first time I've heard him speak since he's been officially the nominee of our party—I thought, that man knows what he wants to do, and that's the beginning of wisdom and the prospect of success. If you just want the job for the honor of the thing, it's not worth the pain of getting there. It's only worth it if you have an idea about what you're going to do.

And all of us are living on the vision of those who went before us. I'm sure that Reverend Jefferson is grateful for the vision of all of his predecessors, Reverend Johnson and others, who conceived of what this might be. The Scripture says, ''Where there is no vision, the people perish.'' And what I want you to think about today is, as you celebrate what goes on in this building for our children, and you imagine what could go on in this entire State and Nation, what is your vision for what America should look like when your children or your grandchildren are your age? That's a question I ask myself and try to answer every single day. It keeps me centered, keeps me focused, keeps me going in the tough days.

When I started this odyssey 6 years ago, I had a vision that I was afraid might not be realized unless we changed what we were doing. I knew we were about to start a new century and a new millennium, and I had a very clear idea of what I wanted. I wanted to see three things out of which I thought all else would flow: I wanted our country to be a place where the American dream was really alive for every person, without regard to race or color or creed or where they live if they were willing to work for it. I wanted our country to continue to lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity and security even though the cold war is over and we no longer totally dominate the economy of the world the way we did at the end of World War II. And I wanted our country to embrace and celebrate our increasing diversity but not be divided by it, instead to come together as one America.

The American dream for everybody willing to work for it; America leading the world for peace and freedom and security and prosperity; America coming together as one America. That's what I want. And everything I do in the limited time available to me as your President I try to make sure is advancing that vision.

Now, we have, therefore, tried to follow certain policies: policies that favor the future, not the past; policies that favor change, not the status quo; policies that favor unity, not division; policies that help everybody, not just a few people; and policies that enable us to lead, not follow. You know, that old joke they used to tell me that unless you're lead dog on the sled, the view is always the same. [*Laughter*] We've got to be leading. We've got to be leading.

Now, we have come a long way in the last 4 years and 8 months as a people: over 13 million more jobs; lower crime; the biggest drop in welfare rolls in our history; a cleaner environment; advances in the safety of our food and the public health generally; breakthroughs in science and technology and especially in medical research; advancing the cause of peace and freedom and prosperity and security all around the world; and with more energy than ever before in Africa, thanks largely to the leadership of your Congressman, Donald Payne. We thank him.

In 1996 I tried to characterize all this as building a bridge to a new century. And we have a strong foundation of success on which to build that bridge, but we all know that there's more to do. There are still people in Newark who don't have a job, even though we've created more jobs in less time than our country ever did before. There are still people in Newark who get up and work hard every day, but they and their children are still living at or below the poverty line. There are still children who are losing their childhoods to crime and gangs and drugs and guns, even though we've tried to reduce those problems and they are not as bad as they were. But if you're one of the victims or one of the people caught up in it, it's just as bad as it ever was.

So we still have things to do. But we know this—we know that if everybody has got a good job and everybody has got a good education and everybody can raise their children properly, most of our problems will go away.

Don't you believe that? Don't you believe that? [*Applause*]

And the reason I wanted to come here today and celebrate what you have done and then look to the future is that it seems to me that, with more and more and more people in the work force, with more two-parent families, having to have both incomes to make ends meet and more and more single-parent families, we can't ever forget that the most important job any of us ever have on this Earth if we bring children into the world is raising those children right.

I used to tell my daughter after I got elected President—the first time she said, ''You're too busy for this, that, or the other thing''—I said, ''Let me tell you something: Until you leave here, you are still my most important job, and don't you ever forget it.'' And I believe everybody—everybody should feel that way. If we fail with our children, since we'll be gone and they'll be left, what will we leave?

Not very long ago, Senator Paul Tsongas tragically died, too early in life, after a long battle with cancer. I remember when he left the United States Senate, the first time he had to deal with his cancer. He wrote a book called ''Going Home.'' I was Governor when it came out. I took it home one day and laid down on the couch and read it straight through, one afternoon—played hooky from school—from work. That's one nice thing about being Governor, you can give yourself an excused absence. [*Laughter*]

And I was laying there reading Paul Tsongas' book, and here was this man I had admired from before. I thought he was such a creative United States Senator; I was sick that he was leaving. I knew he had a reasonable chance to live quite a few more years, and I couldn't figure out why this guy would leave, because he was not a quitter in any way. And there was a section in this book where he was talking about his children, and where he was saying, ''I'm determined to fight this. I hope I'll live a long time.'' And he did, he lived more than 15 more years. He said, ''I hope I'll live a long time, but,'' he said, ''one of the wisest things I ever heard—it never meant anything to me until I was diagnosed—is that no person on his deathbed ever says, 'I wish I'd spent more time at the office.' ''

These kids, they're our most important job. They are the only manifestation of the immortality of the human spirit on this Earth. And I think it's great that everybody—I hope—will want to have a good education and have the ability to work. And I will never rest until the work we've done to bring the economy back embraces everyone. But we should never forget that there are conflicts between work and childrearing which we all have to help people resolve.

There is no more important responsibility than helping people balance the demands of work and family. Because, think about it, if Americans fail at work, then the economy craters and our country has all these problems and all the social problems get worse. If America fails at home, the economy might be strong and our social problems will still get worse, and more importantly, our legacy will be a destructive one.

We must find a way for people to succeed in the workplace and succeed in raising their children and do both. And there is a role for all of us in that. That is a community responsibility. For us to pretend that that is everybody's problem and they've got to work it out ignores the fact, number one, that people can't do it and, number two, that I'm stronger and my child will have a better future if your children have a better future, that we are in this together whether we acknowledge it or not, so we better acknowledge it and reach out and make ourselves one community.

Hillary has said many times that governments don't raise children, parents do, but that every one of us has a special responsibility to help parents succeed, to create the conditions to give parents the tools to make their lives successful. Or in my wife's words, it really does take a village to have the kind of childrearing we want for all of our children. That's what this church and this Head Start program mean. It's the living embodiment of our shared responsibility for our children.

And for nearly 5 years, we have worked very hard to help parents raise their children. We fought for the V-chip and the rating system on television programs, because I think

there is too much inappropriate material on television for young children at times when they're watching it. And I think you ought to have more opportunity to—[*inaudible*]—it. We've worked very hard to put tobacco out of the reach of children because it's still the largest killer of our young children.

We're fighting every day to make our streets and our schools safer and more drug-free and to hold up those examples of fighting juvenile crime that not only punishes people who should be punished but saves kids from getting in trouble in the first place.

It's been nearly 2 years now since a single child under the age of 18 has been killed by a gun in the city of Boston, where the police and the probation officers make house calls and the parents walk the streets. And the compliance with the probation officers' orders is 70 percent; I feel quite sure it's higher than most places in the world and in America. Why? Because they said it takes a village to keep kids out of jail. Better send the kids to college than to jail.

We have made it easier for millions of parents to take some time off if their children are sick without losing their jobs and to keep their health insurance when they move from job to job.

We raised the minimum wage and we lowered taxes on families with children with incomes of under $30,000. It's worth about $1,000 a year now to families of four with incomes less than that. And this summer, when I signed the new balanced budget law, it's the biggest increase in aid to children's health and in aid to education since 1965 in that law—5 million more children, almost all of them in low-income working families, will be able to get health insurance under that bill.

And the bill really does go a very long way toward creating that system of lifetime learning that Senator McGreevey talked about: a $500 per child tax credit for working families; a big increase in Head Start; the America Reads program, to mobilize a million volunteers to teach all the 8-year-olds in this country to read, so that every third grader can read independently; the great effort to wire all of our classrooms and libraries to the Internet by the year 2000, have computers within the reach of all children.

And I must say, thanks to AT&T, which was complimented earlier, and others, New Jersey has had the gift of private sector support there that I want to see in every State in this country. We're going to do our part. We need others to do their part. Technology can be a great liberation for children, particularly in poorer neighborhoods, and if properly used, for children that are having learning problems, and if properly used, children who need to become fully fluent in English as well as whatever their native tongue is. We have to do this.

And we have done more to open the doors of college to all Americans than ever before. I think we can really say when these programs are fully implemented, anybody who's willing to work for it can get a college education because we had the biggest increase in Pell grants in 20 years; we're up to a million work-study positions now in our schools; more and more young people going through the national service program, AmeriCorps, and serving in their communities, earning the right to go to college; an IRA you can save in and withdraw from tax-free if you're paying for college for your children; and the HOPE scholarship and other tax credits so that you can get a $1,500 tax credit to pay for the first 2 years of college and other tax reductions for the junior and senior year, for graduate school, or if you're an adult and you have to go back and get training.

We are trying to set up a system where people of any age can be educated at any time, whenever they need it. And we will help them. But we still have to make sure that our parents have access to quality, affordable child care. That's the great big hurdle left to be crossed. If we can get all the children insured for health care, then the great hurdle for families will be making sure that we can solve this last great obstacle.

As Head Start parents and personnel, those of you involved in this program know how important it is, and your director has already spoken eloquently about it. That's why I worked hard to create Early Head Start, so we could bring in kids even earlier, and why I fought to make sure that in this budget we'll have a million children in Head Start every year by the end of the budget period.

But as hard as we've worked on that, we've got to do more. We've got to keep going until we literally can say, every parent and child in this country can have access to quality, affordable child care, which includes, for the reasons Senator McGreevey said, an educational component, an appropriate, stimulating educational component for the youngest of our children.

Our brains, we know now, are like computers that we're building ourselves, and they get wired in a certain way by the time we're about 4 years old. And it's hard to rewire them after that. We know, for example—and I don't want to get into numbers, but let me just give you an example of the significance of what goes on in this building. The newest scientific research shows that a child who has loving, involved parents—and a big part of this, by the way, is helping parents who—almost 100 percent of parents want to do a good job; one of the things we've got to do is make sure they all know how to do a good job. But a child with loving, involved parents and an appropriate pre-school or other child care program that has an appropriate educational component—and I mean basic things for infants, singing to people, showing colors and sights and sounds, all that—will have about 700,000 positive interactions with that developing computer up here by the time they're 4 years old—700,000. A child who is left essentially isolated, with a parent who has never been trained to do that work, may have as few as 150,000 positive interactions, or less than one-fourth.

Now, you tell me which child has got a better chance to make it at 17, at 21, at 30, at 40, at 50. You can literally reduce it, therefore, almost to a matter of science. Fundamentally, it's an affair of the heart, but you have to understand there is a fact basis behind this, now. And this new scientific research is just stunning; it's breathtaking. And we cannot knowingly permit huge numbers of our children to be at that kind of input disadvantage while their own little computers are being built. It isn't right. And it isn't smart. And we pay every day—today—for the mistakes that were made 10, 15, 20 years ago. And so that's why I say that we have to do this.

One of the things we were worried about when we started moving all these folks from welfare to work is what would they do for child care. So we put $4 billion more into the child care program, because the worst thing in the world we could do is to have someone who had been gripped by welfare feel good about being at work and then be racked with worry about what was happening to the child at home.

We've now—this morning we learned that last month another 250,000 people went to work from welfare. That's a stunning number. Now, in 4 years and 8 months, 3.6 million people who were living in families on welfare now live in families at work, drawing a paycheck. That's good. That's good.

But we've got to make sure their kids are okay. Because most of those jobs, when you move from welfare to work if you don't have a lot of education, most of those jobs don't pay very much. And we know that child care can cost as much as 25 percent of a person's paycheck, if they live on a modest income. So one of the things that I'm encouraging all the States to do as your welfare rolls drop is to take the money that you've got left because the Federal Government gives you the same amount of money now, whatever your welfare rolls are—is take that money, put into child care, and make sure the kids are going to be okay. You help the parents and they go to work; you help the kids when they go to child care.

Listen to this. Over half of the children under the age of one are already in some kind of day care. But 12 million children under the age of 6—17 million children between the ages of 6 and 13—have one or both parents in the work force. So, in spite of the numbers and the great efforts and the stunning success of facilities like this one, the hard truth is, there are still too few child care facilities to meet our growing demands.

And again, I say that remember the findings that Senator McGreevey referred to that we had people testify when Hillary and I sponsored that White House conference on early childhood and the development of the brain. We can't let this happen. There are also too many facilities in operation that are doing the best they can on the money they've got, but they're just not adequate for what

the children need. What every child needs is what you provide here, education. If they need to be here all day, let them stay all day. We've got to find a way to do this.

If you take any survey of parents and experts in the country, they'll say that child care is in short supply, especially in our hardest pressed communities. Studies tell us that more than half of the child care centers that are in operation don't provide adequate child care, including the educational component for their children. One out of three children in child care programs that are running out of private homes receive care that may actually retard their development, according to the studies. But what can the parents do if it takes 25 percent of their income, which is not enough, at any rate, to pay the expenses to be in a proper child care facility.

So I say to you our vision cannot be realized until we face this. And every American should be concerned about it because every American—or our children—will be affected by it. And we pay now or pay later. We either act like a community now to lift these children up, or we will be punished as a community later for our collective neglect. This is a big challenge for our future.

I'm delighted that so many people at the State and local level, and now increasingly in Congress, are taking up this issue and giving it the attention it deserves. On the 23d of this month the First Lady and I will host the first ever White House Conference on Child Care, with parents and child care providers and experts and business leaders and economists to talk about what we can do to learn from promising efforts like yours.

But I ask you to think about this today as you walk out of this building and you think about what everyone has said—what the pastor said, what Senator McGreevey said, what the satisfied parent said and the dedicated Head Start provider said—think about what we can do together to make sure that what was said here about the children in this place can become real for all the children of our country. It is the next great frontier in bringing our community together so that we can realize that grand vision for the new century.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. in the gymnasium. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. David Jefferson, Sr., pastor, Metropolitan Baptist Church, and his wife, Linda; State Senator Jim McGreevey; Mayor Sharpe James of Newark; Audrey West, director, Newark Head Start program; Linda Lopez, a parent who introduced the President; and Rev. B.F. Johnson, former pastor of the church. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks at a Reception Honoring Democratic Gubernatorial Candidate Jim McGreevey in West Orange, New Jersey

October 8, 1997

Well, he looks like a Governor. [*Laughter*] He sounds like a Governor. He's got a good plan about what he would do if he were Governor. And he's got something else, just magical. We were a couple of hours ago in a wonderful Head Start program at a church near here, and when McGreevey walked in the room, the fire alarm went off. [*Laughter*] If you've got that kind of heat and electricity, you ought to be Governor.

I am delighted to be here with all of you. I thank the legislative leaders who are here: Senator Lynch, Assemblyman Doria, State Democratic Party Chair Tom Giblin—if I forget somebody, complain—[*laughter*]—Assemblywoman Buono, State Senator Bryant, Hudson County Executive Bob Janiszewski, Cherry Hill Mayor Susan Bass Levin, Sheriff Fontoura, Mayor-about-to-be Bob Bowser, Mayor Spina, and all other officials who are here.

I'd like to say a special word of thanks to a former colleague of mine, Brendan Byrne, who is in the audience. Governor Byrne, thank you. I'm glad to see you here. After he left the Governor's office, it was never the same at the national Governors meeting. [*Laughter*] He's been gone a long time, and we haven't produced a single Governor who had the one-liner gift that Brendan Byrne had. [*Laughter*] We only laugh about half as much. I'm glad to see you all.

This is perhaps the first opportunity I've had, in this sort of setting anyway, to say something I would like to say really to all the people of New Jersey, which is, I want

to thank you for the enormous vote of confidence that was given to me and to Al Gore and to our team in the election of 1996. I was overwhelmed by it, and I thank you for it. [*Applause*] Thank you very much.

I'd like to talk for a few minutes in maybe an almost conversational way to try to explain to you what I know, both as President and as someone who was a Governor for 12 years before I became President and served with 150 other Governors, about the importance of this election at this moment in time.

I'd like to thank the Lieutenant Governor of New York, who's also here. Betsy, stand up. Thank you for becoming a Democrat and coming across the river to be with us. Thank you.

I think it's important that you understand because you have to go out of here and talk to people about this election, and you want it to be fundamentally a positive election of choices about the future. I promise you, that's the way the voters will look at it. They'll be trying to figure out, if I make this choice, what difference will it make to my life, my child's life, the future of our State. And there are some things you need to really focus on about this particular moment in our country's history and what the role of a Governor, any Governor, would be at this moment in history, and therefore, what kind of things you should be looking for.

When I ran for President and I announced 6 years ago last week, I did it against all the odds, when no one but my mother really thought I could win. [*Laughter*] He said he knows the feeling. [*Laughter*] I'll tell you, there are a lot more who think you can win today, Senator, than when you started. A lot more today than when you started.

I had a very clear reason. I did not think my country was moving in the direction that would take it where I thought we ought to go in the century that was upon us. And I have said all over America repeatedly, like a broken record, and the poor folks that have to follow me around get sick of me saying—I apologize to them—but I actually think about it every day: What is it that you want? And I said, what I want is an America where everybody who is responsible enough to work for it has a shot at the American dream. What I want is an America that—[*applause*]—thank you. What I want is an America that is no longer staving off the nuclear threat and the cold war and no longer controls 40 percent of the world's wealth like we did at the end of World War II but still, because of our values and our successes and our willingness to serve, still can lead the world toward peace and freedom and security and prosperity and is interested in all kinds of people all over the world and what they can do to help us build a better future for our children.

And finally, what I want is an America that embraces all the diversities you see if you look around this room and celebrates it and says, ''We love all this diversity. It's our meal ticket to the future.'' But the most important thing is we are still bound together as one America across all the lines that divide us.

Every day I still say to myself, what do you want for America when you're gone, and what have you done to advance it today—every single day? And then it seemed to me obvious that we had to change course. So I made a few notes and I said, ''Well, what kind of policies would you change?'' I said, ''I want policies that basically look to the future, not to the past; that embrace change, not the status quo; that promote unity, not division''—we've got enough of that, goodness knows, in our country—''that give everybody a chance, not just a few people; and that promote us as leaders, not followers.''

And I advocated a whole lot of things, and we've done virtually everything that I said I wanted to do in '92, and the vast majority of things now that I advocated in the '96 election. And what are the consequences? The strongest economy in a generation, over 13 millions new jobs, even a lot of our poorest areas finally beginning to revitalize, a declining crime rate, an improving environment. We learned that last month another 250,000 people moved from the welfare rolls to families that are living off of payrolls. And now we've had a drop of 3.6 million people moving from homes living on public assistance to homes living on payrolls since I took office. I'm very proud of that. It's the biggest drop in the history of the country. I want that.

But in addition to all the policies, it also was clear to me we needed a different kind of Government, not a Government that

would do everything or a Government that would do nothing but a Government that would focus on getting our country in good shape, creating good conditions, and then giving people the tools to make the most of their own lives.

So, for example, in the beginning of our term we adopted a budget in 1993 that helped us to cut thousands of governmental programs out that we've eliminated over the last nearly 5 years, 16,000 pages of Federal regulation. The Federal Government is 300,000 people smaller than it was the day I took office. But we're not doing everything we were doing before.

Neither are we doing nothing. That was my fight with the Republican contract on America. I didn't want to see us walk away from our guarantee of health care to the poorest children, of our guarantee of a clean environment, of our commitment to giving everybody a chance at educational opportunity, and of our obligation to take on new challenges as a people through our Government when it was necessary.

So I think we made the right decision. You can't do everything; you can't do nothing. You've got to balance the budget, but you also have to invest in our future and our people. That's the path we took. The results have been quite good. But there is still an awful lot of work to do. We have a lot of work to do at the national level.

We were talking about the lack of affordable child care just before I came over here, and what a terrible problem it is since we know that the vast majority of children's mental wiring occurs in their first 4 years of life. We were talking a couple of days ago in Washington about the need to come to grips with the challenge of the climate changing and the globe, and how it could change our lives, but how we have to do it in a way that doesn't throw large numbers of people out of work or disrupt our economic progress. We are working this week on peace in the Middle East again, hoping that we're making some progress. And yesterday I had a meeting to try to further the peace process in Northern Ireland.

So there are a lot of things to do, but what I want to tell you is, this new approach to Government and this new way of doing business has made the Governor's office even more important today and looking to the 21st century than it has ever been before. And it's very important that everybody understands that.

We have given huge new responsibilities to the State. For example, all the States now have to move a lot more people from welfare to work. But I promise you, the easiest work has already been done. It's not that the people are still on welfare don't want to go to work, but the ones that are still there may have more difficulty going to work, may need more training, may need more work.

In this budget, we gave the private sector incentives—tax incentives to hire people. We've provided $3 billion more to flow into States and local communities to help create jobs for people for whom the market did not produce jobs. But this is something you have to have a Governor to tend to. And you want people to succeed at home and at work, which means you don't want to take a poor person and say, ''I'm going to feel better about you when you're drawing a payroll,'' and then said, ''but I feel worse about your child because you can't afford child care,'' which means that, if New Jersey has reduced its welfare rolls and you've got a surplus in the welfare account, you ought to, first of all, make sure that those people that are going to work can take care of their children with affordable child care, they can get a good Head Start program or some other program.

That's a big deal. We said in Washington we can't micromanage this, you've got to figure it out. But it makes the Governor more important. There are a lot of big environmental issues we're trying to face. Our budget now should allow us to clean up another 500 toxic waste dumps in the next 4 years. Remember, I came to New Jersey in 1996 and pledged to support just that. And we got it into the budget, and we're going to do it. But there are all kinds of other issues that have to be dealt with by you here.

The whole issue of fiscal responsibility is very important. When I became President the deficit was $290 billion, projected to go higher. Now it's going to be under $30 billion this year, and 85 percent of it was cut even before we passed the last balanced budget

bill. We haven't balanced the budget since 1969, and don't—let me just say, everybody who works for a living, who pays a home mortgage or a car payment or makes any kind of payment on credit, is better off because we've reduced this deficit because the interest rates are lower because of it. Every single person who makes any kind of payment any month on interest is better off. And the whole country is better off because the private sector has had more money to invest. And that's why we've got over 13 million more jobs.

Now, I've got people in Washington now, including our friends in the Republican Party who said they were fiscal conservatives, they're all talking about how they're going to spend the surplus. [*Laughter*] We still have a deficit—most people think $30 billion is real money, or $28 billion—[*laughter*]—where I come from that's still a nickel or two.

I'm just saying, Jim McGreevey has a record here. He's got a record of proving that he cares about people, he's concerned about people. But in every job he's ever held he's shown discipline and fiscal responsibility and the willingness to resist the sort of siren song of the easy moment to look down the road to make sure that, first of all, the ship of state is being run in a responsible manner. Every person—liberal or conservative, black, white, brown or whatever, Republican or Democrat—every person has a vested interest in that in New Jersey. It's part of what enables us to be a community, knowing that our fundamental institutions are properly run with real discipline. It's a big issue. And sometimes when you're the guy making the decision, you have to make decisions that make people mad if you do it. But it's important.

There are lots of other examples I could give, but let me just give you one that to me dwarfs all the others. The insurance plan, by the way, I think is important because one of the problems that people—that we have with the legitimacy of public officials is that most people think that they don't count. They think in the end the big guys always win. And I've done everything I could to try to change that perception.

In 1993, we cut income taxes on the poorest working people, and now it's worth about $30,000 or a year to a family of four with an income of $26,000–$28,000 or less. And we raised the minimum wage, and we passed the family leave law, and we passed the TV rating system. We've done these things, trying to make ordinary people think that they were being given more authority.

But this insurance thing, this auto insurance thing is a big issue because it relates not only to how much money is going out of people's pocket, if they're feeling that, something has gone wrong, and they don't have any power to do anything about it. And if you're going to bring people together, people have to believe that you're on their side and that when the chips are down something can be done to put things right and make things better. So this is about more than money.

The last thing I want to say to you that I think is terribly important is I cannot tell you how important I believe it is that every single Governor have a passionate, uncompromising commitment to excellence in education for every single person in the State. Now, part of this is a money problem, but a lot of it is not.

We've worked hard to promote all kinds of reforms to sort of shake things up in stodgy bureaucracies and put more power down to parents and teachers and principals at the school level and at the same time to raise standards. We're supporting programs to put computers and to hook up computers to the Internet, every classroom and library in the entire United States by the year 2000.

We are—I think perhaps most importantly, this budget I believe, that we just passed, this balanced budget, 30 years from now people will look back on it and say there were two things that were interesting about it and profoundly important. One is they balanced the budget for the first time in a generation. The second is America finally opened the doors of college to every person who will work for a college education. That is in this budget.

Through the tax credits, the Pell grants, the work-study provisions, all of these things are going to literally make it possible so that no one can say I can't go to college because of the money anymore—no one of any age. Even when older people have to go back and

get retraining, there are tax benefits available.

But in the end, we all know something that we ought to face. The United States has the best system of higher education in the world. No one believes we have the best system of kindergarten through 12th grade education in the world. We have been challenged—I want to just state some facts—we've been challenged. We have far more diversity by income, by race, by culture than any other country trying to do what we're doing, number one. Number two, you need to know that on the whole American education is better than it was a decade ago. Our educators have made it better. Our parents have made it better. It's getting better, but it's nowhere near where it needs to be.

We are the only major country in the world that does not have national education standards and some way of measuring whether our children are meeting them, not to punish the children but so the parents and the taxpayers in every school district can know how the schools, how the district, and how the children are doing.

And I can't do this alone. This is not something I'm trying to impose on people. My proposal, which many Governors in the other party now oppose—although when I wrote it back in 1989 all the Governors but one were for it—my proposal is very simple: that the Federal Government should pay for but not develop—should pay for the development of national exams that reflect the standards that every child should meet in language in the fourth grade and math in the eighth grade. Start there. And then make it voluntarily available to every State and school district. And they then can give it to the children. But the tests cannot be used to punish the children, to hold them back, to put them down, to do anything. It is a measurement so we can finally know the truth.

Now, I believe all our kids can learn. I could take you into schools in every State in this country that, against all the odds, are proving that all children can learn. Therefore, it is unacceptable for us to continue to tolerate a system under the guise of local control or State responsibility or anything else that hides from the clear light of day to do better. We're not trying to punish anybody; we're trying to get better.

Every weekend, tens of millions of Americans are glued to the television set watching football games. Now, we're all glued to the TV set watching the pennant race. Suppose someone came on television and said, ''I'm sorry, but due to the sensitivities of the players we're not going to keep score tonight.'' [*Laughter*] ''We're going to play for 3 hours, and every now and then we'll change sides and let somebody else bat, and I hope you all enjoy it.'' [*Laughter*]

The only difference is, the game I'm trying to play in education, there doesn't have to be any losers. No one has to lose. The difference is, in the exam we're trying to—we're trying to say, ''This is the threshold. This is what everybody should know. But this is a fence over which everyone can jump.'' We're not trying to rank people first to last. We're trying to say 100 percent of the people need to be over this threshold so they can have the kind of future for themselves, their own families, and this country that we need. That is a huge issue, and the Governors will determine whether it's done. And this man is for the proposition that all our children can learn and that every child is entitled to high national standards and an adequate measurement of them. And on that issue alone he has the right to claim your support for Governor of New Jersey.

The point is, when I became President I said, ''We ought to give more power to State government, more power to local government. We ought to do more things with the private sector.'' We even privatized some Government operations I think had been in the Federal sector too long. But when we do these things, and if you like having a smaller, leaner, more focused National Government and you like the results we've achieved, you have to understand it makes everybody else more important. It makes all the mayors here more important. And it means when you elect a county official or a local official, and especially when you elect a Governor, you are voting—whether people know it or not, they are voting to give them a wider range of decisionmaking and a bigger impact over their lives than was the case 4 or 8 or 12 years ago. And it's very important.

And I want you to go out there and talk to the people in New Jersey about this. You don't have to be intensely partisan. You can just take these issues, one after the other, and ask people what they want for the future of their families and their State. And conduct your own little mini town hall meeting. And tell people, first of all, they've got to vote and here's why you are for Senator McGreevey and what you think the issues are. I believe you can have a huge impact.

But I'm just telling you, it is a big deal. Don't be under any illusion. This is not just about who gets this appointment or that appointment or who gets along with whom in the legislature. This is huge now, and we have been given very much more responsibility. And your future is on the line.

This is a magnificent State with unbelievable assets and challenges that are well within the ability of the people of New Jersey to confront them. But it matters who the leader is and what the direction is.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:15 p.m. in the Mayfair Room at the Mayfair Farms. In his remarks, he referred to State Senator John A. Lynch; Assemblyman Joseph V. Doria, Jr.; Assemblywoman Barbara Buono; State Senator Wayne R. Bryant; Sheriff Armando B. Fontoura of Essex County; Robert Bowser, Newark Board of Education; Mayor Samuel A. Spina of West Orange; Brendan Byrne, former New Jersey Governor; and Lt. Gov. Betsy McCaughey Ross of New York.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Reception in Florham Park, New Jersey

October 8, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Jim, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for being here for him and for our party and for what we're fighting for.

I want to thank my longtime friend Alan Solomont for being here and for being the finance chair of our Democratic Party—[*applause*]—yes, you can clap for him, that's nice—why don't you do that? He has a thankless job. [*Laughter*] When he calls people, you know—even when he calls me, I think he's going to call and hit me up for a contribution any day. [*Laughter*]

But most of all I'd like to thank the Kushners, Charles and Seryl, and thank you, Rae Kushner, and thank you, Mrs. Felsen. And I thank the children who gave me the shofar—Joshua and Nicole, Dara and Miryam, thank you.

And I'm glad we've got a long-distance connection to Israel. In a way, I always have a long-distance connection to Israel. [*Laughter*]

President Weizman was just here; we had a great visit. And of course Mr. Arafat and Prime Minister Netanyahu had a visit of their own, and we're hopeful that the peace process is back on track and so is the—that the security process is back on track, and I know all of you hope that, as well. But we're working hard on it.

Let me just briefly say that I came to New Jersey today for Jim McGreevey for what I think is a very good reason—it is entirely positive, there's nothing negative about it—and that is that in the next several years, for the foreseeable future in the 21st century, who happens to be Governor of any State and what decisions they make will have a bigger impact on how people live than in the previous 20 years, as an inevitable outgrowth of the way the world is changing, the way we change how we govern ourselves, how we make decisions, and how we go forward. And I think it's very important.

Let me say that a lot of you have helped me a lot over the last several years, and for that I am very grateful. I think we are much closer than we were 5 years ago to realizing the vision that I started out with when I announced for Governor—for President, when I was a Governor. I'm going to talk about that in a moment. That is, I think we're closer to the time when every American has a chance to live out the American dream if he or she will work for it. I think we're closer to the time when our country has articulated a vision that will maintain our world leadership for peace and freedom and prosperity and security. And I think we're closer to a time, although we still have a lot challenges, in which we can reach across all the racial, the ethnic, the cultural, the religious lines that divide us, and stand in stark contrast to

what is going on in so much of the world today and to the terrible story that Charles told us that had such a wonderful ending—of his family—by being a country that really can embrace all this diversity, celebrate it, respect it, honor it, and say, ''We're still bound together as one America.'' And I feel very good about that.

There is still a lot to do. There is a lot going on in Washington. I'm still trying, for the 5th year in a row, to pass campaign finance reform. And the opponents thought they had killed it yesterday, but we've got a little life left in us up there. If you can influence anybody, I hope you will, although I want to say that Senator Torricelli and Senator Lautenberg are part of the unanimous vote in our caucus for the McCain-Feingold bill and for campaign finance reform, which I very much appreciate.

We're dealing with the trade issue and the question of the extension of the President's authority to conduct trade negotiations with other countries and then have the Congress vote up or down on the bill, which is essential for me to make those agreements and to continue to expand trade. Otherwise—no one wants to negotiate with 535 people; they want to negotiate with one person.

And there's a lot of debate, and it's a healthy thing, because what we really want in the global economy is more involvement in the world economy in a way that benefits America but also having our communities make the appropriate response for people who have or will suffer as a result of dislocations in that economy. We owe that to them. That's what we're trying to achieve.

We had a fascinating conference this week on climate change. I'm convinced the climate is warming at an alarming rate and that we have to do the responsible thing, to lower our emissions of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. But it's a difficult problem for a democracy to address because it's not on anybody's back right now. It's something that's out there ahead of us. But if we do a little bit now we can avoid disastrous consequences and much more burdensome actions later.

Hillary and I are going to have the first White House Conference on Child Care at the end of the month. And that's a huge problem. We have more people in the work force than ever before, a higher percentage of people in the work force than ever before. But the most important job any of us has is our job to raise our children well. I know you believe that. I had more people—we just all took our picture—I had a higher percentage of people in the line that I just stood in ask me about my family and my daughter than any photograph line I have ever stood in in my whole life. And that's a great tribute to you and your values. And I thank you for that.

But this child care issue is really about whether all these people who have to work, who also have children, can succeed at work and at home. And we shouldn't have our country making a choice there. We don't want to crater the economy, but our most important job is to raise our children well.

So we're full of all these challenges, and it's exciting. But we have to—when I took office, we had this huge deficit and basically a yesterday's Government. And I made a commitment, as I've said many times, to the policies that favor the future over the past: change over the status quo, unity over division, and things that benefit everybody instead of just a few people. And that required changes, so we downsized the Government; we shared more responsibility with State and local government and the private sector. And State governments, anyway, have primary responsibility for things like auto insurance rates and, constitutionally, education.

So I can go out here and talk until I'm blue in the face about the importance of embracing national education standards. The United States is the only great country in the world that has no national standards of academic achievement that guarantee international capacity—in terms of operating in the economy—that everybody has to follow. We're not talking about Federal Government standards. We're not talking about imposing anything on anybody. It's totally voluntary. But that means that every Governor will decide whether to participate in the standards movement.

So the decisions made by the Governor of New Jersey in the next 20 years almost certainly will range over a wider scope and have a deeper impact on the lives of the peo-

ple of New Jersey than in the previous 20 years. And if my vision is going to be fulfilled, we have to have a partnership that really works to grow the economy, to fight crime, to preserve the environment, to deal with social problems, and most importantly, to make sure that every child in this country has a chance to live out his or her dreams with a decent education.

That's why I showed up here today, because this young man actually has an idea of what he will do if he gets elected. He's not running for Governor because he wants to live in that magnificent old house—New Jersey I think has the oldest and perhaps the most beautiful old Governor's mansion in the country. He actually has an idea of what he wants to do, and I think it's the right idea. And I hope you'll help him achieve it.

Thank you. Bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 4 p.m. in the chief executive's office at the Kushner Companies. In his remarks, he referred to Jim McGreevey, Democratic gubernatorial candidate; Charles Kushner, chief executive officer, Kushner Companies, his wife, Seryl, and his mother, Rae; Annette Felsen, Seryl Kushner's grandmother; the Kushner children Joshua and Nicole; Dara Freiriech, student council representative, Joseph Kushner Hebrew Academy; and Miryam Lichtman, president, student council, Kushner Yeshiva High School.

Statement on House Ways and Means Committee Action on Fast-Track Trading Authority Legislation

October 8, 1997

I am pleased that the House Ways and Means Committee has reported out legislation with bipartisan support that restores the traditional trading authority every President has had since 1974.

To keep our economy strong, we must continue to break down unfair foreign trade barriers to American products and services. This legislation, now passed by the committees of jurisdiction in both the Senate and the House, will allow us to tear down those barriers and help American businesses and workers compete and win in the global marketplace. I look forward to working with Members on both sides of the aisle to secure passage of this important legislation this year.

Statement on Action Against Terrorist Organizations

October 8, 1997

Last year I signed into law the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act. It authorizes the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, to designate an organization that engages in terrorist activity a foreign terrorist organization if it threatens the national security of the United States. The law prevents any fundraising or other financial transactions by these groups in the U.S. Heavy criminal penalties will also be levied against individuals in the United States who provide material support or resources to these terrorist organizations. Together, these provisions will help deprive terrorist groups of the resources they need to finance their acts of destruction.

Today Secretary Albright has designated 30 foreign organizations as terrorist groups. Now we will work to uncover those who raise money for them in America and encourage our friends and allies to do the same within their own borders.

The Secretary's designations are part of our ongoing fight against those who would undermine freedom and prosperity by violent acts. Just as we must reward and encourage the builders of peace and democracy, we must give no quarter to the enemies of these aspirations. Today's action sends a clear message: The path to change is through dialog and open deliberation, not violence and hatred. The United States is committed to fight against those who speak the language of terror.

Memorandum on the Switzerland-United States Agreement on the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy

October 8, 1997

Presidential Determination No. 98–1

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy

Subject: Presidential Determination on the Proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Swiss Federal Council Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy

I have considered the proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Swiss Federal Council Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, along with the views, recommendations, and statements of the interested agencies.

I have determined that the performance of the agreement will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Pursuant to section 123 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b)), I hereby approve the proposed agreement and authorize you to arrange for its execution.

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

William J. Clinton

Statement on Signing the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998

October 8, 1997

I have today signed into law H.R. 2266, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998.

This bill provides for a strong national defense, maintains high military readiness, funds investment programs necessary to modernize the equipment that our combat forces use, and supports our commitments to a better quality of life for our service personnel and their families. By providing the necessary support for our armed forces, this bill ensures continuing American global leadership.

As President, I have a solemn obligation to provide for the defense of our country. My Administration has designed a coherent strategy to provide the necessary military forces to deter and prevail over the threats we may face.

I remain deeply concerned, however, that the funding provided in this bill is excessive. The bill provides $4.2 billion more than I requested in my 1998 budget, and $1.2 billion more than the levels that my Administration believes was agreed to in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement.

Further, section 8080 of the Act contains certain reporting requirements that could materially interfere with or impede this country's ability to provide necessary support to another nation or international organization in connection with peacekeeping or humanitarian assistance activities other-wise authorized by law. I will interpret this provision consistent with my constitutional authority to conduct the foreign relations of the United States and my responsibilities as Commander in Chief.

My Administration is continuing discussions with the Congress on the remaining 1998 spending bills in order to protect important priorities in education and training, the environment, science and technology, law enforcement, and international affairs. Over the past several days, we have made progress in good-faith discussions with the leadership of the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees to close the gap between us. It is critical that these discussions continue with the goal of reaching a satisfactory conclusion as rapidly as possible.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 8, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2266, approved October 8, was assigned Public Law No. 105–56.

Remarks at a Young Democrats Council and Saxophone Club Reception in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

October 8, 1997

First let me thank my good friend Steve Grossman for the hard work he's done as chair of our party. And I want to ask him and our national finance chair, Alan Solomont, who is here, who is also from Boston—I appreciate what they said about Philadelphia in Philadelphia. Please don't ever say it in Boston. [*Laughter*] We're trying to hold both beachheads in a tough time.

Let me say to the mayor—Philadelphia has a wonderful mayor, flack, promoter, arm twister, and leader in Ed Rendell. He always thinks—[*applause*]—he's never ashamed to ask for the business, and I like that. And I feel pretty good at this podium. Somewhat to my regret, I will not be the nominee of our party in 2000. [*Laughter*] And so, ultimately, it will not be my decision to make, but I will say this: The last time we had a convention in Philadelphia, in 1948, it worked out pretty well for us. And I like that.

I'd like to thank the Saxophone Club and the Young Democrats from Philadelphia, tonight's cochairs, Lou Magazzu, Don Schroeder, Jill Ross-Stein, Jerry McCabe, and David Maser, and all of you who worked hard to make this a success. I'd like to thank you for coming here and for your good spirits, and for helping us to take this country in a new direction.

Through you, I would like to thank the people of Philadelphia who gave me nearly 80 percent of the vote here in the last election—I am very grateful for that—and the people of Pennsylvania, for twice supporting Al Gore and me and our administration and what we were trying to do.

Last week was the sixth anniversary of my declaration for the Presidency, back in October of 1991. It's hard for me to believe that 6 years have passed and that almost five-eighths of my Presidency is behind me. But I am very proud of what we've been able to do together. And I did it mostly for the young people of this country—and for the future of this country—because I wanted you—[*applause*]—I believed that if we changed the direction of America we could create a nation in the 21st century where the American dream really was alive for every person, without regard to race or gender or background, everybody who was willing to work for it.

I believe that we can create an America still leading the world toward peace and freedom and democracy and prosperity. And I believe we can create an America out of all of our diversity where we celebrate our differences and respect our differences, and we're still bound together as one America, a stunning challenge to all those countries where people are killing each other because of their differences. And that's what I want for you and your future and our children's future.

It seems hard for me to believe it was 6 years ago. I said, ''Okay, let's all get together and work at this, and we'll change this country. We will pursue a course based on the future, not the past; based on change, not the status quo; based on unity, not division; based on helping everybody, not just a few; based on leading, not following. And we'll have a Government that doesn't try to do everything but doesn't walk away from our challenges either. And we'll change this country.'' And 6 years later, look at what's happened. In 4 years and 8 months in office, we've got over 13 million new jobs and the strongest economy in a generation, a lot of our most distressed neighborhoods are beginning to come back.

We just learned today that last month alone—in one month—there were 250,000 people who moved from welfare to work, that there has been a 26 percent reduction in the number of people who were living on welfare, moving instead into families living on paychecks—the biggest drop in the history of the country, 5 years of declining crime, thanks to the efforts of people like Mayor Rendell who took those police officers and put them on the streets in community policing programs.

This country has a stronger and cleaner environment than it had 5 years ago. This country has a smaller Government and stronger partnerships with cities and States and the private sector. But we also stood against the contract on America and the at-

tempt to take away the things that bind us together as a country, our common commitments to education, to the environment, to the health of our children, and to the future of our country. That's what this was about.

And as we look ahead, we've still got a lot of challenges ahead of us and a lot of things I hope we can do to build that bridge to the 21st century before we begin to celebrate the millennium in 2000 and I have to depart in January of 2001. And I just want to mention three or four of them now.

First of all, all of you are here at this Saxophone Club-Young Democrats event at ticket prices of $25 to $100. It's my favorite group. We started this when I was running for President—the Saxophone Club. A young American with a great idea started it, and we tried to promote it all over the country. If we can get the other party to stop trying to kill campaign finance reform in the Senate, we could all raise all of our money this way and be on an equal footing, and we'd see who had more bodies, more citizens, more people, more voices, and better ideas. And I hope you'll help us do it.

Secondly, we have a great challenge before us—long-term—that will affect the youngest people in this audience, I'm convinced in your lifetime, if we don't do something about it. And that is confronting the challenge to the change in our climate by the warming that is going on all across the Earth as we put more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. Now, what the challenge is, is for us to figure out a way to do less of it without throwing people out of work, without diminishing incomes, without cutting off future growth. Can we do it? You bet we can.

Don't let anybody tell you that we can't improve our environment and still grow the economy. Two-thirds—let me just give you one example—two-thirds of all the heat generated by electric powerplants is wasted—two-thirds. Of all the inputs of coal and oil, only one-third of it goes to actually giving you electricity you can use for heating or cooling or lighting or for manufacturing purposes. What happened to the other two-thirds? If we go get it back, we'll be putting less into the atmosphere that warms the atmosphere and compromises the future of our children and grandchildren.

So I ask you to help me in that. The young people of America have been the strongest environmentalists, and yet, we owe it to you to give you a strong economy. We have to find a way to do both. I know we can, and I need your help to do it and to send a message loud and clear: We do not want to have to make a choice in the 21st century, and we refuse to do so. We can clean our environment and grow our economy, and we're determined to do it.

The third thing that I would ask you to do in thinking about the future is to support our efforts to continue to lead the world toward peace and freedom and prosperity. I know most Americans believe on a daily basis that what happens halfway around the world doesn't affect them, but it does, not just in the climate changes, which affect us all no matter where the problems occur, but in other ways as well.

If we had not stepped in to stop the slaughter in Bosnia, eventually the United States would have been pulled into a wider, deeper conflict in Europe, and more American lives would have been put at risk. If we had not stepped in to try to restore democracy in Haiti, eventually we would have had much more disruption on our own shores and much more human destruction on the island of Haiti that we would have been forced to come to grips with.

If we don't continue to try to reach out and trade on honorable and fair terms to sell more American products in Latin America and Asia and Africa and the other growing countries of the world, not only will we see other countries with weaker economies and weaker democracies, we won't grow as wealthy as we would grow. Because we only have 4 percent of the people in the world, we have to sell to the other 96 percent. These things matter.

It matters that we're banning chemical weapons. It matters that we're trying to do something about landmines. It matters that we're trying to stop nuclear testing for all time. It matters that we're trying to make this a safer, freer, more prosperous world. And someone has to take the initiative.

So all of you who are young—you look around here at the students who are here who come from all these different heritages

and backgrounds—you should want your country out there working for peace in the Middle East, peace in Northern Ireland, to continue to make the peace in Bosnia hold. You should want your country out there working to reduce the nuclear threat, to fight terrorism, and to take the lead in global efforts to grow the economy and preserve the environment. And you have to develop this attitude. Just like you see people from all over the world in Philadelphia—that is our meal ticket to the future, if we relate to the rest of the world in a constructive and friendly and strong way. So I ask you—say we want America to lead the world, not to follow, and we will support that. That's part of the new Democratic Party we're trying to build.

Finally, and most importantly, let me come back to where I began. The biggest challenge we face is to embrace our diversity, celebrate our diversity, respect our differences—our racial, our ethnic, our religious, all our other differences—and say that still the most important thing is we can find common ground as one America.

When you look at the time I spend as your President, trying to stop people from Bosnia to Burundi and Rwanda, from the Middle East to Northern Ireland, people who look as different as daylight and dark, united only by one thing: They are caught in the grips of ethnic or religious or racial hatred, and it dominates their lives and destroys their countries. We can stand as a shining alternative to that.

One of our school districts, the one just across the Potomac River from Washington—Fairfax County—now has students in the public school district from 182 different countries, speaking over 100 different languages—one school district. Many—I'll bet you the number is not much smaller in Philadelphia. I know it's not in New York or Chicago or Los Angeles. The point is, we are really becoming the world's first truly multiracial, multiethnic democracy in the sense that here we all more or less live and work together. And yet we know that there continue to be problems that divide us.

That's why I had this national advisory board on race, and I asked the American people to join me in trying to deal with our racial differences. And we know that not everybody has an equal economic and educational opportunity. We know there are still some neighborhoods where all this economic recovery has not reached. We know there are still some schools that are not doing the job they should be doing for their children. We know, in other words, that our ideal of liberty, which was forged in Philadelphia around the Liberty Bell so long ago, is still not real for everyone.

This country will always be a work in progress. But as we move into a global information age, where not only the changes in the economy and technology but the changes in how we live and patterns of immigration have brought us closer to others and to each other than ever before, the great test of our time and your future will be whether we can learn to live together, both respecting our differences and saying what unites us in the end is more important—the shared values, the shared devotion to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, the belief that everybody has a place in this country if they work hard, obey the law, and show up every day as good citizens.

That's what I want you to really fight for, because if you do it, believe me, the best days of this country are still ahead, and the Democratic Party that came into power in the United States by a vote of the American people in 1993 and changed the course of this country to bring us together and move us forward, will have a proud claim to its contribution to that for the 21st century, thanks to you.

Thank you. God bless you, and good night. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:52 p.m. in the CoreStates Arena.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner in Philadelphia

October 8, 1997

Thank you. If I had any sense at all, I would simply quit while I'm ahead. [*Laughter*] That was a wonderful statement, Mr. Mayor, given by a person who's in a position to know.

I've said many times in the last 6 years or so that, as I've had a chance to travel this

country, the most gifted and innovative public servants in America today are the mayors of the cities that are beginning to work again for all the people. And Philadelphia certainly is, and in no small measure because of you.

I know most of you heard what I had to say downstairs, and I won't make you sit through it again. So I would just like to try to build on what the mayor said. I've been feeling rather nostalgic lately; last week was the 6th anniversary of my declaring for President, and the end of this week is my 22d wedding anniversary. And Hillary and I are dealing with the empty nest syndrome, so we have time to think—[*laughter*]—we have time to think high thoughts at night now, instead of wondering when Chelsea is going to bed—"Stop studying, turn out the light, you can't learn after one o'clock," or something. [*Laughter*]

Let me just say that I am, first of all, very grateful for the last almost 5 years. I've tried to do what I said I would do when I ran for President. A leading political scientist said before I was reelected that I had already kept a higher percentage of my promises than the last five Presidents and that I made more than they did, which really was something. And I was very grateful to hear that.

This last balanced budget meant a great deal to me because I thought it would be a good thing for the country psychologically, as well as economically, to have a balanced budget for the first time in a generation. And I thought it was important to prove that you could balance the budget and still have the biggest increase in investment, in health care for working families and poor children, and in education since 1965.

And I do agree with Mayor Rendell, I think the biggest legacy of that budget over the long term will be that we literally have opened the doors of college to everybody who will work for it now—because we had the biggest increase in Pell grants in 20 years; we go up to a million people in work-study; we have IRA's that people can save in and withdraw from without penalty if you use it to pay for education. You get a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college, the HOPE scholarship, and then other tax credits for the junior, the senior year, graduate school, or when people go back. It's a great, great thing. But I'd like to just sort of ask you to take a few minutes and sort of look at what underlies that.

Six years ago when I decided to run for President, I had been a Governor for quite a long while. And one of the things that bothered me was that the rhetoric that came out of Washington and the fights that the political parties had seemed increasingly disconnected from the life that I knew my friends to be living and my people to be living. And it was all sort of left-right, liberal-conservative, this box-that box, this conflict-that conflict, and it didn't seem to me to really work. I mean, I didn't know anybody that talked like that except in Washington. I never met anybody on the street that talked like that. And it really bothered me, because I admired a lot of the people in Washington, frankly, in both parties, with whom I had worked. I didn't understand it. But I just thought that we were locked into a dialog with each other in Washington that was actually preventing anything from getting done and moving the country forward.

And essentially what I thought was that the Republicans understood the importance of the market but were blind to the needs to give everybody the tools and conditions to take advantage of the market; that the Democrats understood the importance of compassion and of trying to take care of everybody in the social contract but too often were unwilling to make the tough decisions to get the economy going, which is still the best social program for everybody who has got a good job; and that somehow we had to reconcile that and develop a dynamic approach to politics so that we could have this debate between the two parties, and one would be more liberal and the other would be more conservative and the debate would go on, but at least it would be about the real choices facing the country and the real lives of people.

And I decided that if I didn't do anything else in the campaign—and when I started only my mother thought I could win—[*laughter*]—that I was going to try to change the terms of the debate, so we would be talking about real things in a real way that could have a real impact on the way people live. And in a way, I tried to be President the

way I served as Governor or the way Ed Rendell serves as mayor.

So let me just sort of take stock about where we are. I said, ''We're going to have to take a new direction. If we're going to have opportunity for everybody responsible enough to work for it, if you're going to rebuild the American community with all this diversity, and if we're going to maintain America's leadership, then we have to focus on it.'' Instead of the old left-right, liberal-conservative, we said, ''We have to be for the future, not the past; for change, not the status quo; for unity, not division; for policies that help everybody, not just a few people; and we have to do things that will help us lead, not follow.''

I love that old one-liner, you know, that unless you're the lead dog on the sled, the view's always the same. [*Laughter*] And I think it's something that we have to remember. Because as I told the young people down there tonight, it's very frustrating to me that I have not been able to persuade my fellow Americans of the benefits of our involvement in the world on a general, philosophical level. And I regret that. I've got to keep working on that. I've got to find a way to do a better job of that.

But if you look at where we are now compared to where we were, with an economic policy that says basically we're going to charge head on into the global marketplace, but we're going to try to preserve the social contract at home and give everybody a chance to play—what that has meant in practical terms is expand trade; be fiscally responsible and balance the budget, but invest more in education, invest more in environmental technology, invest more in the health care of our people, and support things like family and medical leave and the minimum wage and the adoption tax credit and things that enable people to build strong families while they go to work; support the empowerment zone, like the one Philadelphia has, and community financial institutions that loan money to new entrepreneurs that couldn't get money at the local bank otherwise, do things that bring the benefits of free enterprise into the inner cities. The other big trade opportunity we've got in America is all these neighborhoods where people are unemployed or underemployed. If they were all working, that would be a big market for America's future.

So that's what we've tried to do. And I think it's incontestable that it has worked. We've never generated so many jobs in such a short time, over 13 million now in less than 5 years. And it has worked. There is more to do, but it has worked.

With the crime program—the mayor talked about that—what we wanted to do was to be tough and smart. We had people in Washington that wanted to pass tougher and tougher sentences when the police were screaming, ''Give me more police officers, and I'll not only catch more criminals, I'll prevent crime. Give me people who can walk the streets and know the kids and know the parents and know the neighbors, and we'll drive the crime rate down.'' And that's what we did. And it had to be done. It cost us a few Members of Congress in 1994, but sooner or later the Federal Government had to take on the people who said that it was wrong to have any restriction on guns. And what we did with the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban has made this a safer country. It was the right thing to do. It's something we take for granted now—we wonder what else we ought to do—but it was a huge thing at the time it occurred. And our party sacrificed so many House Members that it may—that alone may have cost us the House in '94, including some here in Pennsylvania, because all these people were told we were coming after their guns.

But in 1996, I had the pleasure of going back to New Hampshire and looking at all those people with their hunting license and saying, ''You remember 2 years ago when they told you we were coming after your guns, and you beat one of our Congressmen?'' I said, ''Every one of you that lost your gun, you ought to vote against me, too. But if you didn't, you need to know they lied to you, and you need to let them know you don't appreciate it.'' And we carried New Hampshire again and turned it around, because people now say, ''We can have safe streets, we can have responsible gun laws. There's no reason somebody who's got a felony record or a serious mental instability

should be able to walk in and buy a handgun without even being checked out.''

So we changed the debate now. The debate is not this sort of abstract argument about the second amendment. The debate is, how can we preserve the culture, the way of life, the legitimate desire of people to go out and hunt and fish and do what they ought to be able to do and make our streets safe and stop these kids from getting killed in Philadelphia. The mayor told the truth: There are kids all over this country that don't believe they'll ever live to be 50. Why should they ever forgo anything that's bad for them since they're not going to be around very long? But at least we've changed the debate now; we're moving forward.

I think we changed the nature of the welfare debate. Today we found out another 250,000 people moved off the welfare rolls last week. There are now 3.6 million Americans living off paychecks, instead of welfare checks, that weren't when I became President. That's how much we've reduced the rolls by, 3.6 million. Why? Because the answer was not to throw people in the street. And it's fine to require people to go to work, but you also have to realize they had young children—that's why they're on welfare in the first place—so they've got to be able to take care of their kids. So don't take their health care away. Don't take their food stamps away. And give them medical care, and give them child care.

Because the biggest problem most families face—even a lot of well-to-do families with young children face terrible problems of reconciling their responsibilities as parents and their responsibilities to the work force. There are people in this room who have good incomes who have had lots of days where you were tearing your hair out, trying to figure out how you could do what you thought you ought to be doing at work and still do the right thing by your children. It is the single most significant social challenge facing all classes of Americans. Why? Because our biggest job is still raising our kids right. That's more important than everything else. If we do that right, most everything else will be all right.

On the other hand, if we have to, in order to do that, basically crater our family's income, wreck a business, or weaken the American economy, that's a price we shouldn't have to pay. That's why all these family leave policies and all that is so important.

So we tried to say, ''Okay, we'll step into the gap here.'' That's why we passed family and medical leave and raised the minimum wage and passed that Kennedy-Kassebaum bill that said you can keep your health insurance when you change jobs or if somebody in your family gets sick, or stopped the sort of drive-by deliveries where women could be thrown out of the hospital after they had a baby within 24 hours, or provided the extra tax credit so we get people to adopt kids that are homeless and desperately need homes. Why? Because we're trying to figure out a way to grow the economy and support families. Not the same debate—it's not an either-or. We have to find a way to do both things, to have balance and harmony in America.

The same thing with the environment. I consider myself a passionate environmentalist, and yet you know that I have devoted most of my energies in my first term to getting the economy going again. I think if we have to choose, we're in terrible trouble.

But most of the choices are false choices. I remember when the United States decided—this was before my time—to limit sulfur dioxide emissions into the atmosphere. And everybody said, ''This is going to cost a ton of money, and it's going to bankrupt the country, and we'll never get it done on the timetable.'' And we let the market take over. They set up a permit trading system for sulfur dioxide emissions permitting. And a few years later, we're way ahead of schedule at far less than half the predicted cost, and the economy is booming because we found a way to get the private sector and its creativity involved in protecting and cleaning up our environment.

That's what we have to do with this greenhouse gas problem that's warming the climate. If we do this right, we will create jobs, we will not shut down jobs, and we'll preserve the environment for our children.

So we got out of the environment—so the Republicans are for jobs, and the Democrats are for the environment; the liberals are for the environment, the conservatives for jobs—what a crazy way to live. I want to be able

to breathe when I go to and from work. [*Laughter*] This is not a debate that should be structured this way. So I think we've changed it.

And the last thing I'd like to say in that regard is this whole business about how we should handle our diversity. I could see it coming even in '92. The whole thing was, are you for or against affirmative action. What I'm for is everybody having a chance to participate in this country's life. And if people don't have a chance, then I am poorer. It is a selfish thing to want every American, without regard to their race, their neighborhood, their background, or where they start out in life, to have a good chance to make it. That is a selfish thing for you to feel, because if they don't, then they're a drag on your future. And if they do, then they're contributing to your future.

So we tried to reform the affirmative action programs without getting rid of them. Why? Because it was manifestly clear that there is still an absence of completely equal educational and economic opportunity in America. But that's not the main thing. The main thing we've got to do is get everybody a job, everybody an education, and open opportunity to people.

The other thing I tried to get the American people to think about is, we are well on our way to becoming a country in which there is no majority race. Before midway through the next century, people of European heritage will not have a majority of the population, before 2050. We don't know exactly when, but sometime before then. Within about 5 years, that will be the case in California.

Now, we have always said we were a country bound together by ideas and ideals, not by any particular piece of land and not by any race and not by any standard. When we started out, you had to be a white male property owner to vote. We've slowly shed all that stuff. We've moved toward more and more and more equality. But we are now going to have to face the fact that in a global society our greatest asset is our diversity. But if you look at the problems other countries are having, and the problems that are still lurking under the surface here from place to place, it could also be our greatest problem.

Now, it seems to me to be foolish to have yesterday's debate about this. The facts are, here we are. I said to the group downstairs and I'm going to say again: The most diverse school district in the country apparently is the one that's across the river from Washington, DC, in Fairfax County, Virginia, where there are children from 182 countries in one school district, speaking over 100 languages. But there are 5 school districts already in America where there are kids whose native tongues number more than 100. And there will be 12 within a couple years. And every school district—there are school districts that had no diversity at all 4 or 5 years ago that now have large Hispanic populations where people had to be brought in because there was a negative unemployment rate. So this is happening across America.

Now, what's our attitude about this? Are we going to think about this in future terms or in yesterday's terms? Are we going to look at people who are different from us as a great opportunity to make our lives more interesting or as some problem we have to deal with? This is a huge issue.

The one thing I'm convinced of is, if we think about the future instead of the past, and change and not the status quo, and unity instead of division, and what helps everybody instead of what helps a few people, we are highly likely to make the right decision. And it is very important.

So if—in addition to what the mayor said about hope for young people, I want you all to think about this. I want you to do what I try to do. When you get up tomorrow, think about: What would I like America to look like 20 years from now? What would I like America to look like when my children are my age? What would I like my legacy to my children to be in terms of my country? And I think that if we do that, we're going to be just fine.

I have seen, in the last 5 years—if I had told you 5 years ago when I was inaugurated President, in 5 years we'll have over 13 million new jobs and the biggest drop in welfare in history and 5 years of dropping violent crime, and the environment will be cleaner, and the public health will be more secure, and America will be clearly leading the world toward a more peaceful situation—you would

have been pretty happy, wouldn't you? But you probably wouldn't have believed it. At that point, we didn't have much self-confidence. And this was not rocket science; we just sort of showed up for work every day. This was not rocket science.

I thought about how would I—how should I be President in the way I would behave if I were mayor—it's the way I would behave if I were Governor, it's the way I would behave if I were running any other big enterprise—remembering that my bosses are the American people as a whole. And I think we've changed the direction of the Democratic Party. I hope we've changed the direction of the political debate in the country. I hope eventually we'll also change the direction of the Republican Party so we'll have a principled debate about where the dynamic center of America ought to be on education questions and environmental questions and other questions for the future.

But when you come here and contribute to this, I just want you to understand that. I'd also just like to say this last thing. I think that we have changed the way Government works. State and local governments, the private sector are in more partnerships with us now. We have 300,000 fewer people than we used to, 16,000 fewer pages of regulation. We've reformed a lot of our laws and our processes. The only thing we haven't reformed is campaign finance, and that's because—if we had a majority in Congress today, at least enough to break a filibuster, we could do that. But we may get that if we keep working at it. And that will be nice, because I'll still have dinner with you and it will be less expensive for you—[*laughter*]—and we'll have a good time. That would be important, too. That's important, too.

And let me just say one last thing to all of you. I'm glad you're here. I appreciate your support. We ought to pass this McCain-Feingold bill, but the work won't be done until we lower the cost of campaigns. And to do that, you have to lower the cost of communicating with the voters. That's what really has driven this whole thing. So people who observe strict campaign limits ought to be rewarded with free or reduced air time and other means of communication with people, so they can afford it. Sometimes we put the cart before the horse here, and we forget what has been driving all this. And I hope we can do that.

I just want you to feel good about your country. We're in better shape than we were 5 years ago. We're having a debate that makes sense again, by and large. We're arguing over things that are important, that will make a difference to your future. And you should feel very good about your country. You should be very strongly confident in the role you've played in it.

But I want to make it clear that for all the things that have been done, we've got a lot to do between now and the 21st century. And I intend to work to the last minute of the last hour of the last day, until the Constitution puts me out to pasture, to do my part. But even then, there will be more to do. And I just hope you can remember and believe in these basic ideas and make sure that our party keeps pushing this basic line, to throw this country into the future, because this is a great place and it has been given to us to sort of take it through this transition.

And here in Philadelphia, where it all began—I was talking to the mayor tonight about what John Marshall wrote when he heard George Washington had died, and he heard it here, and he couldn't go home to Virginia and get there in time for his funeral. So all the Founding Fathers had to organize a service for President Washington here. And we were thinking about it—just think about it, over 200 years ago. We're still around because people like us, in the past, at every moment of change, did the right thing. And that's what we really have to be doing now.

I think we're going in the right direction. But I need you—you should not flag in your commitment. You shouldn't be discouraged. You should be encouraged, and you should know that if we face the challenges that are still out there and complete this transition, that clearly—clearly—the best days of our country are still ahead.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:45 p.m. in the Victors Restaurant at the CoreStates Arena. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Edward Rendell of Philadelphia.

Remarks Honoring the National Association of Police Organizations' "Top Cops"

October 9, 1997

Thank you very much. Good morning. Madam Attorney General, Tom Scotto, Bob Scully, the executive director of NAPO, and the other officers—Ray Kelly, and Mr. Feldman and the other members of your organization who are here. I want to thank the previous speakers for their comments and, more importantly, for the work they have done to bring us to this day.

I'm delighted to welcome you to the White House to once again honor our Nation's courageous "Top Cops" and to emphasize the importance of the breakthrough we are announcing today in our efforts to protect children from gun violence.

Four and a half years ago, we committed ourselves, as an administration, to take back our streets from crime and violence. We put in place a comprehensive plan based on what law enforcement officers were already trying to do in communities all across America—to put 100,000 new community police officers on our streets, to put tough new penalties on our books, to steer our young people away from crime and gangs and guns, and to keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

We've made real progress. Just last week, as the Attorney General said, we learned our Nation's murder rate has fallen to the lowest point in more than a generation. And for the 5th year in a row, violent crime and property crime have dropped nationwide. These are encouraging trends, and it is clear what is working. One big reason we're turning back the tide of crime is because we're blessed with the kind of outstanding police officers who are standing with me today.

Every year, I look forward to meeting with the winners of the Nation's "Top Cop" awards. NAPO does a great job in picking these people for what they have done. It's an honor to shake hands and look into the eyes of true American heroes. Nominated by their fellow officers, selected from among hundreds of worthy nominees, the "Top Cops" assembled here today represent America's finest.

To say that their courage and devotion has gone beyond the call of duty is indeed an understatement. From rescuing wounded detention officers during a brutal prison riot, to saving hundreds of plant workers under threat from a deranged sniper, you have risked your lives to protect ours. On behalf of a grateful and admiring Nation, I say thank you and congratulations to our "Top Cops" and to their families.

During my time in office, one of the things we've tried to do to work with law enforcement is to help to protect our children from the horror of accidental deaths from unlocked guns. Communities all across our Nation have suffered devastating losses when a child playing with a parent's gun accidentally takes the life of a brother, a sister, or a playmate. According to a recent study released by the Justice Department, 22 million privately owned handguns are kept both loaded and unlocked, which helps to explain why every year about 1,500 children are treated in hospital emergency rooms for unintentional gun injuries. In 1994 alone nearly 200 children died from accidental gunshot wounds.

In March I directed that guns issued to all Federal law enforcement officials, including the FBI, the ATF, the DEA, and Customs agents, be equipped with child safety locks. And by next week, every agency will have fully complied. When I announced this policy, I said if it's good enough for law enforcement, it should be good enough for all our citizens. Today, because of the voluntary action of the firearms industry, millions of our citizens will receive this protection. I'm pleased to announce that eight of the largest handgun manufacturers will now provide child safety devices with every new handgun they sell. This will affect 8 of 10 handguns made in America, and it will save many young lives.

We have today with us leaders of these eight companies: Smith and Wesson, Glock, Beretta, Taurus Firearms, Heckler & Koch, H & R 1871, SigArms, and O.F. Mossberg & Sons. I'd like to ask them to stand so that we can thank them for their commitment. Please stand up. [*Applause*] Thank you very much for your example and your leadership.

I hope soon our other handgun makers will follow your lead.

As is well known, this administration and the gun industry from time to time have stood on different sides of various issues—the Brady law, the assault weapons ban—and there may be other disagreements in the future. But today, as has already been said by your representative, today we stand together and stand with the law enforcement community to do what we all know is right for our children.

I should add, as the Attorney General has already said, there are many Members of Congress who have worked with us to advance this issue of child safety locks, and I want to thank them as well.

Now we must work together to do more to protect our children from the scourge of violent crime and especially from crimes committed by other young people. This is now my highest law enforcement priority. We must provide for more prosecutors and probation officers, tougher penalties, and also better gang prevention efforts, including after-school programs, so that these young people have something to say yes to and some way of staying out of trouble. And we should prohibit violent teenagers from buying guns once they become adults. The same proscriptions of the Brady law should apply to them.

We also, of course, will never be able to supplant the work that must be done by parents in working hard to teach their children that no matter how hard it is, they must do the right thing and reject the wrong course.

For too many years, our people feared that crime would always grow and grow, that nothing could be done to stem lawlessness and violence. But working together—police and parents, public officials and responsible industry leaders—we are making a difference in the lives of our families.

I especially want to thank, again, the ''Top Cops'' for their truly heroic contributions. And through them, I thank all the others who might well have been here today but who still do their jobs every day and also deserve our thanks, in every community in this country. Because of that kind of bravery every day, America is moving forward into a new century with safer streets and much, much greater peace of mind.

Thank you very much, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Thomas J. Scotto, president, and Robert T. Scully, executive director, National Association of Police Organizations; Raymond W. Kelly, Under Secretary (Enforcement), Department of the Treasury; and Richard Feldman, executive director, American Shooting Sports Council.

Statement on Signing the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997

October 9, 1997

I am pleased to sign today H.R. 1420, the ''National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997.'' This Act will strengthen and improve our National Wildlife Refuge System as we enter the 21st century. It embodies the principle that whether they cast a line, pitch a decoy, or click a shutter, the 30 million Americans who annually visit and enjoy our refuges have one common and enduring interest—the conservation of fish, wildlife, and their habitat. That is what the National Wildlife Refuge System is about and that is what this Act will promote and ensure.

The National Wildlife Refuge System is the world's greatest system of lands dedicated to the conservation of fish and wildlife. It is a system founded in faith; a belief that in a country as bountiful and diverse as ours, there ought to be special places that are set aside exclusively for the conservation of fish and wildlife resources. These special places are National Wildlife Refuges where the conservation needs of wildlife are paramount.

Key provisions of H.R. 1420 mirror those of Executive Order 12996, Management and General Public Use of the National Wildlife Refuge System, which I signed in March 1996. These provisions include the mission statement for the Refuge System, the designation of priority public uses, and a requirement that the environmental health of the Refuge System be maintained.

The bill maintains the crucial distinction clearly set forth in my Executive order between wildlife conservation as the dominant

refuge goal and compatible wildlife-dependent recreation as a priority public use. Wildlife conservation is the purpose of the refuges. The opportunity for compatible recreational uses are the important benefits that flow from this purpose. This bill recognizes that the use of refuge lands and waters, to the extent that such use can be allowed, shall be reserved first to those recreational activities that depend and thrive on abundant populations of fish and wildlife.

The bill also maintains the strict policy, first established by the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, that all refuge uses must be compatible with the primary purpose or purposes for which the refuge was established. It sets up a sensible, consistent, and public process for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's managers to follow in making compatibility determinations, and it adopts the Fish and Wildlife Service's longstanding regulatory standard for compatibility.

The bill reiterates the specific categories of wildlife-dependent recreation found in Executive Order 12996 that are to be considered as the ''priority public uses'' for the refuge system: hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation. Where compatible, refuge managers are to provide increased opportunities for these uses and enhance the attention they receive in refuge management and planning.

Finally, H.R. 1420 maintains the historic Refuge System policy that refuges are ''closed until open.'' That is, in order to ensure that wildlife needs come first, existing refuge lands and waters are closed to public uses until they are specifically opened for such uses. Also as provided in Executive Order 12996, the bill establishes a new process for identifying compatible wildlife-dependent recreational activities prior to the acquisition of new refuge areas, thereby avoiding the temporary closure of ongoing compatible recreational activities.

This bill is the result of extensive negotiations by my Administration, the Congress, and environmental and sportmen's groups. Starting from widely differing positions, they worked intensively to reach the compromise reflected in this legislation. The bill is proof that when there is a shared commitment to do what is right for our natural resources, partisan and ideological differences can be set aside and compromises can be negotiated for the benefit of the common good. It is clearly the most significant conservation legislation to emerge from this Congress to date. I hope and trust the process by which this bill was enacted will serve as a model for future congressional action on other environmental measures.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 9, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 1420, approved October 9, was assigned Public Law No. 105–57.

Statement on Signing the Oklahoma City National Memorial Act of 1997

October 9, 1997

I am pleased to sign today S. 871, the ''Oklahoma City National Memorial Act of 1997.'' This Act establishes the Oklahoma City National Memorial as a unit of the National Park System to recognize the profound changes brought to so many lives on the tragic morning of April 19, 1995.

The significance of the tragedy of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, and the meaning and implications of this event for our Nation, compel the establishment of this memorial as a visible and prominent national shrine. After the bombing, I proclaimed a National Day of Mourning for those lost in the tragedy. The people of the United States prayed for them and their community as we gathered in our places of worship around the country. When I traveled to Oklahoma City to participate in a memorial service for the bombing victims, I pledged to do all I could to help heal the injured, to rebuild the city, and to stand by the people of Oklahoma City.

The Oklahoma City Memorial Foundation has done a tremendous job of involving the public, defining its mission and goals, and holding a design competition for the memorial. Building upon these local efforts, this Act establishes the Oklahoma City Memorial Trust to manage the memorial. This Trust,

a Federal Government corporation, will operate within the Department of the Interior in cooperation with the National Park Service to ensure the fulfillment of the obligations and requirements of the laws and policies that govern units of the National Park Systems (NPS).

Through the partnership, the National Park Service will provide technical assistance to the Trust for 2 years, after which time the Trust will reimburse the Park Service for any further services. As part of this partnership, it is my expectation that the National Park Service will establish a position of superintendent or site manager to work closely with the Trust in managing this NPS unit.

Section 5(v)(1) of S. 871 vests the powers and management of the Trust in a Board of Directors consisting of the Secretary of the Interior and eight other members appointed by the President. These Presidential appointments would be made from names submitted by the Governor of Oklahoma, the Mayor of Oklahoma City, and the Oklahoma congressional delegation. Because the Constitution does not permit limiting the executive branch's appointment power by requiring nominations from lists of recommendations, I will regard any lists submitted pursuant to that section as advisory.

I commend all those who worked so hard to memorialize the lives of the innocent victims of the Oklahoma City bombing.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 9, 1997.

NOTE: S. 871, approved October 9, was assigned Public Law No. 105–58.

Message on the Observance of Yom Kippur, 1997

October 9, 1997

Warm greetings to all those observing Yom Kippur.

On this most solemn of Jewish holy days, Jews across America and around the world acknowledge the transgressions of the past year and come before God to atone for their sins. It is a time to rectify mistakes, to repair broken bonds between family members, friends, and neighbors, and to reaffirm their sacred covenant with God. Rich with tradition and ritual, observed with strict fasting and devout prayer, the Day of Atonement offers the Jewish people a powerful reminder to begin the new year by seeking what is most important: the mercy of God and the forgiveness of those whom they may have failed.

As our nation embarks upon a season of renewal and reconciliation, Americans of all faiths can learn from the lessons of Yom Kippur. By acknowledging the divisions among us and seeking forgiveness from one another for past injuries and mistakes, we can strengthen our families, communities, and nation and enter the future as a more compassionate and united people.

Hillary joins me in extending best wishes to all for a blessed Yom Kippur.

Bill Clinton

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 9.

Memorandum on the Brazil-United States Agreement on the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy

October 9, 1997

Presidential Determination No. 98–2

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy

Subject: Presidential Determination on the Proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy

I have considered the proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, along with the views, recommendations, and statements of the interested agencies.

I have determined that the performance of the agreement will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Pursuant to sec-

tion 123 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b)), I hereby approve the proposed agreement and authorize you to arrange for its execution.

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

William J. Clinton

Proclamation 7035—Leif Erikson Day, 1997

October 9, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Americans have always been a people marked by a spirit of discovery. Generations of American explorers and pioneers have pushed against the boundaries of the known world, eager to see what lies beyond the next horizon. We come by that spirit naturally, for millions of us are descended from men and women of courage, vision, and independence who left their native lands to seek new possibilities in a new world.

One of the earliest of these was Leif Erikson. Almost a thousand years ago, braving the cold and unforgiving North Atlantic, he set out on a voyage that would ultimately bring him to this continent and a lasting place in history. But Leif Erikson is more than a symbol of the pioneer spirit. He is also a powerful reminder of the long and proud history of the sons and daughters of Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland who endured the hardships of the American frontier to build a new life for themselves and their families. These immigrants from the Nordic countries, and their descendants, have contributed immeasurably to America's strength, character, prosperity, and independent spirit.

Today, the people of Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland are our partners in building a new Europe. Committed to democracy and self-determination, they have always reached out to those struggling for freedom and equality. We are proud to join them in fostering the integration of the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Western family of nations. We also look forward to joining our Nordic friends in celebrating in the year 2000 the millennial anniversary of Leif Erikson's momentous voyage to our shores. It is fitting that we should pay special tribute to Leif Erikson—son of Iceland, grandson of Norway—as we begin our own uncharted journey of discovery into the new millennium that stretches before us.

In honor of Leif Erikson and of our Nordic-American heritage, the Congress, by joint resolution approved on September 2, 1964 (Public Law 88–566), has authorized and requested the President to proclaim October 9 of each year as "Leif Erikson Day."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 9, 1997, as Leif Erikson Day. I encourage the people of the United States to observe this occasion with appropriate ceremonies and activities commemorating our rich Nordic-American heritage.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:59 a.m., October 10, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 14.

Proclamation 7036—General Pulaski Memorial Day, 1997

October 9, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

In times of peace and at moments of great crisis, America has been blessed with the steadfast support of friends from other nations. Few have proved their friendship with more courage and generosity than Casimir Pulaski, who paid for America's independence with his own life.

As a son of Poland, Pulaski knew well the desire for freedom and self-determination. He fought bravely beside his father and brothers in his native land, defending Poland from the aggression of neighboring empires with such skill and valor that he was known throughout Europe for his military exploits. Ultimately outnumbered by opposing forces, he escaped to France, where he met Benjamin Franklin and offered his services in behalf of the American Revolution.

Upon his arrival in America, Pulaski told General Washington that he had come to defend liberty and "to live or die for her." True to his word, he fought valiantly as a brigadier general in our Continental Army and made the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation's freedom during the siege of Savannah.

More than two centuries later, Americans and Poles alike remember with pride and gratitude the outstanding service General Pulaski gave to both his native and adopted lands. Today the United States and Poland enjoy freedom, prosperity, and the prospect for a bright future as allies in NATO, thanks to the unwavering commitment of patriots and heroes like Casimir Pulaski.

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 Saturday, October 11, 1997, as General Pulaski Memorial Day. I encourage all Americans to commemorate this occasion with appropriate programs and activities paying tribute to Casimir Pulaski and his contributions to the cause of American freedom.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:59 a.m., October 10, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 14.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner

October 9, 1997

Thank you. Only a fool would speak after both a Baptist minister and a rabbi. [*Laughter*] Thank you, Steve. And I thank Vernon and Ann for having us here. Hillary and I and Chelsea, we've been here a lot over the last several years. This has often been a home away from home and on occasion, in difficult times, a real refuge for us. This is the largest crowd with whom I have ever dined in this room, with the fewest number of people related to Vernon and Ann. [*Laughter*] But we're all family in a way here, and I thank you for being here.

I thought what might be good to do tonight is maybe I would just talk a couple of minutes and follow up on something that Vernon and Steve talked about, and then see if any of you had any questions or comments you wanted to make or anything you wanted to say.

Let me begin by thanking you for helping tonight and, for many of you, over many years. I've been feeling rather nostalgic lately, as you might imagine. Last week was the sixth anniversary of the date I declared for President. And we just took Chelsea off to school. A couple of days from now is my 22d wedding anniversary. I'm not feeling so young anymore. And almost five-eighths of my Presidency is over, which I have a difficult time believing.

Let me tell you why I think what we're doing is important. I never will forget when I was trying to make up my mind whether to run for President in 1991. I didn't especially feel compelled to do it. I was having the most wonderful time of my life as a Governor, enjoying enormous success, great approval from our people; our family, our friends, everything was going great. I was very concerned then that our country seemed to be sort of lurching toward this new century and this incredible new era without any real strategy for how to proceed.

And I was also concerned, very frankly, about the quality of the political debate in Washington in both parties. It seemed to me kind of stale and not very helpful. There was a lot of emphasis on what I thought of as

''old think,'' you know—liberal-conservative, left-right, in yesterday's terms—and a whole lot of emphasis on the politics of personal destruction which, regrettably, I have not quite succeeded in eliminating from Washington. It may be part of human nature.

I read a great biography of General Grant the other day, pointing out that his commander in the Union Army, even though he kept winning and his men loved him and everybody thought he was great, was trying to replace him until finally he won at Vicksburg and no one could question whether he was the lead dog in the hunt—whereupon the guy immediately rushed to Lincoln and started talking about how great he was. So maybe this is just part of this town and the way it works.

But I didn't like it very much, because it seemed to me then—it seems to me now—that we have all these incredible opportunities, but we have to be thinking about them in the right way. There is a great role and a need for two parties in this country, but they need to be having a principled debate about the future, not yesterday's debate about things that don't really matter anymore.

And so, I set about doing what wound up winning the campaign in '92, saying that we had to focus on keeping the American dream alive, reasserting America's leadership in the world, and rebuilding America's community at home, and that we needed to focus on the future, not the past; on change, not the status quo; on unity, not division; on policies that helped everybody, not just a few. And I think it's fair to say it's worked pretty well, because not only is the economy doing well but crime has dropped for 5 years in a row. We have the biggest drop in welfare rolls in history now—3.6 million people tonight are living in families with payrolls who were living in families with welfare checks 4 years ago. That's something our country can be proud of. We have advanced the cause of the environment and public health. The country is better off.

But if I look ahead to the future, I will say again, the reason this is important, why you're here tonight, and the reason it's important that we continue to be active in the political process and not be apologetic or believe there's anything wrong with it, is that we still have these huge decisions to make and we desperately need a principled debate about the future. That's what we owe our children. That's what we owe this country.

Now, let me just give you a few. The major challenges confronting America for the remainder of this century and for the foreseeable future will be those posed by the globalization of the economy and the society, and the changing nature of the way we work and live as a result of the information and technology revolution. Among other things, one big challenge will be how do you maintain individual opportunity and give everybody who is willing to work a chance with all this dynamism in the economy, number one. Number two, how do you make sure that we have the requisite set of policies—and maybe most important—to keep this economy going and competitive? That's what I think the fast-track issue is about. Number three, since we have a higher percentage of Americans than ever before in the workplace, how do we help people balance better the demands of work and family, since the most important job anyone ever has is still raising children properly? Nothing else compares to that. If we fail at that, we can all work like crazy, and then when we're gone, the whole thing will crater.

On the other hand, people shouldn't be asked to choose and face not succeeding as a parent because they can't balance these demands. That's why I worked so hard for the family leave act and the Kennedy-Kassebaum health care bill and the part of the balanced budget that will enable us to provide health insurance for 5 million more kids and working families who don't have it, because we have to find a way for people to succeed at rebuilding childhood in America and strong families and still keep growing this economy like crazy.

The third thing that I want to say—or the fourth one, on globalization—we also, it seems to me, as Americans, have to put our minds more to bringing the strategies that have brought so many of us so much prosperity into the areas that have not been affected one way or the other by the good things that are happening. And I think we shouldn't miss that. There are areas that have not been af-

fected one way or the other, that just are still static, and they are a great market for America. They're a great growth potential. They're a great potential strength for our future. So, there's that set of challenges.

Then I think we have a set of generational challenges. I think we have to not only preserve Medicare and Social Security for future generations but we have to do it in a way that frees us up to focus on the fact that an enormous number of our children are still born into and reared in poverty and are, therefore, relatively disadvantaged compared to those of us who are not young. And we pay a big price for that.

The next big challenge I think we have is how do we deal with the very real and, I'm convinced, quite profound environmental challenges that will be presented to the world if China, India, and other countries grow quite wealthy, if they all get rich the same way we did? The President of China is about to come visit me, and we once had an interesting conversation in New York, when he said, ''Sometimes I think the United States is trying to contain us. And we don't want to be a threat to you, and we don't want you to think we are.'' And I said, ''The only threat you propose to us right now is I'm afraid you want to get rich the same way we did, because if you do it in exactly the same way we did, all your cities will be clogged with pollution and will be heating up the atmosphere so fast that nothing I do will turn it around.'' And I could tell he'd never thought about it in those terms.

This climate change issue I think is a very real issue. It's only one of many environmental challenges we have to face, but we have to prove that we can do it in a way that permits us to continue to grow the economy and doesn't make us look like we're trying to hold down people in countries that at long last are beginning to come into their own and give their kids a better future. It's a huge challenge. Science and technology—how are we going to deal with the potentials of it? Are there ethical dilemmas? I think there are. I've talked about them in some cases. But the United States has to maintain its leadership in these areas.

Just two more that I think are very important. The world we're living in now with no cold war and no clear divisions gives us both an enormous opportunity to advance peace and freedom and democracy and our own security and prosperity, but it also presents us with a whole lot of new challenges that cross national lines. I don't know how many of you saw the article that was in our local paper within the last 2 weeks about how the South American drug cartels are linking up with the Russian mafia gangs who are far more diversified in their operations. So, they're becoming a cash cow for people who don't have as much money but have more connections in more different illegal and violent activities. That's just one little example of what happens.

If you break down all these barriers to information, to movement, to money—all the things that are making it possible for many of you to do so well in the world—organized forces of destruction can equally take advantage of those declining barriers to cause us new and different problems. So you will have—in our lifetime, we'll have to face problems of terrorism, organized crime and drugs, and ethnic and racial and religious hatreds, spawning wars; not to mention the fact that diseases will travel across international borders more quickly, especially if there are compounding environmental problems.

These are new challenges. We have to be thinking about them. We cannot afford to be mired in a debate that either makes us smaller than we are, keeps us torn up and upset all the time, or distracts us away from the real challenges of our people. And I have to say, you know, you've all heard me say this in the beginning, but I think the two most important things that we can really do for our own people are make sure that we give genuine excellence of education to every child and give everybody in America the opportunity to go to college who is willing to go and work for it, and find a way to make a strength rather than a weakness of our diversity.

I can't tell you—I don't want to embarrass him, but I had a wonderful talk with Dr. Wong at dinner, whom I admire so much, and he was telling me that he and the President of China graduated from the same university from the same department a few years

apart. So we have an American, who has done a great thing in our country, who can be a part of our attempts to have a peaceful future with China.

We also have people from India, from Pakistan, from every country in Latin America, from every country in Europe, from every country in Africa. This is an incredible gift, and we should not blow it. And a lot of people think I talk about this more than I should, but it's great. If you saw what I saw and the way I see it, how much time I have to spend getting people around the world to stop killing each other and essentially stop behaving on primitive or childish impulses, whether it's in Bosnia or the Middle East, or Rwanda and Burundi, or Northern Ireland, and you realize that these people—oftentimes they go along for years and they do just fine, and then something snaps, they're poorly led, and they disintegrate into destructive behavior. We need to be able to be a model to the world that will stand as a stern rebuke to that kind of conduct so that we can spread it around.

Now, these are the kinds of things that political debates ought to be about. We will always have a difference with our friends in the Republican Party, but it's not yesterday's difference. Fundamentally, I believe that what we stand for is—if I could just sort of ad lib with the quote that Steve gave about relationships—what we believe is that our individual lives are more fulfilled when we work together through strong units—families, communities, businesses—and that Government is one of those, and that there are some things we have to do together that we can only do through Government, that we can't do in other ways.

And I say that as the man who downsized the Government more than President Reagan did, gave more authority to State and local governments, and privatized more operations than President Reagan did, but stood strongly for doing more in education and health care and research, in science and technology, in environmental action than Presidents of the other party and Members of Congress of the other party.

I think this is what we're about. And we have to be—we have to imagine the future and then try to define it. And we should welcome a principled debate on the other side. We should welcome debates within our party. I noticed there has been a lot of publicity lately about the debates within the Republican Party about whether they should just keep on their Government-hating tirade or whether they should have a more sophisticated view, and they're debating that. I think that's a healthy thing for them. And it will be a good thing for the country.

We need this. And that's what you're contributing to. I'm telling you, if we find a way to really provide opportunity for everybody, if we find a way to resolve our intergenerational responsibilities, if we can find a way to grow the economy and preserve the environment and even improve it, if we can keep America ahead of the curves and live together as one country, and finally, if I or my successors can persuade a heavy majority of the American people that we have to lead in this world that we no longer dominate—the most frustrating thing for me in terms of communication is, no matter how many talks I give or how many times I give this speech, most Americans, I think, still don't—they may trust me to do it, but they still don't necessarily agree that it's in our interest to be involved in an aggressive way with other countries and their future. But if we can do these things, the best days of this country are still out there.

And that is what your contribution is about. It's about giving us a chance to do that, and I hope you'll be very proud of it. You ought to be happy with the results today, but the main results will come when most of us aren't around anymore. And that's just as it should be.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:35 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Steve Grossman, national chair, Democratic National Committee; dinner hosts Vernon Jordan and his wife, Ann; President Jiang Zemin of China; and dinner guest Dr. C.J. Wong.

Remarks on Internal Revenue Service Reform

October 10, 1997

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for your work. Mr. Secretary, thank you. Mr. Summers, Mr. Sperling, Commissioner, Mr. Tobias, members of the task force, employees of the IRS who are here today, and others who are concerned about this. And especially I thank the Members of Congress who are here who are supporting this endeavor and the others in Congress, including Senator Kerrey and Congressman Portman, who have shown such interest.

Let me say, as someone who had not worked in Washington until I became President, I have spent most of my life talking to people who were on the receiving end of the IRS for good or ill. And I took particular interest in the recent congressional hearings into the problems of IRS policy and some specific examples of taxpayer abuse. Like most Americans, I was genuinely angered by the stories of our citizens harassed and humiliated by what seemed to them to be an all-powerful, unaccountable, and often downright tone-deaf agency.

And since I took office, as has already been said, our administration has worked hard to give the American people an IRS that is fairer, more efficient, easier for the public to understand and to deal with, with the electronic filing and filing by telephone, with the second Taxpayer Bill of Rights, with our efforts to reduce the conflict between the IRS and people's religious expression, just to name three examples.

It is clear that we have more to do. The IRS should be above reproach. Americans who work hard and pay their taxes deserve to be treated fairly, and no one should ever have a home, a car, a livelihood threatened by unaccountable actions of Government. Abuse or bullying or callousness by officials of our Government are unacceptable whenever and wherever they occur. If they occur once, it's once too many. But especially in connection with the IRS, it is important that they be rooted out.

Let me say that it's important, too, for the American people to know that the IRS is made up overwhelmingly of hard-working and dedicated people who put in long hours in public service. The vast majority of them do their jobs well, and the vast majority of them were just as outraged by the case studies profiled in the congressional hearings as other Americans were.

It is clear that in spite of our best efforts in the past, there remain significant problems and challenges at the IRS. That's why last May the Vice President and the Secretary of the Treasury initiated their effort to deal with problems, many of which have been a long time in the making but which have to be addressed, and addressed now.

Their initiatives will take significant steps toward ending abuses, protecting taxpayers, and making the IRS more customer-friendly. Their recommendations are strong and sound and I believe represent the right way to reform the IRS. I'm instructing that they be put into effect just as soon as possible, and I'm asking Congress to pass legislation where necessary to make them the law of the land. And again, I thank the Members here who have agreed to support that endeavor.

Let me say, I can't go over all 200 recommendations, although I hope that most of them will be widely reported to the American people. But let me give you just a few. The package of reforms says to every taxpayer, first, you will have a tax collection agency that is reinvented so that it serves its customers and taxpayers every bit as well as the best private companies serve their customers. As the Vice President said, reinvention begins with a ban on the use of dollar goals to evaluate IRS employee performance, goals that can give some IRS agents the wrong incentives, just as parking ticket quotas can give police officers the wrong incentives. And the IRS will trim paperwork, increase hours, make sure that phones are answered, expand electronic filing, and move toward a systematic review of all taxpayer penalties.

Second, you have rights as a taxpayer that will be protected. I'm calling on Congress to pass a new—the third—taxpayer bill of rights, to build on the law I signed last year. This will extend the refund period for taxpayers with health problems that keep them from seeking refunds in a timely fashion, it will protect innocent spouses from paying for

the dishonesty of a spouse or former spouse, and it will take other steps to expand taxpayer rights.

Third, as a taxpayer you will have recourse when you believe you've been treated unfairly. We're greatly strengthening the taxpayer advocates, who already fight effectively for taxpayers in individual cases, by expanding their resources and giving them greater power to award taxpayers immediate relief. And we are creating new, independent, locally based citizen advocacy panels throughout the country. These independent watchdogs will be able to monitor how local IRS offices treat taxpayers, publicize problems, and help taxpayers to get relief. A taxpayer who has been treated unfairly should have somewhere to go, someone to fight on his or her side, someone to make the agency listen. With a stronger taxpayer advocate and these new citizen panels, they will have just that.

Fourth, we will strengthen the governance and oversight of the IRS. The steps I have taken today are building on the reforms already put in place and described by Secretary Rubin. In order to strengthen public accountability, I am seeking legislation to establish a new IRS board of trustees with the majority of members from the private sector. This board will review IRS performance on customer service, strategic plans, performance measures, and citizen advisory panel recommendations to ensure that taxpayers do, in fact, receive the treatment we say they deserve. The board would report independently, and at least annually, to the Secretary, the President, and the Congress. It will provide the private sector input we need. All of this should help to assure that leaders of the executive branch fulfill their responsibility to the American people to effectively oversee and govern the IRS. It is the right way to reform the agency.

In conclusion, let me say that I believe the attention given to this issue and the information made public by Congress has served the public and the public interest well. We have an opportunity to build on the reforms already put in place and to use this moment to extend them further, so that the IRS achieves its purposes and serves the public in the spirit of the best institutions, both public and private.

I don't suppose anyone will ever enjoy paying their taxes, and the agency that collects taxes will undoubtedly never be the most popular part of our Government. But it's important work, and all the more important that it be done properly. If we act now, we can make sure that the IRS genuinely earns and deserves the trust of the American people, and we are determined to achieve that goal.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:57 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Lawrence H. Summers; National Economic Adviser Gene Sperling; Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue Michael P. Dolan; and Robert M. Tobias, president, National Treasury Employees Union.

Statement on Signing the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998

October 10, 1997

I have today signed into law H.R. 2378, the "Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998," which provides $12.8 billion in discretionary budget authority for various programs in the Department of the Treasury, the United States Postal Service, the General Services Administration, the Office of Personnel Management, the Executive Office of the President and several smaller agencies.

The Act provides funding for the Department of the Treasury of $11.4 billion, including $131 million for violent crime reduction programs. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is funded at $7.8 billion, including $325 million for Information Technology Investments. While this funding level is $175 million below my request, I believe that the funds will strengthen the IRS's ability to provide timely and accurate data for American taxpayers. The bill also includes $138 million for the Earned Income Tax Credit compliance initiative and $377 million for Year 2000 conversion requirements for IRS computer systems. Law Enforcement bureaus within

the Department of the Treasury are funded at $3.1 billion.

The Act provides $195 million for the Office of National Drug Control Policy's (ONDCP) national media campaign. This money will enable ONDCP to develop a national media campaign targeting drug consumption by youth. The campaign will be a model public-private partnership, exposing 90 percent of all 9 to 17 year-olds to anti-drug messages at least four times a week.

The Act repeals cooperative purchasing authority that would have allowed States and localities to buy products off the General Services Administration's Federal supply schedule contracts. I am disappointed by this repeal, which will deprive us of the opportunity for potential savings achievable by leveraging the combined purchasing power of the Federal Government, States, and localities.

Section 640 of the bill prohibits the use of appropriations to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Federal Government who interferes with certain communications or contacts between other Federal employees and Members of Congress or congressional committees. I understand this provision is intended to protect "whistleblower" employees who wish to inform the Congress of evidence of violations of law or other wrongdoing in the Government. Any broader interpretation of the provision that would apply to "nonwhistleblowers" would raise substantial constitutional concerns in depriving the President and his department and agency heads of their ability to supervise and control the operations and communications of the executive branch. I do not interpret this provision to detract from my constitutional authority in this way.

I urge the Congress to complete action on the remaining FY 1998 appropriations bills as quickly as possible, and to send them to me in an acceptable form.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 10, 1997.

NOTE: H.R. 2378, approved October 10, was assigned Public Law No. 105–61.

Message to the House of Representatives Returning Without Approval Partial Birth Abortion Legislation

October 10, 1997

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1122, which would prohibit doctors from performing a certain kind of abortion. I am returning H.R. 1122 for exactly the same reasons I returned an earlier substantially identical version of this bill, H.R. 1833, last year. My veto message of April 10, 1996, fully explains my reasons for returning that bill and applies to H.R. 1122 as well. H.R. 1122 is a bill that is consistent neither with the Constitution nor sound public policy.

As I have stated on many occasions, I support the decision in *Roe v. Wade* protecting a woman's right to choose. Consistent with that decision, I have long opposed late-term abortions, and I continue to do so except in those instances necessary to save the life of a woman or prevent serious harm to her health. Unfortunately, H.R. 1122 does not contain an exception to the measure's ban that will adequately protect the lives and health of the small group of women in tragic circumstances who need an abortion performed at a late stage of pregnancy to avert death or serious injury.

I have asked the Congress repeatedly, for almost 2 years, to send me legislation that includes a limited exception for the small number of compelling cases where use of this procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. When Governor of Arkansas, I signed a bill into law that barred third-trimester abortions, with an appropriate exception for life or health. I would do so again, but only if the bill contains an exception for the rare cases where a woman faces death or serious injury. I believe the Congress should work in a bipartisan manner to fashion such legislation.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
October 10, 1997.

NOTE: The Office of the Press Secretary also made available the President's earlier veto message, dated April 10, 1996.

Proclamation 7037—White Cane Safety Day, 1997

October 10, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As we stand at the dawn of the 21st century, new technologies are rapidly changing and improving the lives of Americans. For one group of Americans in particular—those who are blind or visually impaired—these technologies have opened doors to unparalleled opportunities. Blind Americans now can more readily access information of all kinds, and these advances have brought important improvements to the education, careers, and daily lives of blind and visually impaired people.

In this time of extraordinary progress, however, the simple yet profoundly useful white cane remains an indispensable tool and symbol of independence that has afforded countless blind and visually impaired citizens the opportunity to pursue the American Dream. And so, as we all share in a new era of expanded technological innovations that improve the lives of all of our Nation's citizens, we also celebrate the white cane for its ability to empower and recognize it as the embodiment of freedom.

As a Nation, let us also reassert our commitment to ensuring equal opportunity, equal access, and full participation of citizens with disabilities in our community life. This year, we celebrated the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, reaffirming our belief that all students can learn and must have the opportunities and resources necessary to do so. And we must continue to enforce vigorously the Americans with Disabilities Act, so that our blind and visually impaired fellow citizens enjoy equal opportunity, access to public and private services and accommodations, and a workplace free of discrimination.

To honor the numerous achievements of blind and visually impaired citizens and to recognize the significance of the white cane in advancing independence, the Congress, by joint resolution approved October 6, 1964, has designated October 15 of each year as "White Cane Safety Day."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 15, 1997, as White Cane Safety Day. I call upon the people of the United States, government officials, educators, and business leaders to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 14, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 15.

Proclamation 7038—National School Lunch Week, 1997

October 10, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Each year during the month of October, we set aside a week to focus on the importance of the National School Lunch Program and its contributions to the health and well-being of America's schoolchildren. Through this program, established more than 50 years ago by President Truman, young people learn firsthand about healthful dietary habits and how to make wise choices regarding the foods they eat. And for millions of children, many of whom come from families in need, their school lunch is the most nutritious meal they will eat during the day.

When President Kennedy proclaimed the first National School Lunch Week in 1963, some 68,000 schools were serving lunches to 16 million children each day. Today, the program is available in more than 94,000 schools across the country, and 26 million students participate daily. This dramatic growth proves that the program continues to meet a significant need in local communities across the Nation, and its success admirably reflects the hard work and commitment of school food-service professionals, as well as the support and technical assistance provided by State administrators.

The National School Lunch Program also reflects our profound concern for the well-being of our young people. By providing them with wholesome, nutritious meals day in and day out, we are helping to improve our children's overall health, increase their learning capacity, lengthen their attention span, and promote healthful dietary habits that will serve them well for a lifetime.

All of these accomplishments are made possible by the many dedicated food-service professionals, administrators, educators, parents, business and community leaders, and other concerned individuals at the local, State, and Federal levels who work in partnership to ensure the effectiveness of the National School Lunch Program. We must strive to build on their achievements so that this vital program will continue to meet the needs of America's children into the next century.

In recognition of the contributions of the National School Lunch Program to the nutritional well-being of children, the Congress by joint resolution of October 9, 1962 (Public Law No. 87–780), has designated the week beginning the second Sunday in October of each year as "National School Lunch Week" and has requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of that week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 12 through October 18, 1997, as National School Lunch Week. I call upon all Americans to recognize those individuals whose efforts contribute to the success of this program and to observe this week with appropriate programs and activities.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 14, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 15.

Proclamation 7039—Columbus Day, 1997

October 10, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The life and achievements of Christopher Columbus demonstrate how powerful and lasting an influence one individual can have on the course of human history. Although great explorers reached the shores of this continent both before and after Columbus, few have captured the American imagination as he has. Perhaps because we have always been an adventurous people, eager for challenge and change, we feel a special affinity for this extraordinary man who left the safety of known waters to pursue his vision across the ocean to the threshold of a new world.

Although his momentous voyages across the Atlantic took place more than 500 years ago, their impact can still be felt today. Columbus' discoveries in the West Indies brought about substantive and continuing contact between the peoples of the Old World and the New, contact that gave rise to misunderstandings and conflicts that we still seek to reconcile today. He also made possible the exploration and settlement of North America and opened the door to our continent for generations to follow—people of every race and culture and ethnic origin, who have given our Nation its rich and unique diversity.

Christopher Columbus, a son of Italy whose bold enterprise was made possible by the Spanish crown, holds a special place in

the hearts of Americans of Italian and Spanish heritage. But, as we prepare for our own voyage of discovery into the next millennium, all Americans can draw inspiration from the character and accomplishments of Columbus. With vision, courage, imagination, and optimism, we can create a future bright with promise and a new world where all of us can pursue our dreams.

In recognition of the enduring achievements of Christopher Columbus, the Congress, by joint resolution of April 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 657), and an Act of June 28, 1968 (82 Stat. 250), has requested the President to proclaim the second Monday in October of each year as ''Columbus Day.''

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 13, 1997, as Columbus Day. I call upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities. I also direct that the flag of the United States be displayed on all public buildings on the appointed day in honor of Christopher Columbus.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 14, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 15.

Proclamation 7040—National Children's Day, 1997

October 10, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

With the birth of every child, the world becomes new again. Within each new infant lies enormous potential—potential for loving, for learning, and for making life better for others. But this potential must be nurtured. Just as seeds need fertile soil, warm sunshine, and gentle rain to grow, so do our children need a caring environment, the security of knowing they are loved, and the encouragement and opportunity to make the most of their God-given talents. There is no more urgent task before us, as a people and as a Nation, than creating such an environment for America's children.

One of the surest ways to do so is to strengthen American families and help parents in their efforts to raise healthy, happy children. My Administration has worked hard to give parents the tools they need to fulfill their crucial responsibilities. We have sought to put tobacco and guns out of the reach of children. We are improving the quality of our children's schools by making a national commitment to high academic and teaching standards. Recognizing the importance of a child's early years to his or her development, we have expanded Head Start and established Early Head Start for low-income families with children 3 years old or younger. We have made it easier for millions of parents to take time off to be with a sick child without losing their jobs, and to keep their health insurance when they change jobs. We have protected Medicaid coverage for 36 million Americans, including about 20 million children, and the Balanced Budget Act I recently signed into law will provide meaningful health care coverage to millions more uninsured children.

But there is still much to be accomplished if we are to ensure that America's children grow up to meet their fullest potential. Our next important goal must be to build upon our efforts and improve the quality and affordability of child care in our Nation. With more people in the work force, with more single-parent homes, and with more families in which both parents have to work to make ends meet, millions of American children are already in some form of day care, and the demand for affordable, quality child care is growing. Later this month, the First Lady and I will host the White House Conference on Child Care to work with and learn from other parents, child care providers and experts, business leaders, and economists. Together we will focus on the best means to increase the quality, availability, and affordability of child care in our Nation.

As we observe National Children's Day this year, let us recommit ourselves to creating a society where parents can raise healthy, happy children; where every newborn is cherished, where every child is encouraged to succeed, and where all our young people are free to pursue their dreams.

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 October 12, 1997, as National Children's Day. I urge all Americans to express their love and appreciation for children on this day and on every day throughout the year. I invite Federal officials, State and local governments, and particularly all American families to join together in observing this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities to honor our Nation's children.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:16 a.m., October 14, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 15.

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.

October 4

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Beltsville, MD, to observe U.S. Secret Service tactical expertise and training exercises at the James J. Rowley Training Center. Later, they returned to Washington, DC.

In the evening, the President traveled to Arlington, VA. Later, he was joined by Hillary Clinton, and they traveled to Camp David, MD.

October 6

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton returned to Washington, DC. In the evening, the President hosted a dinner for President Ezer Weizman of Israel in the Blue Room at the White House.

The President announced his intention to nominate James C. Hormel to be Ambassador to Luxembourg.

The President announced his intention to nominate Gerald S. McGowan to be Ambassador to Portugal.

The President announced his intention to nominate Lyndon L. Olson, Jr., to be Ambassador to Sweden.

The President announced his intention to nominate Kenneth R. Wykle to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration at the Department of Transportation.

October 7

In the morning, the President attended a meeting with Northern Ireland Ulster Unionist Party leader David Trimble in National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger's office at the White House.

In the afternoon, the President met with congressional Democrats to discuss fast-track trade legislation. In the evening, he met with representatives of State and local government and business and community leaders from the Midwest.

The President announced his intention to nominate Christopher Ashby to be Ambassador to Uruguay.

The President announced his intention to nominate James A. Larocco to be Ambassador to Kuwait.

The President announced his intention to nominate Mark Erwin to be a member of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The President announced his intention to nominate James H. Bailey to serve as Deputy Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The President announced the nomination of Bill Richardson and A. Peter Burleigh to be U.S. Representatives and Richard Sklar,

Victor Marrero, and Nancy E. Soderberg to be U.S. Alternate Representatives to the 52d General Assembly of the United Nations.

The President announced the nomination of Nancy E. Soderberg to be Alternate U.S. Representative for Special Political Affairs at the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

October 8

In the morning, the President traveled to Newark, NJ. In the afternoon, he traveled to West Orange and Florham Park, NJ. Later in the afternoon, he traveled to Philadelphia, PA, arriving in the evening.

In the evening, the President attended a Democratic National Committee reception at CoreStates Arena. Later, he returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced the administration's intention to appoint Rev. Jesse Jackson to be Special Envoy for the President and the Secretary of State for the promotion of democracy in Africa.

October 9

In the afternoon, the President had a telephone conversation with Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom concerning the Prime Minister's recent visit to Russia and the President's October 7 meeting with Northern Ireland Ulster Unionist Party leader David Trimble.

Later, the President had a telephone conversation with retiring University of North Carolina men's basketball coach Dean Smith to commend him on his long and successful career.

The President announced his intention to nominate David B. Hermelin to be Ambassador to Norway.

The President announced the nomination of Betty Eileen King to be an Alternate U.S. Representative to the 52d General Assembly of the United Nations. Ms. King has also been nominated to be U.S. Representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

The President announced his intention to nominate Kevin Gover to be Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs at the Department of the Interior.

October 10

The President announced the nomination of Mary Mel French to be Chief of Protocol at the State Department.

The President announced the nomination of Richard W. Fisher to be Deputy U.S. Trade Representative (Washington), with the rank of Ambassador.

The President announced the nomination of Robert T. Grey, Jr., to be U.S. Representative to the Conference on Disarmament.

The President announced the nomination of Joy Harjo to be a member of the National Council on the Arts.

The President announced the nomination of Ida L. Castro to serve as the Director of the Women's Bureau at the Department of Labor.

The President announced the nomination of Carl Spielvogel as a member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for the International Broadcasting Bureau.

The President announced the nomination of Robert S. Warshaw to serve as Associate Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy for the Bureau of State and Local Affairs.

The President announced the nomination of Thomas H. Fox to be Assistant Administrator for Policy and Program Coordination at the Agency for International Development.

The President announced the nomination of Donald C. Lubick to be Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy at the Department of the Treasury.

The President announced the nomination of Fred P. Hochberg to serve as Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The President announced his intention to appoint Arthur M. Hamilton and Sally Ann Jochum as members of the President's Committee on Mental Retardation.

The President announced his intention to designate David J. Barram, in his capacity as Administrator of the General Services Administration, Andrew M. Cuomo, in his capacity as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Rodney E. Slater, in his capacity as Secretary of Transportation, to serve as members on the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

The White House announced that the President named Amy Weiss Tobe as Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy Press Secretary for Operations, effective October 27.

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 October 6

A. Peter Burleigh,
of California, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

James Catherwood Hormel,
of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

Gerald S. McGowan,
of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Portugal.

Lyndon Lowell Olson, Jr.,
of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

Bill Richardson,
of New Mexico, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

Richard Sklar,
of California, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform.

Nancy E. Soderberg,
of the District of Columbia, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nancy E. Soderberg,
of the District of Columbia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations.

Kenneth R. Wykle,
of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, vice Rodney E. Slater.

Submitted October 8

Betty Eileen King,
of Maryland, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Phyllis E. Oakley,
of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Toby Trister Gati.

Stanford G. Ross,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2002, vice William C. Brooks.

Michael B. Thornton,
of Virginia, to be a Judge of the U.S. Tax Court for a term of 15 years after he takes office, vice Lapsley Walker Hamblem, Jr., retired.

Christopher C. Ashby,
of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United

States of America to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.

James Hudson Bailey,
of Wisconsin, to be Deputy Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, vice Harvey G. Ryland, resigned.

Mark Erwin,
of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1999, vice Gordon D. Giffin, term expired.

Garr M. King,
of Oregon, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Oregon, vice Helen J. Frye, retired.

James A. Larocco,
of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait.

Norman K. Moon,
of Virginia, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Virginia, vice Jackson L. Kiser, retired.

Submitted October 9

Ida L. Castro,
of New York, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, vice Karen Beth Nussbaum, resigned.

Richard W. Fisher,
of Texas, to be Deputy U.S. Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, vice Charlene Barshefsky.

Thomas H. Fox,
of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, vice Henrietta Holsman Fore.

Kevin Gover,
of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Ada E. Deer, resigned.

Joy Harjo,
of New Mexico, to be a member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2002, vice William E. Strickland, Jr., term expired.

Fred P. Hochberg,
of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration, vice Ginger Ehn Lew.

Donald C. Lubick,
of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, vice Leslie B. Samuels, resigned.

Carl Spielvogel,
of New York, to be a member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 1999 (reappointment).

Harriet C. Babbitt,
of Arizona, to be Deputy Administrator of the Agency for International Development, vice Carol J. Lancaster, resigned.

Mary Mel French,
of the District of Columbia, to be Chief of Protocol, and to have the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service.

Robert T. Grey, Jr.,
of Virginia, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the Conference on Disarmament.

David B. Hermelin,
of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

Robert S. Warshaw,
of New York, to be Associate Director for National Drug Control Policy, vice Rose Ochi, resigned.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

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

Released October 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by National Economic Adviser Gene Sperling and Office of Management and Budget Director Franklin Raines

Released October 7

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Deputy Press Secretaries Joe Lockhart and Barry Toiv on Senate action on campaign finance reform legislation

Transcript of a press briefing by Special Envoy to Latin America Thomas F. (Mack) McLarty on the President's upcoming trip to South America

Released October 8

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry: Appointment of Rev. Jesse Jackson as Special Envoy for the President and the Secretary of State for the Promotion of Democracy in Africa

Announcement of nominations for U.S. District Judges for the District of Oregon and the Western District of Virginia

Announcement of nomination for U.S. Tax Court Judge

Released October 9

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Released October 10

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's naming Amy Weiss Tobe as Assistant to the President and Deputy Press Secretary for Operations

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry: Southeast Asia Fires—U.S. Assistance

Acts Approved by the President

Approved October 6

H.R. 111 / Public Law 105–49
To provide for the conveyance of a parcel of unused agricultural land in Dos Palos, California, to the Dos Palos Ag Boosters for use as a farm school

H.R. 680 / Public Law 105–50
To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the transfer of surplus personal property to States for donation to nonprofit providers of necessaries to impoverished families and individuals, and to authorize the transfer of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions and instrumentalities of States, and nonprofit organizations for providing housing or housing assistance for low-income individuals or families

H.R. 2248 / Public Law 105–51
To authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions toward religious understanding and peace, and for other purposes

H.R. 2443 / Public Law 105–52
To designate the Federal building located at 601 Fourth Street, NW., in the District of Columbia, as the "Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington Field Office Memorial Building", in honor of William H. Christian, Jr., Martha Dixon Martinez, Michael J. Miller, Anthony Palmisano, and Edwin R. Woodriffe

S. 996 / Public Law 105–53
To provide for the authorization of appropriations in each fiscal year for arbitration in United States district courts, and for other purposes

S. 1198 / Public Law 105–54
To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend the special immigrant religious worker program, to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to extend the deadline for

designation of an effective date for paperwork changes in the employer sanctions program, and to require the Secretary of State to waive or reduce the fee for application and issuance of a nonimmigrant visa for aliens coming to the United States for certain charitable purposes

Approved October 7

H.R. 2209 / Public Law 105–55
Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1998

Approved October 8

H.R. 2266 / Public Law 105–56
Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998

Approved October 9

H.R. 1420 / Public Law 105–57
National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997

S. 871 / Public Law 105–58
Oklahoma City National Memorial Act of 1997

Approved October 10

H.R. 394 / Public Law 105–59
To provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain property located in the County of Iosco, Michigan

H.R. 1948 / Public Law 105–60
Hood Bay Land Exchange Act of 1997

H.R. 2378 / Public Law 105–61
Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998

United States Government Printing Office

SUPERINTENDENT
OF DOCUMENTS

Washington, D.C. 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for private use, $300

BULK RATE
Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Government Printing Office
PERMIT G-26