Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, November 10, 1997
Volume 33—Number 45
Pages 1697–1753

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Fast-track trade legislation—1729, 1735, 1743, 1746
Florida
Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee dinner in Boca Raton—1701
Democratic National Committee luncheon in Palm Beach—1697
Democratic National Committee autumn retreat on Amelia Island
Arts and culture session—1710
Dinner—1712
Education session—1705
Globalization and trade session—1707
National Public Radio's "Performance Today," 10th anniversary—1725
New Jersey, gubernatorial candidate Jim McGreevey in Edison—1716
New York
Congressional candidate Eric Vitaliano in Staten Island—1714
Mayoral candidate Ruth Messinger in New York City—1719
Senator John F. Kerry, dinner—1732
Texas, dedication of the George Bush Presidential Library in College Station—1741
Virginia, gubernatorial candidate Donald S. Beyer, Jr., in Alexandria—1722

Bill Vetoes

Line item vetoes
Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, message transmitting reports—1712
Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, message transmitting reports—1711

Communications to Congress

See also Bill Vetoes
Cyprus, letter transmitting report—1750
Sudan, message—1728

Executive Orders

Blocking Sudanese Government Property and Prohibiting Transactions With Sudan—1727

Interviews With the News Media

Exchange with reporters
Briefing Room—1743
College Station, TX—1740
Oval Office—1735
Roosevelt Room—1746
Rose Garden—1729

Proclamations

National Adoption Month—1726
National American Indian Heritage Month—1722
National Day of Concern About Young People and Gun Violence—1745
Veterans Day—1749

Statements by the President

Fast-track trade legislation—1731
Russian ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention—1739

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1753
Checklist of White House press releases—1752
Digest of other White House announcements—1750
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1751

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.*

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session at a Democratic National Committee Luncheon in Palm Beach, Florida

October 31, 1997

The President. Harriet got on a roll, I didn't want her to stop. What did you say? No, I was just thinking Harriet was on a roll. I didn't want to stop her.

Thank you, and thank you, Jerome. We are old friends. And I want to thank Sidney and Dorothy for having me back in their wonderful home. I was here a little over 5 years ago. They look much younger even than they did then, and I have all this gray hair to show for the last 5 years, but I've enjoyed it immensely.

You mentioned the St. Mary's Hospital Board, and for those of you who don't know, that was the hospital that took care of me when I tore my leg off by falling 8 inches here a few months ago. I visited the little school in Jupiter that I was supposed to visit that day when I couldn't go. And I'm delighted to be back here.

We're in Florida, among other things, pushing the fast-track legislation. There's going to be a vote in Congress next week. And Secretary Daley, the Secretary of Commerce, and my Special Counselor, Doug Sosnik, who has a wife from Argentina, the three of us just got back from Latin America. And I came back even more convinced than ever that it's the right thing to do for our country.

Let me just be very brief. What I'd like to do is to talk a minute or two and then, if you have a couple of questions maybe I could hear from you. That would help save my voice, and it will be more interesting for you.

We learned today that growth in the last quarter—this quarter, is 3.5 percent, and growth has averaged almost 4 percent over the last year, the highest in more than a decade. I think that has come about because we both broke political gridlock in Washington in 1993 with the economic plan and in 1997 with the Balanced Budget Act, and because, perhaps even more important, we broke an intellectual gridlock.

Harriet mentioned that she knew me a long time before I became President. Most Americans didn't. And one of the things that never ceases to amaze me is when I read things written about our policies and they say, ''Well, he's adopted this Republican policy and that Democratic policy and just making it up as he goes along.'' I was reading the other day—last night, getting ready to come down here, an article I wrote in 1988 that basically sounds like the speeches I'm giving today. But if you're a Governor out in the hinterland, you don't exist for people that interpret you to America until you move to Washington. So I thank Jerome and Harriet for being my old friends.

But what I wanted to do when I came to Washington 6 years ago was to get people to stop thinking in these sort of outdated, left-right terms, and start thinking instead about what we were trying to do, what is the mission of America. And if you think about it in that term, it helps you to pick the proper course.

Without economic policy, it seemed to me there was a huge fight between whether we should run a huge deficit and cut taxes or whether we should run a slightly smaller deficit and spend more money. And I thought both of those were wrong for the modern economy. And people laughed at me when I went to Washington and said, ''Here's what we're going to do. We're going to reduce the deficit, balance the budget, and spend more money on education and the health care of our children and empowering our poorest communities.'' And they said, ''Yeah, and the $3 bill is coming back.'' But that's what we've done, and it worked.

On crime, it seemed to me we were having a phony debate in Washington about whether we needed to talk tougher and have harsher sentences or do more to help prevent crime in the first place. The sensible thing to do is to sentence more harshly people who should be and prevent everybody you can from committing crimes and also work on the environment. That's what the Brady bill, the assault weapons ban, 100,000 more police on the street were about. And we've contributed to a dramatic decline in crime in the last 5 years.

On welfare, the debate was, ''It's an unfortunate system, but don't you have to take care of these children,'' or ''These people don't really want to work, so you have to make them work''—sort of polarizing debate. My experience as a Governor was that nearly every person I ever met on welfare was dying to go to work; that the system penalized them because they generally didn't have the education and skills they needed on the one hand, or on the other, if they took a job that was a minimum wage job, they lost Medicaid health coverage for their kids, and they didn't have the money to pay for child support.

So we said, ''Let's be tough on work, require people that can work to work, but take care of their children, because everyone's most important job is taking care of their kids.'' We've had over 3 million people drop off the welfare rolls, the biggest decline in history, the smallest percentage of Americans on welfare since 1970, after 20 years of high levels of immigration.

I guess what I'm saying is, what I think works is saying, ''The Government can't sit on the sidelines. The Government can't be a savior. The Government's job is to create the conditions and give people the tools to make the most of their own lives and to build good communities and families.''

And I believe we're much closer than we were 5 years ago to my dream of the 21st century America where there's opportunity for everybody responsible enough to work for it, where we're still leading the world for peace and freedom, and where the country is managing its diversity, even celebrating it, but coming across all those lines into one America. And for all of you who have helped me to do that, I'm very grateful.

Now, we still have some challenges. One of them is this fast track bill. A third of our growth in the last 5 years has come from trade. This bill gives me the power to negotiate trade agreements. If the Congress doesn't like them, they can vote them down. It has all been caught up in, I think, worries of uncertainty and instability among certain workers, because not everybody wins when there's more trade, although most job loss in America, 80 percent, is due to technology.

So what should we do? We ought to provide more education and better transition for people who lose their jobs through trade or technological changes, not walk away from trade. These jobs pay more on average. And we have no choice. Latin America is going to grow on average 3 times the rate of America. We're 4 percent of the world's people. We've got 20 percent of the world's income. If we want to keep it, we better sell more to the other 96 percent. So the fast-track debate is a big debate.

We had a big meeting with China this week; the President of China was here. We have severe disagreements over human rights, political rights, religious rights. But the best way to advance those issues, in my view, is to work with China and try to make a partner out of China in the 21st century, not create a new cold war with a different country on the other side. If it comes out that way, it ought not be our fault. We ought to have the sure knowledge if there is a polarizing situation in the 21st century that it's not our fault, that we did everything we could to create a responsible, international system of free trade, peace, common efforts against terrorism, weapons proliferation, shared environmental and disease problems, and respect for democracy and human rights. So I think we're doing the right thing.

We've got a number of other challenges. I'm in a big debate with the Congress—in some ways, the most fateful one—over whether the United States should have national academic standards in the basics in schools and an exam—voluntary—to see if our children are meeting those standards. And I suggested we start with a reading test in the fourth grade and a math test in the eighth grade. Just had another study this week that said that kids who take algebra in

the eighth grade are far more likely to stay in school and far more likely to go to college and far more likely to do well in college. We're the only major country without any kind of national academic standards, and I think it's crazy not to do it. I'm still fighting that out.

We were thwarted this year in our efforts to pass campaign reform, but I think we've got a good chance to pass it next year. And I might say, I appreciate the fact that all of you who are here at this event are giving us what in the current jargon is called ''hard money'' and what also will be provided for under the new campaign finance reform law. We need to change the finance system.

But I would also point out, those of you politically active a long time know this, the money has not driven the cost up, the costs have driven the money up. It's like every other endeavor in human life: The cost of communicating with voters has exploded exponentially. So if we really want to get a handle on this problem, we also have to say, ''If you observe the campaign finance limits, you should get free or reduced air time and access to voters.'' If we do that, we can also change the nature of debates and elections.

You look at a British election, for example, where each party gets a certain amount of time in different time blocks, and where people have reasoned debates, and they're much more like the Presidential debates are here, and almost nothing else is like that. And I'm convinced if we have free and reduced air time, more citizen participation like the debates we did in '92 and '96, that our campaign insisted on to bring real people into the debates, the voting record of the country would go way up.

Well, anyway, these are just a few of the things I wanted to talk about. The last thing I wanted to say is, in the '98 elections going forward, people will not be able to paint this sort of gnarled, twisted picture of Democrats anymore. You can't say we're weak on foreign policy and national defense. You can't say we can't be trusted to manage the economy. You can't say we're spending the country blind. You can't say we're against responsible tax cuts or that we're not strong for welfare reform or sensible criminal justice policies.

If you look ahead to the future, the major issues that will affect the lives of ordinary Americans—education, the environment, health care, the overall strength of the country—these are issues that our party, with its new direction, is strong on. And you are helping to contribute to that, and in doing it, I think you'll help make America a better place.

Thank you.

I've got time for one or two questions if anybody wants to ask a question.

Education

Q. It's really not a question. It's just sort of a comment and sort of a personal anecdote—when people have talked about the public schools and a lot of criticism about it. My daughter is in seventh grade at the School of the Arts here, and recently was sick—in St. Mary's Hospital, actually—missed 3 weeks of school. And in the public schools where I would expect very little to happen, every one of her teachers called her to find out how she was. Her principal sent her balloons to cheer her up—been involved in the School of the Arts and I guess the foundation quite a bit.

There are some really good stories, and it would be nice if they got out somehow. This is just one that I know personally. And I never would have dreamed—as my daughter had gone to private school until this year—and for whatever it's worth people ought to try to find out more success stories from the public schools.

The President. Ninety percent of our children are in public schools. If most of them weren't doing a good job, they wouldn't be there. That's the first point. Second thing is—it's very important to make this point because I've been working at this now since, seriously, since 1979, and I think I've been in enough schools and looked at enough data and talked to enough people to know, the schools are better than they used to be, and they're getting better.

The real problem is there are some that aren't good at all. And what do they need? You can do one of two things. You can say, ''Okay, well we ought to just make it possible for people to abandon them.'' The problem

is, only a portion of the people would abandon them and the people that are left will be even worse off because they'll have less money, and a lot of them are in financial trouble now. Or you can do what I think should be done: You have to have high standards; you have to have accountability; you have to have reform; and then you have to have adequate investment.

Now, this school you mentioned—one of the things that I think every school district ought to do is, I think they ought to give the parents of the children a choice of the schools they attend within the districts, and I think every district—I hope some day before too long every district will have what educators call a charter school, which is a part of the public schools but it's created. For example, suppose there were no art school here, where teachers can get together and create a whole new school with a separate mission, with fewer rules and regulations, and it only stays in existence as long as the parents and the students are satisfied that its's fulfilling its mission. There are now 700 of these schools. In our budget, we're going to create 3,000 more. Once you get enough of them to be in every district in the country, and if we can get more people to give choice to the parents within the school districts, you're going to see dramatic improvements.

We need the national standards. We also need—I have been a very strong supporter of the national board for teacher certification to get board-certified teachers as master teachers, one in every school in the country. There are only about 1,000 now. Our budget contains funds to help train 100,000 in the next 4 years, and they are dramatically better trained than most people.

So I'm with you. They're getting better. They can do a good job. Most of them are doing better than they used to.

Iran

Q. What is your position on the growing tension between the Malaysian French oil group that is hoping to get financed by Goldman-Sachs to mine new oil fields in Iran and will increase Iran's economy by about $400 million under 20 years?

The President. Well, you know what my position is: we don't like it. We're in an intense debate within the administration now about exactly what we ought to do about it. I just have a different view of—the United States generally has a different view than most of our allies. They all think we're all wet. But I just believe that we should not be conducting ordinary business with a country that funds, trains, and supports terrorists. I don't have the same opinion. They can have a different religion than we do. They can have different politics. They can attack me on the evening news every night—whatever they want. But I don't think we should be doing business with a country that funds, trains, and supports terrorists. And I don't think we should be bashful about telling our friends that we think that's wrong. And if we're the only country in the world that thinks that, I think that's still what we ought to say.

Now, what we have to decide within the parameters of the law which was passed—which I signed because I support that position—what the appropriate action is in the case. And frankly, I haven't gotten a recommendation from my administration yet, and I haven't had a lot of time to even talk to them about it because we've been so preoccupied with what's going on and with our relationship with China in the last couple of weeks.

But I keep hoping that Iran will take a different course. It's a very old culture. It's a very great country. There are still a lot of people there that were educated in our country. And the people voted in the last election, obviously, at least for relaxation of their ordinary lives at home. And I would like it very much if they would take a different course. But until they do, I think we have to be quite firm, even if we're all by ourselves.

Child Care and Brain Development

Q. [*Inaudible*]—in terms of diverse programs. Recently it has come to our mind that at the University of Miami we conducted a study with rats and it has to do with the warehousing of our children at day care centers. And the rats that were brought up in a non-stimulating environment versus the

rats that were stimulated had a profound effect, once those brains of those rats were dissected. And it's something else to know that the Life Foundation has become extremely interested in because I'm a mother of six and grandmother of nine. This is the future. And these rats that were not stimulated became violent, did not live as long; and brains, when dissected, were atrophied, versus the brains of the rats who lived in a stimulating environment, lived a longer life, were more productive in every way, and had brains with arteries that were clear to the brain and obviously were happier rats.

So, therefore, it goes to say that the children—our children that are being warehoused, this is a very big problem in America, and I really believe that it's not just the Government's obligation and responsibility to take care of these children and to help out. It's our responsibility as well.

The President. Well, let me say it's both our responsibilities. And given that the budget realities of where we are now, that's the way it has to be attacked. But very briefly, this year Hillary and I hosted two conferences at the White House. One was on early childhood and brain development and the other one, last week, was on child care.

We now know, scientists know that an enormous percentage of the brain's capacity develops in the first 3 years of life. We also know that children in supportive environments, whether it's from their parents or in a child care facility where they get not only love and affection, but I mean, actually stimulating environments, have an average of 700,000 positive interactions in their first 4 years of life. Children who are left to sit in front of a television, even by a loving parent, or at a child care center where they're not being stimulated, have an average of 150,000 positive interactions in the first 4 years of life—700,000 to 150,000, while the infrastructure of the brain is being developed. It's not rocket science.

Now, the child care thing—the basic fundamental problem is lower income parents spend as much as 25 percent of their income on child care. And if you want to raise the standards for the child care centers and make sure that a higher percentage of them have more stimulating educational programs, the money has to come from somewhere. Now, we may be able to increase the child care tax credit. I'm working on some options of things we can do. We can help to actually fund the training of more child care workers. But we also have to do more to make child care, that is quality care, affordable. It's a huge issue for the country.

Q. I'd like—if we could, I know that you're having a little problem with your voice——

The President. [*Inaudible*]—to lose my voice. I lost it once. It was pretty scary. [*Laughter*]

Q. ——ask that you sort of try to—I know you'd like to go on—but if we could call off the questions now if you don't mind, Mr. President——

The President. Thank you. I enjoyed being with you. Thank you so much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Harriet and Jerome Zimmerman and Sidney and Dorothy Kohl, luncheon cohosts. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at a Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Dinner in Boca Raton, Florida

October 31, 1997

Thank you very much. You may or may not have already noticed that I don't exactly have all my vocal capacities. The good news is you'll get a shorter speech. [*Laughter*] The bad news is you'll have to listen harder to what does come out.

I want to start by thanking John and Peggy for bringing us into their magnificent home and even more for their commitment, which was so powerfully expressed in what John said.

You know, I tell people all the time that I have been in public life now almost continuously since 1974. I have been in public office all but 2 years for the last 20 years. Most of the people I've known in politics were good, honest people who worked a lot harder than they had to work and fought for what they believed in and tried to make this

country a better place. And I really appreciated what you said about those Members of Congress.

Even our friends on the Republican side, when that pitched battle we had over the Contract With America, virtually all of them really believed they were doing the right thing. But I didn't, and Mr. Gephardt didn't, and Mr. Frost didn't, and the other Members of Congress who are here—Congressman Deutsch, Congressman Kennedy, Congressman Baldacci—we didn't. And we won.

But you don't work like that, under those kinds of conditions, if you don't feel it. And I must tell you, John, that it means a lot just to know it got across to somebody, because we're very well aware of the presentation that's given to the American people about people in public life, the nature of the political process, and then even the nature of fundraising.

To hear people tell it, the very act of getting people to support you is somehow suspect. You just described your activities in Washington, and I must tell, that's consistent with probably more than 80 percent of the people who help us. And if the others have something they want to talk to us about, well, that's democracy, too, and there is nothing wrong with it. So I thank you very much.

I want to thank Dick Gephardt and his legion in the House, first for the help they gave me in 1993 when we passed the economic plan which was principally responsible for reducing the deficit by 90 percent, without a single vote from a Republican Member in the Senate or the House, not a single, solitary one. Before this new balanced budget law, which I'm very proud of—but before it takes effect, don't forget the deficit dropped from $290 billion to $22.6 billion because of what a lot of brave people in our caucus did in 1993. And a lot of them lost their seats because of it, because the benefits were not apparent by the '94 election. And it made me more proud than ever to be a member of the Democratic Party.

There were a lot of other things that were done, thanks to the leadership that the Democrats here gave us. In 1994 we passed a crime bill, bitterly opposed by the leadership of the other party. They said it was all wrong. They went out in rural areas and tried to convince people we were going to take their guns away. And again, they cost us a few seats. We had some Members in Congress who gave up their seats to vote for 100,000 police, to vote for the Brady bill, to vote for the ban on assault weapons. But we've had 5 years of steeply dropping crime rates, and now we know whether we were right or they were right. The voters didn't know in 1994, but we were right.

And the President gets the credit. When the economy is up, the President gets the credit. John Kennedy thought it was fair. He said, "Victory has a thousand fathers, but defeat is an orphan." So if it goes down, I'll be here, folks. [*Laughter*]

But that plan could not have been passed without the support of our people in Congress. The crime bill could not have been passed without the support of our people in Congress. We wouldn't have the right kind of welfare reform bill without the support of our people in Congress because I had to veto two bills first to get the one I wanted. We had record—3 million plus people move from welfare to work.

And I'm very proud of what these members of this caucus have done. I'm also proud that we got caught trying to provide health insurance to people in America who don't have it. You know, our opponents said when we tried to pass the health insurance program in 1994, they said, you know, "If you support the President's health insurance program, the number of people without health insurance will go up." And as one Democrat said to me the other day. "I supported your program. We got beat, but I supported it. And they were right; the number of uninsured people went up." And now we're trying to do something about that. In the last budget, we got funds to give health insurance coverage to half the children in America who don't have it.

But I want to make it clear, even with a Republican majority in Congress, nothing I do would take place without support of our caucus in the Congress. Do you believe that this balanced budget would have the biggest increase in health care for poor children since 1965 if it weren't for enough Democrats who could support my veto? Do you believe, for example, that we would have, for

the first time in the history of the country, in this budget, opened the doors of college to everybody, literally, with a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college, tax credits for the other years, better loan programs, more scholarships, more work-study funds, education IRA's? It happened because we were together and we worked together.

So I'm grateful, and you can see—I'd like it very much if we could win 11, 12, 20, 30 more seats. What are the stakes, though? Let's talk about this. What are the stakes, and what are the chances? Why is the country working now?

First of all, when I started running for President 6 years ago, I basically was driven by two things. The first reason was, I didn't really think the country had a plan for the 21st century. It's a big, complicated country, and I thought we were just going to kind of wander into a new millennium, and I didn't believe we were very well-prepared.

The second reason was, I thought the debate in Washington was downright counterproductive, and that our Democrats had turned into sort of cardboard cutouts of real people, just what you were talking about. They said we were weak on defense and weak on welfare and weak on crime and couldn't be trusted with tax money and all that stuff they said about us. And as a result, it sort of relieved people of the burden of having to think, because if they made us unacceptable, particularly in races for President, well, then the voters didn't have to think. I think that's why folks in the other party get so mad at me sometimes. We've gotten the American people to thinking again. [*Laughter*] They're not on automatic anymore.

For example, why should we have had this old debate on the budget: Are we going to explode the deficit with tax cuts or just have a little smaller deficit with spending? So I said, ''Vote for me, and we'll cut the deficit and spend more money on education.'' And people said, ''Yeah, right.'' But that's exactly what we've done, and it worked, because we're Democrats.

Take the crime debate. Every time you read about crime, it was to hear the way they had framed it: ''You've got to be tough on crime.'' ''Well, what do you mean by that?'' ''Put everybody in jail longer.'' And, ''The other guys, they just want to let them out because they're soft-hearted.'' So we said—I said, ''I don't know anybody who thinks like that, not a single living soul.'' So we said, ''Why don't we find the people who really deserve to be in prison longer and keep them, and spend more time trying to keep our kids out of prison and take these guns off the street and out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them?'' And it worked, we put the police on the streets. This was not rocket science. This was the way people think out here in the real world when they're not being presented in artificial terms from a long way away.

On welfare, the debate was structured as: ''All these people on welfare, they don't want to work, and we're tough. We're going to make them work.'' And the other side, our side, was, ''Well, that's probably right, but we feel so bad about the kids we don't want to do it.'' I didn't know a single living soul who really thought that way. And I'd spent a lot of time in welfare offices. I never met anybody on welfare who didn't want to go to work.

So we said, ''Okay, make people who are able-bodied go to work, but get them the education and training, and let's don't hurt their children because their most important job is raising their children. Provide the child care for the children. Provide the medical care for the children. Then you can be tough on work and good to the kids.'' Guess what? It worked. Why? Not because it was rocket science. It was common sense, mainstream values, thinking about tomorrow, and getting away from the hot air.

Same thing on the environment. I believe in preserving the environment. I've worked hard on the Florida Everglades. We've got an agreement in this Interior bill to save the Yellowstone Park from gold mining and to save a bunch of the Redwood forests that are precious, and there are not many of them left in California.

But I always thought it was crazy—you know, they said, ''Well, the environment is nice, but we've got to grow the economy.'' And then we were made to look like sort of blissed-out tree huggers who never got over the McCarthy campaign. [*Laughter*] And that wasn't consistent with my experience. It

looked to me like, for example, if we had a really sensible economy, we could organize it in a way that would promote a clean environment and create more jobs, not fewer jobs.

They said when we tried to take—and this was before my time—we took CFC's out of the atmosphere to stop the hole in the ozone layer. Have any of you missed them? Do you know the name of anybody who has lost a job because of it? But the hole over the ozone layer is shrinking, and the layer is thickening, and it's good for your children and grandchildren.

We had all these coal-fired powerplants that were putting out a lot of sulphur dioxide and making acid rain. The Democrats in Congress—before my time—the Democrats in Congress authorized a trading system so that the free market could trade permits to allow the most efficient way to take the sulphur dioxide out of the atmosphere. We're 40 percent ahead of schedule at less than half the projected cost because the Democrats found a way for the free market to clean the environment and grow the economy. That's our policy, and that's what we intend to do in the future. And it's the right thing to do.

I say this because I think it is terribly important that we look to the future. I'm glad the economy is in good shape. We learned at the last—over the last—this year, this quarter, compared to last year, we grew at 3.5 percent. We've got the lowest inflation since 1964. That's good.

But we've got more to do. Not everybody who needs a job has one. Not everybody who is losing jobs in the technological changes and the trade flows is getting the kind of training that he or she needs to move on with their lives. We've go more to do on the economy. Dick talked about education. We need desperately to have national standards in education, and we need to measure whether our children are measuring up. And we ought to give them more choice in the public schools they attend.

I want every grade school kid in America to go to a school like the one I visited in Jupiter today, the one I should have visited a few months ago before I hurt myself.

We've got more to do. We've got more to do in so many areas. And if you think about it, our Democrats are not vulnerable anymore to the old cardboard pictures they painted of us, not just because of me or the Vice President but also because they were with us. They can't say, ''You can't trust that crowd anymore. They're not good with your money. They won't give you a tax cut. They can't manage the economy. They can't manage crime. They're weak on welfare. They're no good in foreign policy and defense.'' All that stuff is out. We can have a real conversation in 1998.

And what is it about? What is it about? Just what you said: How are we going to prepare this country for the 21st century? What still needs to be done? How are we going to preserve Social Security and Medicare for our generation, the biggest generation, without asking our kids to pay too much to take care of us because we're bigger than our kids are in numbers? How are we going to give a world-class education to every American? How are we going to embrace all this diversity we have and still be bound together as one America? How are we going to stop being the biggest polluter in the world when it comes to carbon dioxide, which is warming the planet with potentially serious consequences to our people and people around the world, and still keep this economy growing so everybody can make a good living? How are we going to provide working families with the tools they need to succeed at home and at work—still the biggest challenge we've got?

I'm glad everybody has got a job, folks, but now—you ask our hosts; they now have a one-year-old daughter—that little child has become their most important work. It dwarfs everything else. Every day—every day—there are people in this country, from hard-working lower middle class people, who are spending 25 percent of their income on child care and still can't afford child care where their children are stimulated, to upper middle class people who feel like they can't hold on to their jobs unless they spend so many hours at work they're not with children when they need to be.

Every day there are people in this country who are making choices between being good parents and good workers. And that's why the Democrats ought to expand family leave

so people can get a little time off from work to go to parent-teacher conference or take their kids to the doctor. That's why the Democrats need to keep working until all the children in working families can be insured with health insurance. That's why we need to keep working until we have uniform standards of excellence and lots of local reform in schools. That's why we need to keep working on these things.

We have done so much, but believe me, maybe it's just because I've just got 3 years and a few months left, but I think all the time about 2010 and 2015 and 2020 and what this country is going to be like when my child is my age. And I'm telling you, the best days of America are still ahead if we keep on doing what we're doing.

That's what this election in '98 is about. Why is it important that you're here? Because the voters—there are a lot of voters out there who are still like you were for a long time. They don't think it matters. They think everybody is just screaming at each other in Washington. And what happens? Usually at the end of these campaigns, the party with the most money wins because the airwaves get full of these 30-second ads which either persuade people who are undecided or turn them off so much they stay home. And the marginal voters that stay home are the working people who would vote for us if they showed up.

That's why this dinner is important. You ask Martin Frost to go through the 20 closest congressional races in the last election, 1996, when the Vice President and I were honored to be returned to office with the electoral votes of the people of Florida. We were honored. We won a nice victory. But you go through those races, and you will see that in the 20 closest races, in the last 10 days, we were out-spent 4 to 1.

So I have to tell you, I am unapologetic about being here. I am proud of you for being willing to help carry on this debate. We can have a discussion, an honest discussion about the future in 1998, but we have to make it possible for Patrick Kennedy and John Baldacci and Martin Frost and Dick Gephardt and Peter Deutsch and all those people we've got running, fabulous people who are not in office, to be heard, because we now are in a position to finish this work of preparing our country to be what our children deserve.

I'm proud of you for being here and very grateful. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:54 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts John W. and Peggy Henry. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks in the Education Session of the Democratic National Committee's Autumn Retreat on Amelia Island, Florida

November 1, 1997

[*The discussion is joined in progress.*]

The President. I'll try to get through this. I think I'll get better as we go along. We'll see.

First of all, I believe that the condition of our children will continue to be one of the major issues for the country for the next 10 to 20 years. And I think we have to admit that with all our economic success, with the fact that we've got 3 million fewer people on welfare and crime is down and the schools are getting better, there are still a lot of kids in this country who don't have the childhood they need and that we need for them to have. And I'd just like to make a few comments on the issues that all of you have raised.

First, I think almost every family, even families in comfortable incomes, feel the tension of their job in the workplace and their job at home. Americans, we know, in general, are working longer than they were 20 years ago. There are more hours spent at work today by the average American family at all income levels than 20 years ago. And I think that means that things like child care and family leave are much more important.

Now, if I might just make a comment, the family leave law has probably touched more people in a profoundly personal way than just about anything else we've done. People still come up to me on the street all over the country and talk about it. And I believe we should go beyond it. I think we ought to expand the law to require that people should

be able to get a little time off to go to regular parent conferences with the teachers at school and regular medical appointments.

And I believe we ought to have more flex time options for people in the workplace, so that if they build up overtime—a lot of people are required to work overtime; others wish to work overtime—I personally believe that if the employee makes that choice, then he or she should be able to take the overtime in cash or in time with their families. So I don't think—when we talk about all these other things we need, I don't think we should get away from first base.

The other thing I think Valerie said, there's very little the Federal Government can do about this except in some of our specific programs like early Head Start. But there are some States that have social service and public outreach programs that do a very good job in visiting families before babies are born and trying to help young people, especially without much background, get the basics of parenting down. Now, we take that for granted, but it's a big mistake. An enormous amount of good can be done in that.

And I guess Ellen's probably already talked, but you know, when we had this conference on early childhood and the brain, I read a lot of the scientific data, and one research project I reviewed said that a child in a supportive family in a child care environment would get 700,000 positive contacts in the first 4 years of life. A child in an environment that might be loving but ignorant, just not knowing what to do, where the child was left in front of the television a lot, might get as few as 150,000 positive contacts in life. It's not rocket science to figure out what the difference in impact is.

So, beyond the work and family issue, if I could talk just a moment about child care, the United States basically doesn't have the national systems in many areas that other countries take for granted but especially in health and in child care. Businesses can do more. We are now reviewing whether we should change the tax laws to try to accelerate the activity of larger businesses and make it more possible for small businesses to contribute in some way to their employees' child care. We also need to raise the standards. That entails costs. We have to meet them either directly or indirectly, helping people to do that.

And we are going to try to do more to train child care workers and to contribute to that because it is phenomenally important what is done with all those hours those babies have, starting at very early ages, like Richie said, in the child care centers.

Then there is a second issue we haven't talked about much, although Diana alluded to it when she mentioned the lady who had been on welfare with an 8-year-old child, and that is the need of children for supervision after they start school when their parents are working after school hours. And we're working very hard and have put some funds into and proposed more to help schools design programs to stay open to give kids things to do in the after-school hours. I think that's terribly important.

I think what we're trying to do in education—I still think we've got a lot of work to do there. We're working very hard—I had a long talk with Governor Chiles yesterday to make sure that the money we have for children's health will be used to add 5 million children to the rolls of the health insured.

Then the last big issue I think is very important is how do you connect children to the larger society. And safety is important. Having positive role models and specific help is important. That's why this mentoring issue is so terribly important. It's one of the goals that was set at the Presidents' Summit of Service in Philadelphia. The most important mentoring now being done—new mentoring project in America is America Reads. We have 800 colleges signed up, tens of thousands of college students working today with young children, helping them to read, also serving as role models. And there are countless other organizations. The church that Hillary and I attend in Washington has 45 America Reads volunteers. We're going to try to mobilize a million people to make sure that all our 8-year-olds have reading confidence by the end of the third grade. Huge issue. I think children should be given a chance to serve themselves when they reach an appropriate age.

And finally, I think it's very important that we broaden our focus of education. Children need to understand the relationship of the

social environment to the natural environment. They're natural environmentalists anyway. But we need to build a mindset among our kids that they can grow the economy and have a stable family life, they can grow the economy and preserve their environment, and that we are living in a period where we've got all these conflicts that we have to resolve as a society if we want to have people living a good life in the 21st century.

And finally, I think it's very important that children from earliest childhood, through the use of the Internet or whatever else is available, gain a greater understanding of the relationship of the United States to the rest of the world.

I must say that when my voice is working, sometimes I get credit for being a reasonably effective communicator. But I have completely failed. According to every public opinion survey, I have completely failed to convince a substantial majority of American people of the importance of trade to our economic development and the importance—although specifically they understand it, but as a general principle—and the importance of our involvement in the rest of the world to our own success here at home, whether it's in peacemaking efforts or contributing to the United Nations, or participating in other international efforts.

So these are some of my thoughts: First start with work and family, with child care and family supports; then look at education, health care; then look at how the children relate to the larger society and how children from difficult circumstances can have a safe environment with a mentor, with positive experiences, learning about how we can build a seamless life between the social environment, the natural environment, and the larger world. That's the way I look at this. And I think if we keep our focus on children, number one, we'll be doing the right thing, and second, I think the American people will like the Democratic Party, because we'll be doing the right thing.

Thank you.

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

The President. Before I go, I just want to talk about the standards issue. You should all understand, the good news is schools are getting better. They're getting better. The troubling news is they are not getting better uniformly, and the United States is the only major country that has no national academic standard, not Federal Government standard, not federally enforced but just a national measurement, so that every parent, every teacher, every school can know how kids are doing.

The more diverse we get within our country and the more we compete with people around the world, the more we need some common standard. And that's the biggest fight we've got going in Washington right now in terms of what will really affect our children's future.

So I hope you'll all talk about this. Governor Romer is not only in better voice, he knows more about it than I do. But we've been fighting for this for 10 years, and it's crazy that we haven't done it. So I hope we can rally our party behind it.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:52 a.m. in Salon Two at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Valerie Rogers, wife of Annapolis, MD, energy executive Wayne Rogers; Ellen Galinsky, president and cofounder, Families and Work Institute; Richie Garcia, teacher, Music Institute of Hollywood; Diana Lawrence, wife of Cincinnati, OH, attorney Richard Lawrence; Gov. Lawton Chiles of Florida; and Governor Roy Romer of Colorado.

Remarks in the Globalization and Trade Session of the Democratic National Committee's Autumn Retreat on Amelia Island

November 1, 1997

[*The discussion is joined in progress.*]

Role of National Economic Council

Q. Perhaps the time has come to elevate the National Economic Council to the level of stature that the National Security Council has had. Yesterday I attended in Washington a Council on Foreign Relations meeting which was a retrospective of the first 50 years of the National Security Council, at which a half-dozen former and the current National Security Adviser were present. And the scope

of their remarks and their ability to integrate across the disparate organizational interests of Defense, State, other U.S. Government and nongovernmental organizations to create policy synthesis was, although not perfect, very impressive. And I was wondering whether you had a comment on whether the United States Government perhaps needed at this time a comparable structure.

[*At this point, the moderator invited the President to respond.*]

The President. First of all, while it doesn't have a 50-year history, I think the record will reflect that's exactly what we've done. I brought Bob Rubin in to be the head of a new National Economic Council to reconcile all the different economic agencies. And then Laura Tyson did it. Now Gene Sperling and Dan Tarrullo do it. As a result of it, for the first time in most business people's experience, you have the State Department aggressively working in Embassies around the world to help American business; you have the Export-Import Bank, Overseas Private Investment Council, working with the Agriculture Department, the Commerce Department, and all the other economic agencies, especially, obviously, the Treasury Department.

And it works like the NSC does. We try to get everybody together, reach a common policy, and then all back it. Sometimes we don't quite get there, but we've had a remarkable amount of success, and I think that it is the single most significant organizational innovation that our administration has made in the White House. And I think that the economic record of the administration is due at least in part to the institution of the National Economic Council.

[*The discussion continued.*]

Integration of Diplomatic and Economic Policy

Q. ——I think the question is whether, organizationally the Government needs to think about different ways to both create that and sustain a free trade area of the Americas.

The President. Well, basically, I agree with you. The reason that I asked Mack McLarty to take on that job is that I thought our relationship with Latin America was of profound importance and that it cut across economic and political lines, and we needed to have somebody concentrating on it who could deal with not just specific diplomatic or security issues but the whole range of political and economic issues. And it's worked.

And what I'm hoping we can do now is take a look at whether we could do the same sort of thing in other parts of the world and how we'd have to reorganize the State Department and how we might integrate our diplomatic and economic efforts even more closely than we have to date.

Let me just say generically, one of the things that stunned me when I became President was how antiquated all the organizational and information structures of the Federal Government were. When I walked in the Oval Office as President the first day, Jimmy Carter's phone system was on the desk—you know, where you punch those big old plastic buttons and the light comes up—[*laughter*]—and you dialed. And if you were having a call with three people, everybody else in the White House that had the line on the button could pick it up and listen. It was unbelievable—1993—we had an almost 20-year-old phone system.

And believe me, that is a metaphor for other problems. One of the things that Speaker Gingrich and I have discussed as a possible bipartisan project is an effort to totally upgrade the information systems and communications systems of both the executive and the legislative branches, to try to get us in tune with the world. I know we had some high-tech executives testifying before Congress recently, and they were asked—they said, "One real problem is in communications. We operate at 3 times the speed of normal business decisions." Normal business operates at 3 times the speed of Government; therefore, we're at a 9-to-1 disadvantage in trying to harmonize these policies. [*Laughter*]

So I think Bob's made some very good points about that.

[*The discussion continued.*]

Trade Policy and Domestic Economic Development

The President. Before I go, if I could just say one thing about this trade issue, because

we need your help on this. I think we ought to say, first of all, that the Democratic Party has moved on the trade issue. Even a lot of the people who are against fast track basically want it to pass in the sense—and they know that we need to open more markets to Latin America and that there are political as well as economic benefits to a free trade area of the Americas, to the African initiative that I have announced. They know the biggest middle class in the world is in India. They know that the Indian subcontinent, if the differences between Pakistan and India could be resolved, would be an enormous opportunity. They know these things. This is not a secret. And there is much more of a willingness to embrace this in our caucus in the Congress than I think is—than you would sense.

The question is how to get over the hurdle of the feeling that it's not just foreign markets that are more closed to us but that other countries, through the use of labor practices we think are wrong, or Mark mentioned the pollution problem in Mexicali—which we are moving to address and have some money to do so—that they'll gain unfair economic advantage; and secondly, the feeling that while we all talk a good game—and I think this is really the issue—while everybody talks a good game, our country really does not have a very good system, or at least it's not adequate, for dealing with people who are dislocated in this churning modern economy.

And I might say that the Council of Economic Advisers did a study for me which indicated that 80 percent of the job dislocation was the result of technological change; only 20 percent from trade patterns. But my view is, if you're my age and you've got a kid in college and you lose your job at some company, who cares what the cause is?

So I think that really thoughtful people need to think about how are we going to set up a system of kind of lifetime education and training and growth, and how are we going to give people who are dislocated the transitional support they need for their families so they don't lose all self-respect and become desperate, and try to increase the flow here because we know we have—today—you've got significant shortages in America in high-wage job categories that could be filled by people who are being dislocated today from other high-wage or moderate-wage jobs.

So what I would like to ask a lot of you who agree with me on this trade issue to think about is, is we have moved our party. You may not be able to tell it on the vote here in the fast track, but the truth is, if you listen to the arguments, there's almost nobody standing up saying anymore like they used to a few years ago, ''Trade's a bad thing. We're always going to be taken advantage of. It's always going to be a terrible thing.'' You don't hear that much anymore. People are genuinely concerned now about making sure that the rules are fair and that the dislocation is addressed.

So I say that to ask you, first of all, to keep on working on fast track, because our opponents are wrong and it won't create a single job if we lose; it will cost us jobs. So that's the short-term thing; we've got to fight for that. But we also have to recognize that you've got three categories of people out there: those that are displaced by trade; a much larger group of people that are just being dislocated by technological and economic changes that are going to occur anyway; and then you've got a group of people that we're trying to address with the empowerment zones who haven't been affected one way or the other by trade or economic growth because they live in islands that haven't been penetrated by free enterprise in America. And in a funny way, we should look at them as a market, the way we look at the Caribbean or Latin America or Africa or anyplace else. We should look at these people as a market.

Mark Nichols represents a Native American group. If you think about the Native American tribes that aren't making a ton of money off their gambling casinos, that need jobs and investment, if you think about the inner city neighborhoods, if you think about the rural areas that haven't been touched, I think as Democrats we ought to be more creative about thinking about how we can push an aggressive trade agenda and say we need all these people, too, and it's a great growth opportunity—and not be deterred in trying to do what we ought to be doing on trade but also understand that this other

thing is a legitimate issue and we have to address it.

In the next few days we're going to do more in the Congress to do this, but I think—I'm talking about this is going to be an ongoing effort. It's going to take about 10 years, I think, to just keep pushing at it as we learn more and more and more about how to do it. And if the people in the country get the sense that this is a dual commitment on our part and that we're passionate about both, I think that is not only the winning position, I think, more importantly, it is the right position.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:20 a.m. in Salon One at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Mark Nichols, chief executive officer, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians.

Remarks in the Arts and Culture Session of the Democratic National Committee's Autumn Retreat on Amelia Island

November 1, 1997

[*The discussion is joined in progress.*]

Q. With regard to the national, also looking to the international, I have a couple of questions I'd like to ask the President. What impact do you think on our culture and our arts Cuba will have after Castro?

The President. Well, if you think baseball is an art form, and I do—[*laughter*]—it will be huge. [*Laughter*]

No, to be more serious, there are a lot of Cuban artists, Cuban musicians. All you have to do is look at the impact of South American, Central American music and arts in the United States now—Caribbean art. I think it's obvious that it will be significant. It will be one—when we get back together with more normal relations with Cuba, it will be one of the principal benefits of it.

Let me say, if I might, on the general point, Glenn made the points that I wanted to make about this. The assault on the NEA and the NEH needs to be seen against the background of the apparently less ideologically driven reduction in the availability of music and art generally in the schools, in the public schools, which we saw because of financial problems and other decisions being made.

If you look at what's happened—and let me explain that. The cutting of the budget of the NEH and the NEA and the attempt to do away with them basically had two legs of support, not one. There was obviously the sort of right-wing ideological attack based on the symbolism of some controversially funded projects, photography exhibits or whatever. Beyond that, there were Members of Congress, with the deficit being what it was, making the same sort of judgments that school board members made all across America: "I can't dismantle the football team and the basketball team; I'll get rid of the arts and the music program for all the kids, because, by definition, most of them aren't all that good in art and music. And nobody is going to come down on me if I do it. And I don't have to take on any institutional interests to do it. And after all, it's just a piddly amount of money."

Now, I think because the Balanced Budget Act has been passed and we've cut the deficit by more than 20 percent and because we have taken on the ideological argument, I think, and, first of all, tried to respond to some of the more legitimate concerns about how the projects were funded and, secondly, tried to reaffirm the positive notions that what the NEA and NEH has done—I think at the national level we've sort of stemmed the hemorrhage. I would submit that that's not nearly enough, first of all, because it's only a small portion of the more. And secondly, because I think what you said is terribly important. We have all this data that kids that come from different cultures with different languages have their language facilitation, their ability to learn English, to read in English, to think and relate to people in a new culture dramatically accelerated if they're more proficient and more exposed to music and arts and other ways of hooking their mind in.

We have a lot of evidence that kids from very difficult situations do much better in math if they have a sustained exposure to music, for reasons that are fairly obvious, if you think about it.

So what I would like to ask all of you to do—I'd like to invite you to do something.

I don't have an answer; this is not a set-up deal. I never thought about it until I realized I was going to come do this panel. I have given a lot of thought to what our gift to the next century ought to be in terms of our approach to the arts. And yes, I'm glad I stood up for the NEA and the NEH, and I won a political battle—fine. It's one percent of the more.

What should we do with this one percent of the money? If we want more than this, what case should we make for getting more? What would we do with it? And in a larger sense, what should our mission be in terms of the public role of the arts, particularly for our children? What arguments could we make to make the schools have it a priority again?

I see something like the Harlem Boys Choir or all these incredible arts programs in New York or whatever, and I feel two things: I am exhilarated, like we all are, but then I wonder how many other little kids are going out there to some other school every day where they still don't even have a music teacher. And what about them?

That's not an argument not to do what's being done, but I would invite you—a lot of you know so much more about this than I do, but I'm telling you, I've been in school after school after school after school where the buildings are old, and they can't be maintained, and they shut down the music and arts programs, and they shut down, by the way, all the recreational programs except for the varsity sports, which I also think is a mistake.

People are whole people. Even poor kids—you talked about this—it's hard to say, "Why spend money on the arts when you have problems with welfare and poverty and all that?" Because poor people need their spirits nourished. Most children are not all that conscious of being poor unless they're genuinely deprived or brutalized. But when they grow up, they remember experiences that lift their spirits when they're young.

So I guess what I'm saying is, we need an affirmative strategy. We played good defense, and we won—big deal. How would you go to a conservative Republican group in town X and argue that this investment ought to be made either in the National Endowment of the Arts or in the community, or that the arts and music programs ought to be restored and here's why. That's what we need now, and that's what we ought to be doing now. We shouldn't be playing defense with this issue.

I mean, so what? You won a fight in Congress over one percent of the money. It was very important symbolically because it gave dignity and strength and integrity to your efforts, and I'm very glad we fought it. It also makes a lot of difference to some programs in the country. But we need an affirmative strategy for the next century.

And I hope one of the things that will come out of this seminar is that some of you will come out of this being willing to work with our Millennium Project and with the White House generally to get off the defense and get on offense. And I don't mean to hurt anybody else. I don't see this as necessarily a big political winner for us. I'm not interested in the politics of this. I'm just talking about what's right for the children and the future of this country.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:50 a.m. in Plaza One at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Glenn D. Lowry, director, The Museum of Modern Art.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Line Item Vetoes of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

November 1, 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 "Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998" (Public Law 105–65; H.R. 2158). 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,
November 1, 1997.

NOTE: The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on November 4.

Message to the Congress Transmitting Line Item Vetoes of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998

November 1, 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 "Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998" (Public Law 105–66; H.R. 2169). 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,
November 1, 1997.

NOTE: The reports detailing the cancellations were published in the *Federal Register* on November 4.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Dinner on Amelia Island

November 1, 1997

Thank you very much. Please be seated. We're going to reverse the order tonight, and I'm going to introduce the Vice President because you've all heard me speak before—[*laughter*]—because I need to save my voice to campaign for our candidates in New Jersey and in New York tomorrow. [*Applause*] Thank you.

Let me once again thank all of you for coming. I hope you have enjoyed this. I certainly enjoyed it today. I was glad to meet with the various panels, and I enjoyed Governor Romer's speech at lunch very, very much. Didn't he do a terrific job?

Ladies and gentlemen, 6 years ago when I began running for President, I wanted to win the election to change the country, and I felt very strongly that we were not preparing America for the 21st century and that our party needed to break the logjam not only with a set of new policies but with a set of new ideas. I thought the political debate had become, frankly, stale and, at least to someone like me, governing a State out in the country, often completely meaningless.

I believed we had to move the debate toward what was good for the future, not the past; what would support positive change, not the status quo; what would bring us together, not divide us; and move away from the old left-right, liberal-conservative and, frankly, outdated name-calling and labeling that dominated national politics. Six years later, we've made a lot of progress, not only in moving the country to a better place but in changing the nature of political debate.

I very much hope that the simplistic antigovernment, reactionary approach had its last gasp in the Republican congressional victory in 1994. The fact that we beat back the "Contract With America" and signed the right kind of welfare reform, got a balanced budget with the biggest investments in education and health care since 1965 and that we're moving forward in a way that brings the country together around the ideas of opportunity, responsibility, and community that we have espoused now for a long time is deeply encouraging to me.

The fact that all around the world now people are beginning to talk in the same terms—the First Lady is in Great Britain today; she's been in Ireland. I, frankly, was very flattered that Tony Blair's campaign was often compared to ours and that the so-called New Labor movement has a lot in common with what we've tried to do here. I believe all over the world countries that are serious about helping people make the most of their own lives, assuming a leadership role in dealing with the challenges of the modern world are going to have to basically adopt similar approaches.

If you hadn't helped us, none of that would have been possible. But what I want to say to you is, if I hadn't been smart enough to pick Al Gore to be my running mate, none of it would have been possible.

Let me just give you a few examples. Sam Rayburn used to say it's a lot easier to tear something down, even a jackass can kick a barn down, but it takes a carpenter to build one. Now, we took the position that the old debate that Government could not be a savior, but couldn't sit on the sidelines, either, was a false debate, and that we had to have a new kind of Government that was smaller, that did more with less, that could balance the budget but also invest more in our future. Al Gore's reinventing Government project was the instrument through which we put that principle into practice.

And 5 years after we took office, our Government is smaller by 300,000, several thousand pages of regulation, several hundred Government programs that were out of date. It has been modernized in many ways, but we did not walk away from the problems, the challenges, and the opportunities of the American people.

The reinventing Government project was often, frankly, made fun of because it's not the sexiest issue in town. But it's what enabled us to cut the Government by 300,000 and increase the quality of public service and have money left over after we reduced the deficit, passed the balanced budget bill, to still invest in our future. The American people owe the Vice President a great debt of gratitude for that achievement alone.

Second example: When I became President, I got a very interesting letter shortly after I took office from former President Nixon, written a month and a day before he passed away. And it was about Russia, the importance of Russia to our future, and how we had to work with them to make sure we didn't repeat the ugly history of the last 50 years, but instead had a partnership for peace and prosperity and cooperation.

Well, I struck up a pretty good relationship with President Yeltsin, and I stuck by him through tough times because he was standing up for democracy and prosperity. But we had a huge number of exceedingly difficult issues, and frankly, we still have some tough issues, and we always will because it's in the nature of relationships between two great countries.

The Vice President agreed to head a commission along with the Russian Prime Minister, Mr. Chernomyrdin, for which there was really no precedent in global affairs. And the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission is the instrument through which the good intentions and principles articulated first by me and then by Boris Yeltsin have made the United States-Russia partnership the success it is. They've made it possible for us to go together into Bosnia. They made it possible for us to dramatically reduce the number of nuclear missiles we have. They've made it possible for us to detarget missiles so that none of our missiles are pointed at each other's children. They made it possible for us to do a whole range of things.

The Vice President has done a similar thing with the Vice President of South Africa. He has worked out an environmental partnership with top officials in China. In other words, it's fine for the President to make these statements; it's quite another thing if you have to look up 4 or 5 or 6 years from now and nothing has been done. It won't happen because Al Gore was the Vice President of the United States with unique responsibilities for helping to build our common future.

I could give you any number of other examples. I remember not long after I became President, when I was still reading critical columns—[*laughter*]—someone wrote a column in which they said something like—well, anyway, the import of it was that obviously I was a weak person, and that's why I had a wife who was so influential and why I gave my Vice President so much power, more than any President ever had before. And that sort of tickled me, because it seemed to me that if I had a partner in the Vice President who had knowledge in areas greater than mine, who had expertise in areas greater than mine, and who had all this energy and ability and a passionate dedication to this country and its future, I would be a fool not to use it. And I would be disserving you and every other American citizen if I had done anything

other than make Albert Gore the most influential and effective Vice President in the history of the United States. So I think I did the right thing there.

We've had a unique partnership. Believe it or not, we don't always agree. [*Laughter*] Our disagreements have been among the most stimulating experiences of my presidency. But if I want to disagree with the Vice President, since I get the last vote, I know at least that I have to go to school and I better have my facts straight.

I will never be able to convey publicly or privately the depth of gratitude I feel for the partnership that we have enjoyed. But I just want you to know that every time I see another economic report like the one we saw yesterday, that the economy grew another 3.5 percent in the last quarter; every time I think about the 13 million people who have jobs, the 3 million people who aren't on welfare, the more than 12 million people who have taken advantage of family and medical leave, and all of the achievements that this administration has played a role in, I know—I know that one of the most important factors was the unique and unprecedented relationship I have enjoyed with this fine, good man.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Vice President.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:32 p.m. in Salons Two and Three at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to President Boris Yeltsin and Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin of Russia.

Remarks at a Rally for Congressional Candidate Eric Vitaliano in Staten Island, New York

November 2, 1997

The President. Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, as you may have noticed in the last couple of days, I'm a little hoarse—[*laughter*]—so I can't speak too loud, though I hope I will be heard.

I want to thank President Springer for making us feel so welcome. Thank you, Assemblywoman Connelly, and all the other leaders of our party who are here. I want to thank Senator Bob Torricelli, from New Jersey, for being here with me. And in a moment, I want to ask him to say a few words—he is always in stronger voice than I am. [*Laughter*] But most of all, I want to thank Eric Vitaliano, and his wonderful family for making this race for Congress for your future and for our country.

I'm so happy to be back in Staten Island. I'm glad to be here especially on this mission, because the people who live on this island and the people who live in Brooklyn in this congressional district are representative of the people I ran for President to give voice to and to give a future to.

I want to just ask you to remember what it was like in 1991 and '92, when I started running for President. The economy was down, the country was drifting, politics was used to divide people with hot air and bogus charges, and we had no strategy to restore the middle class, to rebuild the economy, to reclaim the future for our children. And so I set out from a very different place, but representing people very much like you, to bring a vision to this country and unite us behind the idea that in the 21st century every American responsible enough to work for it, regardless of their race or station in life, ought to have a chance to live the American dream; that this country ought to continue to lead the world for peace and prosperity; and that we ought to unite, across all the lines that divide us, into one America.

Now, no one can come into this district and tell you for whom to vote. But I want to ask you, why has the other party spent all this money on ads trying to tear down Eric Vitaliano? And why did my predecessor and my distinguished opponent in the last election come here on behalf of his opponent? Because they are still trying to implement the contract on America and their agenda, and we don't think they're right. And because they have—this is the most important thing—they have opposed every single thing we have tried to do that has moved this country forward in the last 5 years.

So I don't want you to vote for me or against President Bush or Senator Dole or even Speaker Gingrich. I want you to vote for yourselves and your families and your future. This election—this is not about New York City politics, New York State politics. This is about what this man can do for you to set the right course for this country that

will help the children of Staten Island and Brooklyn to have a brighter future. That's what this is about—nothing more and nothing less.

I'll just give you some examples. And you remember, they all came for Mr. Vitaliano's opponent. I'm proud to be here for him, but let me just give you some examples. Vote for your future. I said we ought to break out of the bogus political debate in Washington that was paralyzing America. I said we could reduce the deficit and balance the budget and still invest in the education of our children. They all opposed it. We were right and they were wrong. We've got 13 million jobs and low unemployment.

I said that we could talk tough on crime till the cows come home, but until we acted tough and smart, till we supported more punishment and prevention, and until we put 100,000 police on the street in America, we couldn't bring down crime. Well, they opposed it. But we were right, they were wrong. Crime has been going down in this country for 5 years. That's what you ought to vote for.

They said Government was inherently bad and ought to be demolished. I said, no, it ought to be smaller and less bureaucratic, but we still ought to invest in the education of our children, in cleaning up our environment, in protecting the public health. They opposed us on all those issues. Today, the deficit has been reduced by 90 percent, the Government is 300,000 people smaller, but we're spending more on education and public health and environmental protection. We were right, and they were wrong.

Make no mistake about it, this is about you and your life. This man has shown you in his public service that he knows how to take sensible, tough, but smart policies on crime; that he is committed to preserving the environment—when he got the legislation through to close that landfill. He has shown you that he cares about middle class families and middle class values and the future of children and that he believes it ought to be a future that includes all kinds of Americans. That is what is at issue. Make no mistake, that is what is at issue.

And what you have to decide is whether you believe the course that I have taken, which has moved away from the old liberal versus conservative debate to build a common future for America's future—whether that kind of course, which requires independence, which requires the ability to differ, which requires the ability to think, and requires the ability to pull people together—whether that's the course you want, or whether you want one more soldier in the army that opposed our economic policies, our education policies, our environmental policies, our crime policies, right down the line. If you believe the country is better off today by having that kind of leadership and that kind of direction, you have only one choice on Tuesday, you have to show up for Eric Vitaliano and send him to Congress.

We are determined to open the doors of college to every American who will work hard enough to earn the grades to go. We are determined to make sure every 8-year-old in this country can read, that every single classroom in America is hooked up to the Internet, that every adult who loses a job has an immediate—immediate—chance to go back and get new skills and get back into the work force. We are determined to move this country forward together. We are determined to prove we can keep cleaning up the environment while we grow the economy. We are determined to keep working on the crime problem until it not only goes down but everybody in every neighborhood feels safe when their children are on the streets and in the parks again. That's what we're determined to do.

And maybe most important of all, we are determined to give families and communities the tools to solve their own problems. The first bill I signed was the family and medical leave law. The people who are trying to beat Eric Vitaliano opposed it.

So I ask you to think about this. And on Tuesday when you get up, don't be thinking about me, don't be thinking about those other folks that came in here for Eric's opponent. Be thinking about your children, your grandchildren, the people you live here with, the kind of Staten Island you want to build, the kind of New York you want to build, the kind of future you want to build. And make sure you show up and drag three or four of your friends along with you, and tell them

that America has a lot riding on the decision made in Staten Island and Brooklyn.

Thank you, and God bless you. [*Applause*] Thank you.

Now, 2 years ago, I was in the same sort of fight with Bob Torricelli in New Jersey. They said we couldn't win. They ran the same kind of negative ads against him. They said the same things against him. One thing is, they're perfectly predictable. [*Laughter*] But Bob Torricelli triumphed with the help of people like you. He's worked all over America to help us have that kind of election in other places, and I'd like to ask you to make him welcome. Senator Bob Torricelli from New Jersey.

[*At this point, Senator Robert G. Torricelli of New Jersey made brief remarks.*]

The President. One more thing. One more thing. In these elections, these special elections, very often the outcome is determined not by those who vote but by those who have an opinion who don't vote. And I want to say a special word of thanks to the unions, to the police officers' association, to the teachers, to the firefighters, the city workers, to every group of people who are supporting Eric.

But let me tell you, those of you who are part of organizations, and those of you who are active in the Democratic Party, and those of you who are here as concerned citizens, and especially those of you who are here who are students, who have the most at stake because you have the most years still ahead of you—you must go and you must bring your friends. Don't make your endorsements meaningless by not making them manifest by a big turnout. Don't let the people who don't vote determine this. Let the people whose eyes are bright and focused on the future have the energy and the compassion and the patriotism to show up on Tuesday so we'll have a big celebration Tuesday night.

God bless you. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:06 p.m. in the athletic center at the College of Staten Island. In his remarks, he referred to Dr. Marlene Springer, president, College of Staten Island; State Assemblywoman Elizabeth A. Connelly; and Vito Fossella, Republican Party nominee for Congress for New York's 13th District.

Remarks at a Rally for Gubernatorial Candidate Jim McGreevey in Edison, New Jersey

November 2, 1997

Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, if you have heard the radio spot I did for your next Governor, you know that I am not in very strong voice. I've been a little hoarse. But the subject of my speech is the last line of the radio address: I may have lost my voice, but you can find your voice on Tuesday, election day.

I want to thank the people of New Jersey for being so good to me and to Al Gore in 1992 and in 1996. I thank the Members of your congressional delegation who are here who work with us every day—Congressmen Payne and Menendez, Pallone and Pascrell, and our good friend Congressman Harold Ford from Tennessee. I thank Barbara Buono, Senator Bryant, Chairman Giblin for helping in this campaign. I want to say a special word of thanks to your Senator, Senator Lautenberg, who did so much work on the balanced budget. And I want to thank Senator Torricelli for the work he did—for the work he has done on the balanced budget and the work he has done to stand up to the negative partisan attacks of the leaders of the other party. You should be very proud of both of them for what they have done.

I'm glad to be back here at Middlesex. Hillary and I were here 3 years ago. Since I came here, with the help of these Members in Congress, we passed a balanced budget which includes the HOPE scholarship, which is a $1,500 tax credit for the first 2 years of college so that every American can go on to a place like Middlesex.

And I want to thank the students here for their engagement in community service, for their involvement in AmeriCorps. And especially I want to thank the volunteers in the America Reads program who are making sure our children can read.

Now, this is an interesting Governor's race. As I said the last time I was here, Senator McGreevey, I don't get a vote in New Jersey, and he won't get a vote in Congress—why am I here? Why have two members of the Republican majority in Congress come here to campaign for the Governor in the last few

days? Because it really matters in the world we're trying to create for the 21st century not only what we do in Washington but what happens in the State capitals.

And so I say to you, in the last 2 days you should listen to what they say and how they voted. You listen to see what I say and what I've done. But when you sort it all out, you should vote based on what's best for you and your children and the future of New Jersey.

This election is terribly important to me because the people of New Jersey are important to me, and because you can send a signal to the rest of the country about the direction that we have to take into the new century. You know, just remember what it was like 6 years ago when we started: the economy was in bad shape; the country was increasingly divided; the middle class felt like it was on the ropes and ignored; and we seemed to be drifting toward the future. Washington was dominated by exceedingly partisan debates and a lot of hot air rhetoric.

And I said, I think we can do better. We can create a country where the American dream is alive for everybody responsible enough to work for it. We can create a country where we're coming together across the lines that divide us, not being driven apart, as so many other people around the world are being driven. We can continue to lead the world for peace and prosperity. But we have to change, and we have to move forward.

And I've worked hard to do that. But what I want you to understand today is that everything we do in Washington depends upon whether it is supported, implemented, and added to in State after State after State for its ultimate success.

I've worked so hard to get this country out of debt. You know, the deficit of this country was so bad when I took office, we had quadrupled the debt of the country in the 12 years before I became President, over the previous 200—increased 4 times. And I said we're going to reduce the deficit, we're going to balance the budget, but we're going to invest more money in the education and health care and environmental protection of our country so that we can have a better country.

We took some tough votes. When Senator Lautenberg and then-Congressman Torricelli and the other Members of the House, they stood up and voted for our economic plan in 1993, they were excoriated, and the people who are here campaigning against Senator McGreevey said we were going to bring the economy down. The people who are here from Washington campaigning against him said our economic policy would be a disaster. Well, we've had 4 years of experience. They were wrong, and we were right. And we're right about this race, too.

They said they were tough on crime. I said, let's show it. Let's punish the people that ought to be punished and spend more effort trying to prevent our kids from getting into trouble in the first place and support the police—and support the police with 100,000 more police and the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. Their party was overwhelming against these measures. And now we've had 4 years to know whether they were right and we were wrong—and we know: Crime just keeps coming down. Our approach was right. We were right; they were wrong. And we're right about this race, too.

On the environment, New Jersey is a State that has shown time and again it is passionately committed to cleaning up the environment and preserving it. They said we don't have time to reauthorize the Superfund. They said we have to relax our environmental laws because it's too hard on the economy. They said it's just too much trouble; we're going to relax all these laws. I said, no, no, we're going to have cleaner water, cleaner air, clean up more toxic waste sites, and grow the economy—and grow the economy.

We've had a test now—4 years of experience we have—and we stopped the contract on America and its assault on the environment. And we know now—after 13 million jobs, the last quarter the lowest inflation in over 30 years, the best growth picture in a generation—we know our ideas are right and theirs are wrong. We know. You don't have to guess anymore.

And so I say, what's that got to do with the Governorship of New Jersey? Plenty. Let me tell you, folks, I was a Governor for 12 years—and on the hard days in Washington I think it was still the best job I ever had. [*Laughter*] And let me tell you exactly what

it has to do, based on 12 long, good years. Number one, our economic policies of getting this country out of debt won't work in States that get themselves in debt. You have to have fiscal responsibility in Washington and at the State capital in New Jersey. You have to do it together.

Number two, we have to be partners. We can't restore middle class values, middle class lifestyles, and a future for our children by providing sensible tax relief and a strong economy if you have to deal with the problems that you have here in New Jersey with the car insurance rates and the property tax. We have to work together to rebuild the lives of ordinary American families in New Jersey.

Number three—and these are very specific—education. We're doing everything we can to hook up all our classrooms and libraries to the Internet, to open the doors of college to all, to provide more choices in schools, to provide more excitement and innovation and reform, and most importantly, as Jim McGreevey said, to raise standards. But the work, the day-to-day work in education, and the money comes at the State and local level. Everything we are trying to do in Washington can quickly be undermined unless you have a passionate believer that every child can learn, is entitled to the world-class education that every child needs.

Child health—10 million children in this country and tens of thousands in New Jersey live in working families without health insurance. We passed a bill to provide health insurance to 5 million of those kids as part of the balanced budget. But the plans have to be devised by the State. I trust Jim McGreevey to work with us to insure the children of New Jersey.

Welfare reform—we have reduced the welfare rolls by over 3 million, but we have a lot of work still to do. They said, just cut people off. I said, make people who can work, work; but remember, everyone's most important job is being a good parent. Provide the child care, provide the support; then require people to work. Our plan is working. But it has to be implemented by the States. I trust Jim McGreevey to help us drive the welfare rolls down more, in ways that support being strong for work but good to the children of this State. And it's a big issue for you.

Finally, in the last few months, Hillary and I have had two conferences in Washington about young children, preschool children—one on the development of children's brains, in which we discovered that an enormous amount of the capacity all of us have as adults was developed in our first 4 years of life; in which we discovered that if a child has loving and supportive parents and a good child care environment, they'll get about 700,000 positive interactions in their first 4 years, but if a child lives in either a home or is in a child care center or both where the children are not being stimulated, they might get as few as 150,000 supportive interactions in the most important period of a child's life.

Then we had this child care conference in which we discovered that some families are spending up to 25 percent of their income on child care; that some of our best-educated child care workers are more poorly paid than some of our rudimentary workers in our society; and that we are simply not doing enough.

Now, I want to design a system in this country by the time I leave office where I can have confidence that people can succeed at home and at work, and no one has to sacrifice being a good parent to do their job. I want to see—I'm telling you, we have to balance the budget, we have to run a stronger economy. We cannot afford to do the whole job at the national level. It will have to be done in partnership, partnership with private companies, partnership with the States. I trust Jim McGreevey to care about the children of the working families of the state of New Jersey.

So that's about it, folks. [*Laughter*] I want you to understand this is not about me, or about my Republican congressional friends who are in here campaigning for the Governor. This is not about Washington or about what the pundits will say. Only one thing matters: Is it good for you and your children and the future of this State?

But I can tell you, based on 12 years as Governor, almost 5 years as President, and the things that I have seen work and my passionate commitment to the future of this

country, you can trust Jim McGreevey to fight for that future as Governor.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:10 p.m. in the gymnasium at Middlesex County Community College. In his remarks, he referred to State Assemblywoman Barbara Buono; State Senator Wayne Bryant; Tom Giblin, State Democratic chair; and Gov. Christine Todd Whitman of New Jersey.

Remarks at a Rally for Mayoral Candidate Ruth Messinger in New York City

November 2, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. Now, I'm a little hoarse, so you're going to have to bear with me. And I'll try to be heard in the back. I won't be funny as Al Franken—[*laughter*]—because I don't want to be driven from office. [*Laughter*] But I thank him for being here tonight and for always being there for me. Thank you, Al. I thank our friends, Peter Yarrow and Judy Collins, for performing at one of the—at this event. I thank all of you for being here.

Let me begin by saying from the bottom of my heart, I am profoundly grateful and will be to my last day on this Earth to the people of this State and especially the city of New York for the wonderful support you have given to me and Hillary, the Vice President, and our administration. Thank you. [*Applause*] Thank you very much.

I look out at this sea of people here tonight from so many different racial and ethnic and religious backgrounds, somehow bound together across all your differences by a common concern for the future of your children, and this is what distinguishes Democrats in this time: a common understanding that if we want all of our kids to do well, including our own, we have to go forward together.

And I want to tell you tonight why I'm here. I know why you're here, you have a vote in New York. [*Laughter*] You're entitled to know why I'm here. I'm here for three reasons.

Number one, in 1991, when I first started running for President, the borough president of Manhattan endorsed me. Now, that may seem like a smart decision in 1997—[*laughter*]—but let me remind you, in 1991, when Ruth Messinger endorsed me, most people in New York didn't know who I was. [*Laughter*] A lot of people in New York couldn't find my State on a map. [*Laughter*] Other people pointed out it was only about as populous as Brooklyn and what did I have any business running for President for? [*Laughter*]

And then, when I got into the race, there were a lot of people who said that I shouldn't be President, and others who said, well, even if I could be President I couldn't be elected, and she ought to leave me. And there were lots of times when it would have been more comfortable for somebody who was the borough president of Manhattan to be somewhere else. But through all the times, when I was going through my own particular New York marathon in 1992—[*laughter*]—she stuck by me, and I'm standing with her tonight, and I'm proud to do it.

Now, there is a second reason. The second reason I'm here is that I am very proud to be a Democrat. And I am proud to be a part of a party that has a broad tent and is inclusive and welcomes all kinds of people. We heard for years that if they ever gave us the range of any executive authority, we'd be soft on crime, foolish on welfare, we would wreck the economy, raise taxes, and mess up the foreign policy of the country.

Well, 5 years later, the country is stronger around the world, we've advanced the cause of peace and freedom, we have the best economy in a generation, 3 million fewer people on welfare, the environment is cleaner, the schools are better, and we're opening the doors of college to all Americans. I think they were wrong, the Democrats were right, and I'm proud to be here as a part of that.

I would also like to say—and in that connection, let me say I am especially pleased to see the people who contested the Democratic primary for mayor here. The fact that Ruth's former opponents are here says a lot about their character and their concern for the people of New York. And I thank them for being here.

Here's the third reason, and it's the most important, because the third reason relates to you. After all, this election is not about

me or any big Republican leader who may have been here. It only matters to those of you who live here, to your children and your children's children, and the future. So I was thinking to myself—and I had been thinking about this for weeks because I care a lot about Ruth and I knew when she got into the race it would be a hard race and I knew there were good reasons it would be a hard race—so I said to myself, if I were a citizen of New York, knowing what I know about the way the world works and what's going on in our country, why would I vote for her? What are the good reasons?

Well, let me begin by saying I think it's a good thing that crime has come down in New York, and I don't think any Democrat should criticize any legitimate effort that brought it down. After all, remember, the first aggressive community policing and the first drop in the New York City crime rate began when David Dinkins was mayor. Don't forget that.

Now—wait a minute—so, if in the last 4 years there's more community policing, more sophisticated deployment of law enforcement resources, if people aren't getting hassled on the street as much, there's not as much crime and less violence and people are less likely to get hurt, that is a good and noble thing. That is an American ideal. That doesn't belong to either party. And I am proud that our party in Washington, over the opposition of the Washington Republicans, came out for the Brady bill, for the assault weapons ban, for putting more police on the street, for doing things that would help to bring the crime rate down.

Now—and I believe with all my heart that there is a bipartisan, American consensus now that we ought to keep pushing more police officers on the street, working with communities, preventing crime from happening in the first place, catching people when they do something wrong as quickly as possible, making the streets safer. Now, having said that, every election ought to be about tomorrow. What about tomorrow?

There are three things I want you to think about. Number one, while the crime rate has gone down in this country and in New York City substantially in the last 5½ years, crime among people between the ages of 12 and 18 has not gone down so much; in some places not at all. The second fact about that is, most crime by juveniles is committed between 3 o'clock in the afternoon and 7 o'clock at night. Why? Because they're out of school, not at home, and mamma and daddy are still at work.

Now, it is my opinion, having been involved in law enforcement now for more than 20 years, that the most serious proposal put forward in any of the elections occurring in this election year likely to deter juvenile crime and lower the crime rate is Ruth Messinger's call to keep all the schools in New York open after school hours.

Second reason—I heard you amen-ing when Ruth was talking about the schools—if you really want a safe society, you must have a well-educated society. New York is blessed by having a phenomenally diverse population, people from over 100 different racial and ethnic groups in your school system. But they're all kids with minds given to them by God, and they can all learn. They can all learn. But they deserve good schools with high standards, high accountability, adequate investment, and, yes, we ought to do some more in Washington. And I'm going to do my best to help the cities alleviate the overcrowding problem, to repair these schools, and build new facilities. We've got to do that.

But I just got back from Chicago, where Hillary and I went because they opened up the town to her one day—it's my wife's hometown—to celebrate her 50th birthday. And let me tell you that not so many years ago, Chicago had, by common consent, the worst schools of any major city in America. They were shut down every year by a strike, whether there was an issue or not. And that's all people knew about them. In the last 4 years, the people of Chicago, led by a mayor who put education first, have begun to literally revolutionize their schools. They have mandatory summer school for children who don't perform. They hold kids back if they don't pass an exam to go on to high school. But they don't just punish kids, they give all children a chance to succeed. New York City should give every child a chance to succeed. Ruth Messinger cares about that.

The third thing I want to say is this. I am very proud of the fact that our economic policies have led to over 13 million new jobs, an unemployment rate below 5 percent, and the best economy in a generation. I'm proud of that. But it bothers me that there's still too many people in America who have not felt the economic recovery. I have done what I could to provide special tax incentives for people to invest in inner cities, to set up new banks for people to loan money to people who couldn't get money in any other way to start their own businesses, to do other things that would rebuild the economy of areas where the unemployment rate is too high.

But anybody who's ever worked in this field will tell you that the Federal Government cannot do this alone. You have to have State support. You have to have local support. You have to be able to work with the private sector. And you have to try new ideas. Believe me, no one has fully solved this problem. So I say to you, I believe if I were mayor of New York City, I would say my three priorities are: I'm going to get the unemployment rate down to the national level, I'm going to fix our schools, and I'm going to give these kids something to do after school to keep them out of trouble in the first place and keep the crime rate going down.

Now, this ought to be a positive experience for you and a positive election, and so I say to you——

[*At this point, there was a disturbance in the audience.*]

The President. Let me just say this. Wait, wait, wait. I believe in his right to free speech more than he believes in mine. So we let him talk a little bit. If you want to talk to me, go out there. Don't mess with the mayor's race. She doesn't deserve this.

Who do you believe——

[*At this point, there was another disturbance in the audience.*]

The President. Let me say something. While he's on his way out, let's talk about AIDS a minute. Let's talk about this. You all be quiet and listen to me. This AIDS issue is a serious issue. But you never get to the facts if you're just screaming. And I can't win a screaming match today. [*Laughter*]

You might be interested to know, if you think it's important, that we have dramatically increased spending on AIDS research, dramatically increased spending—while I was cutting other things and balancing the budget—dramatically increased spending on AIDS treatment; that the new drugs dramatically approved much faster under my administration than ever before have lengthened the life and the quality of life of people with AIDS. And in terms of research, we are spending today more than twice as much per person with AIDS—with a fatal case of AIDS—in research than we are women with breast cancer, and more than 8 times as much as men with prostate cancer. I think we have done a good job on this issue. I'm proud of it, and I think you should.

Now, secondly, since we're here about the mayor's race, who do you think is more likely to care more about the AIDS issue as mayor of New York?

Audience members. Ruth! Ruth! Ruth!

The President. Now you've got a day and a half. You've got a day and a half. I want to ask you to do something. I was glad to come up here tonight. I don't have a vote. You have a vote. I won't be here on Tuesday to drag people to the polls, but you can. So think about the next day and a half and say, "You know, I'm thinking about the future of New York. I'm worried about the kids, and I want them off the streets and doing something positive after school. I'm worried about our schools and I want them to be the best in the country. And I know we've got to try something new and innovative if we're going to cut the unemployment rate from 10 percent to 5 percent. And Ruth Messinger has a plan to deal with all three. I believe I'll help her."

Go out and do that, and have a good Tuesday. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:25 p.m. in Royal Ballroom B at the Sheraton New York Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to comedian Al Franken, and musicians Peter Yarrow and Judy Collins.

Proclamation 7047—National American Indian Heritage Month, 1997

November 1, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

American Indians and Alaska Natives have played a vital role in the life of our country, and their many contributions have enhanced the freedom, prosperity, and greatness of America today. In celebrating National American Indian Heritage Month, we reaffirm our country's commitment to remember those contributions and to honor the unique heritage of our continent's first inhabitants.

This special observance also reflects our continuing commitment to American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments as an integral part of the social, political, and economic fabric of the United States. The framers of our Constitution incorporated Indian nations into the political and legal framework of this country, forever joining the destiny of the tribal nations with that of the American people. By this action, our founders charged themselves and future generations with the moral obligation to guard the rights and fundamental liberties of our country's tribal peoples as zealously as we protect the rights of all Americans.

As we enter the next millennium, we have an exciting opportunity to open a new era of understanding, cooperation, and respect among all of America's people. We must work together to tear down the walls of separation and mistrust and build a strong foundation for the future. To accomplish this, we must strengthen tribal governments, improve the quality of education for American Indian and Alaska Native youth, build stable, diversified economies in tribal communities, create high-wage jobs, and ensure that all our citizens have the skills, education, and opportunities they need to reach their full potential.

The government-to-government relationship between the tribes and the United States embodies the fundamental American belief that people of widely varied and diverse cultural backgrounds can join together to build a great country. Such greatness can be sustained, however, only so long as we honor the ideals and principles upon which America is founded and abide by our commitments to all our people. In recognition of America's moral and legal obligations to American Indians and Alaska Natives, and in light of the special trust relationship between tribal governments and the Government of the United States, we celebrate National American Indian Heritage Month.

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 November 1997 as National American Indian Heritage Month. I urge all Americans, as well as their elected representatives at the Federal, State, local, and tribal levels, to observe this month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this first day of November, 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., November 4, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 3, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on November 5.

Remarks at a Rally for Gubernatorial Candidate Donald S. Beyer, Jr., in Alexandria, Virginia

November 3, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. This looks like a crowd of winners to me. Ladies and gentlemen, I am so honored to be here with Senator Robb and Mrs. Robb and Congressman Moran, Congressman Scott, your mayor, your Democratic State chair, with Bill Dolan and Susan Payne. And let me say, I thought Yvonne gave a great speech, didn't you? [*Applause*] And I am very, very proud to be here—very proud—

to be here with Don Beyer and his fine family.

Now, let me say to you, I think the last two speeches were about as good as it gets. [*Laughter*] And I may have nothing to add, but let me speak to you as someone who will never be a candidate for public office again——

Audience members. Awwww——

The President. ——unless you let me run for the school board down here someday. [*Laughter*] But I was a Governor for 12 years, and I've been your President for 5 years, and I've seen most of the major political battles of the last 20 years unfold. Many times they were Democrats against Republicans in traditional ways, liberals against conservatives. That is not what this is. This is nothing more or less than what Don Beyer said: This is a vote for an easy hit today or doing the right thing for tomorrow.

And I was a Governor for 12 years—nobody likes to fool with licensing their cars, with taxing their cars; it is a pain. This is a brilliant ploy because there is hardly anything in life more irritating. [*Laughter*] So let us give the opposition credit; they have found an irritant that we would all like removed. The question is, at what price? At what consequence? And what happens after it's done?

This really is a question about whether Virginians will be selfish in the moment or selfless for their children and their future, not because there is anything inherently wrong with getting rid of a pain in the neck, wherever it is—[*laughter*]—but because as we grow older and we assume responsibilities, we all do things in life because we can't think of a better way to do something even more important. And I say to you, that's what's at issue here.

This reminds me back in 1993, when Senator Robb bravely stood by me, and we adopted that tough economic program. And the easy thing to do was to oppose it. And our Republican friends said, ''The President's economic program is going to raise your income taxes.'' It didn't, but they convinced a lot of people it did—unless you were in the same income group that Don Beyer and I are in. [*Laughter*] Ninety-nine percent of the people didn't have their income taxes raised. And they said it would bring a recession. Well, 5 years later, we have reduced the deficit by more than 90 percent before the balanced budget law kicks in, because we did the right thing. And we have 13 million new jobs and the lowest unemployment rate in a generation and the lowest inflation rate in over 30 years. But in 1994, some good Members of Congress lost their seats because they did the right thing for the long-term and the people hadn't felt it yet.

I was in New Jersey yesterday; you heard Don Beyer talking about that. Well, the Governor said, ''I'll cut income taxes by 30 percent,'' and it sounded so good. And she did. But what she didn't say was, they'd have to run the State into huge debt to do it and, oh, by the way, local governments had the power to raise the property tax by every dollar that they cut the income tax, which was more regressive, more burdensome, and wound up being a bigger pain in the neck. And so, a race which we shouldn't even be having up there because the economy is good, with an incumbent Governor, turns out to be a real horse race, because people figured out 4 years later, ''I went for the quick hit, and maybe I got sold a bill of goods.''

Now, you don't have 4 years, you just have 24 hours. But it's amazing how common sense can strike people in the flash of an eye. This is a great State. This is the State of our Founding Fathers. You have a tradition to uphold. You have a meaning that is special not only to you but to the rest of America. How could you knowingly damage the education of our children and the future of your State for something that will be immensely satisfying for about 30 seconds, maybe an hour, maybe a week at most, and then you'll be paying for it for the next 4 years?

That is the issue. You have to get people to think not about the immediate frustration being relieved or the comfort of the moment but about what they really believe in.

The other thing I want to say is, I know that a lot of people vote who don't have children in school. But if we hadn't learned anything in the last 2 years in America, surely we have learned they are all our children. I think it is amazing that all these former Republican Governors have come out against this plan. I also think it is amazing that it's

the Democrat in this race, not the Republican, who is standing up for higher standards and accountability and moving our State—your schools forward, not just with more investment in education but with higher quality of education. I am proud of the fact that it is the Democratic Party in Virginia and in Washington, DC, standing for high standards, accountability, and excellence, as well as investment in education.

So I say to you, this is really a race where you have to choose the moment over the lifetime—or today or tomorrow; or a mature, full, whole vision of the future, or what gratifies you personally but very briefly. This is going to be like one of those meals you order and you're hungry 30 minutes later—[*laughter*]—or it's going to be like something you do and afterward you are so proud of yourself.

Think how this State will feel on Wednesday morning when Don Beyer is Governor. Think how you'll feel. Think how you felt every time in your life when you did something you knew wasn't quite so, wasn't quite right, selfishly gratifying, and you felt lousy the next day. And think how you felt every time in your life you were tempted to do something that was selfish and you didn't do it, and the next day you felt wonderful. You felt more alive. You felt more human. You said, ''This is what I'm here on this Earth for.'' Every time you gave up something so you could do something else for your children; every time you gave up something so you could give a little more to your favorite charity; every time you didn't sit home and watch a ball game and instead went out and helped the Scouts or some other community group—think how good you felt. That's how this State is going to feel if you vote for Don Beyer, because you'll know you did it for the future, for your children, for your noblest instincts. That's why you will do it.

Now, I've seen all these polls. Let me tell you something I know about them. I've been on both sides of them—[*laughter*]—always more fun to be ahead than behind. The remarkable thing about these surveys is they all agree on one thing: There is still an enormous undecided vote.

Now, that means two things. Number one, it means if everybody who is willing to make the mature, long-term, noble choice here on this issue shows up to vote, that counts about 1½ times as much as it would in a race where there's not a big undecided vote. So before you go pat yourselves on the back too much for being here, just remember, if you and everybody else you know who is for Don Beyer don't show up, then your good intentions don't amount to a hill of beans. So you have to be there.

The second thing is, with all these undecided votes, that's telling you something. That's telling you that the electorate of Virginia is just like all of us are whenever we're confronted with this kind of choice: Yes, I want the pie after the meal. [*Laughter*] No, I want to feel good tomorrow. [*Laughter*] I think I'll spend this money. No, I had better put it in my child's college savings account.

That's what's going on; that's what this undecided vote's about. There's a scale in the mind and psyche of the voters, and the scale can still be shifted. So you need to think about it. You've got 24 hours and then all day when the polls are open tomorrow. And if the polls are right and there are all these undecided votes, you could practically just start walking up and down the street here today talking to people and find a bunch of them. And so I want you to do it.

I'm telling you, once in a great while an election like this comes along where a murmur starts in the people. And it spreads like wildfire, and people really get caught up in it—and it doesn't happen till the last minute. That is what is happening now. You have a chance to win this election if you go—if everybody you know who is for Don and L.F. and Bill goes, and if you go out there and say, ''I am not going to treat this election like it's over. There are too many undecided people. There must be 10 or 20 people I can call. I can go out into the mall and walk up to strangers and ask them to think about this.''

Remember, this is about how the State is going to feel the next day. It's about where the State is going to be 4 years from now. And it's about where your children are going to be in the 21st century. Do the right thing, and you'll love it.

God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:43 p.m. at Market Square. In his remarks, he referred to Lynda Robb, wife of Senator Charles S. Robb; Mayor Kerry J. Donley of Alexandria; Sue Wrenn, State Democratic chair; William D. Dolan III, State attorney general candidate; Susan Payne, wife of L.F. Payne, Jr., candidate for Lieutenant Governor; and Yvonne Jukes, president, Fairfax Education Association.

Remarks on the 10th Anniversary of National Public Radio's "Performance Today"

November 3, 1997

Thank you very much, Martin. Ladies and gentlemen, as you can hear I'm still a little hoarse, but I'm delighted that you're here, and I'm delighted to be here. And I thank you for mentioning the biggest thrill I've had lately, the opportunity to conduct the National Symphony. Actually, I have been used to dealing with the Congress for so long now, I was surprised that they followed my lead. [*Laughter*] But we got through it just fine.

Welcome. The first concert held in this magnificent house was on New Year's Day, 1801, when President John Adams invited the Marine Band to play. In nearly 200 years, there have been a lot of other concerts here. More than a century ago, President Chester Arthur inaugurated the first concert right here in the East Room. And 20 years later, Theodore Roosevelt made showcasing the world's finest musicians in this room a standing tradition. Pablo Casals was among the first artists Theodore Roosevelt invited to perform, in 1904.

It was more than 50 years later that the concert to which Martin referred at the outset of the performance tonight occurred, when Casals came back for another East Room performance when President and Mrs. Kennedy lived here. This was made even more momentous, of course, by the fact that his performance was enjoyed not simply by Cabinet members and diplomats gathered in the room but by Americans of all walks of life who could tune in on their radio stations and hear the concert.

Hillary and I are very proud that we're able to continue this fine tradition tonight to have the finest of music, from classical to jazz to opera to gospel, with all Americans. We're honored to celebrate with you the 10th anniversary of "Performance Today." It has been an extraordinary effort by National Public Radio. In just 10 years "Performance Today" has become an important part of the lives of so many of our fellow Americans—1.5 million Americans in more than 200 communities listen to "Performance Today" every single week, and I know its audience will surely grow. If every American could hear what we heard tonight, there would be a fire sale on radios throughout America and everyone would want 10 or 20 more.

We want to do what we can to continue to support the young musicians we've heard tonight—and I consider them all young. [*Laughter*] Even 50 is young to me. [*Laughter*]

As part of our White House Millennium Initiative, we'll host a series of cultural showcases, shining a spotlight on the next generation's most promising musicians, celebrating their great American creativity. Who knows what great musicians and composers will enliven our concert halls and airwaves in the 21st century—the next Marsalis or Graves or Roberts or Galway or Perahia or Ngwenyama? And thank you, young lady, by the way, for sticking up for the National Endowment for the Arts, as well. We appreciate you very much.

All of these great performers who have been here tonight have made us feel a little more alive, a little more human, and a little more noble. We thank them. And perhaps the best way we can honor their gift to us tonight is by resolving to celebrate the gifts of the future, both in the White House and on "Performance Today," for many, many years to come.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:45 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Martin Goldsmith, host of NPR's "Performance Today" program; and musician Nokuthula Ngwenyama.

Proclamation 7048—National Adoption Month, 1997

November 3, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Most American children are blessed with loving, stable families. But, tragically, in our country today there are too many children whose parents are unwilling or unable to care for them. While foster care offers these children a safe and nurturing temporary haven in their time of greatest need, as many as 100,000 foster care kids will need permanent homes in the next few years. Many of these children have special needs and require the security and stability of an adoptive family to develop their full potential. Adoption allows these and other children to have the permanent homes they deserve, and it enables many dedicated adults to experience the joys and rewards of parenting.

My Administration is working hard to find ways to help encourage adoption. On December 14, 1996, I issued a Memorandum to the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, the Treasury, Labor, and Commerce and to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, directing them to promote efforts to both increase the number of children who are adopted or permanently placed each year and to move children more rapidly from foster care to permanent homes. I also urged them to increase public awareness about the children waiting for permanent families and to encourage all Americans to consider the rewards of adoption.

I challenged the members of my Administration to work with States, communities, and civic leaders to create a plan for doubling the number of adoptions and permanent placements for children to 54,000 by the year 2002. And on February 14, 1997, the *Adoption 2002* report, outlining changes in policies and practices necessary to reach this goal, was released. Since then, we have been actively implementing the recommendations included in the report, and States are reviewing data and submitting numerical targets for adoption and guardianships to be completed by the year 2002. The Office of Personnel Management has published a guide for Federal workers interested in adopting, and the Department of Health and Human Services is preparing to make the first annual Adoption 2002 Excellence awards later this year. Finally, the Congress is considering historic legislation that would provide the resources and statutory authority for financial incentives, technical assistance, and improved judicial decision-making for children in foster care.

As a Nation, we have before us an opportunity to make a real difference in the lives of our most vulnerable children. We must continue to promote public awareness of the need for adoptive families and to help families make the choice to provide loving, permanent homes for the many children who otherwise must continue to wait. We must also strengthen our support of those families who do choose to adopt. As we observe National Adoption Month, we reaffirm our commitment to adoption as a new beginning for thousands of children, and we celebrate the many American families who have embraced these children by accepting the rewards and responsibilities of adoption.

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 November 1997 as National Adoption Month. I urge all Americans to observe this month with appropriate programs and activities to honor adoptive families and to participate in efforts to find permanent homes for waiting children.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this third day of November, 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., November 5, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 4, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on November 6.

Executive Order 13067—Blocking Sudanese Government Property and Prohibiting Transactions With Sudan

November 3, 1997

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code;

I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, find that the policies and actions of the Government of Sudan, including continued support for international terrorism; ongoing efforts to destabilize neighboring governments; and the prevalence of human rights violations, including slavery and the denial of religious freedom, constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, and hereby declare a national emergency to deal with that threat. I hereby order:

Section 1. Except to the extent provided in section 203(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)) and in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued pursuant to this order, all property and interests in property of the Government of Sudan that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches, are blocked.

Sec. 2. The following are prohibited, except to the extent provided in section 203(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)) and in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued pursuant to this order:

(a) the importation into the United States of any goods or services of Sudanese origin, other than information or informational materials;

(b) the exportation or reexportation, directly or indirectly, to Sudan of any goods, technology (including technical data, software, or other information), or services from the United States or by a United States person, wherever located, or requiring the issuance of a license by a Federal agency, except for donations of articles intended to relieve human suffering, such as food, clothing, and medicine;

(c) the facilitation by a United States person, including but not limited to brokering activities, of the exportation or reexportation of goods, technology, or services from Sudan to any destination, or to Sudan from any location;

(d) the performance by any United States person of any contract, including a financing contract, in support of an industrial, commercial, public utility, or governmental project in Sudan;

(e) the grant or extension of credits or loans by any United States person to the Government of Sudan;

(f) any transaction by a United States person relating to transportation of cargo to or from Sudan; the provision of transportation of cargo to or from the United States by any Sudanese person or any vessel or aircraft of Sudanese registration; or the sale in the United States by any person holding authority under subtitle 7 of title 49, United States Code, of any transportation of cargo by air that includes any stop in Sudan; and

(g) any transaction by any United States person or within the United States that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in this order.

Sec. 3. Nothing in this order shall prohibit:

(a) transactions for the conduct of the official business of the Federal Government or the United Nations by employees thereof; or

(b) transactions in Sudan for journalistic activity by persons regularly employed in such capacity by a news-gathering organization.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this order:

(a) the term ''person'' means an individual or entity;

(b) the term ''entity'' means a partnership, association, trust, joint venture, corporation, or other organization;

(c) the term ''United States person'' means any United States citizen, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States (including foreign branches), or any person in the United States; and

(d) the term "Government of Sudan" includes the Government of Sudan, its agencies, instrumentalities and controlled entities, and the Central Bank of Sudan.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and, as appropriate, other agencies, is hereby authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to me by IEEPA, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this order. The Secretary of the Treasury may redelegate any of these functions to other officers and agencies of the United States Government. All agencies of the United States Government are hereby directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of this order.

Sec. 6. Nothing contained in this order shall create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

Sec. 7. (a) This order shall take effect at 12:01 a.m. eastern standard time on November 4, 1997, except that trade transactions under contracts in force as of the effective date of this order may be performed pursuant to their terms through 12:01 a.m. eastern standard time on December 4, 1997, and letters of credit and other financing agreements for such underlying trade transactions may be performed pursuant to their terms.

(b) This order shall be transmitted to the Congress and published in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

The White House,

November 3, 1997.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:22 a.m., November 4, 1997]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 4, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on November 5.

Message to the Congress on Sudan

November 3, 1997

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b), I hereby report to the Congress that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare that the policies of the Government of Sudan constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States and to declare a national emergency to deal with the threat.

Pursuant to this legal authority, I have blocked Sudanese governmental assets in the United States. I have also prohibited certain transactions, including the following: (1) the importation into the United States of any goods or services of Sudanese origin, other than information or informational materials; (2) the exportation or reexportation to Sudan of any nonexempt goods, technology, or services from the United States; (3) the facilitation by any United States person of the exportation or reexportation of goods, technology, or services from Sudan to any destination, or to Sudan from any destination; (4) the performance by any United States person of any contract, including a financing contract, in support of an industrial, commercial, public utility, or governmental project in Sudan; (5) the grant or extension of credits or loans by any United States person to the Government of Sudan; and (6) any transaction by any United States person relating to transportation of cargo to, from, or through Sudan, or by Sudanese vessel or aircraft.

We intend to license only those activities that serve U.S. interests. Transactions necessary to conduct the official business of the United States Government and the United Nations are exempted. This order and subsequent licenses will allow humanitarian, diplomatic, and journalistic activities to continue. Other activities may be considered for licensing on a case-by-case basis based on their merits. We will continue to permit regulated transfers of fees and stipends from the Government of Sudan to Sudanese students in the United States. Among the other activities

we may consider licensing are those permitting American citizens resident in Sudan to make payments for their routine living expenses, including taxes and utilities; the importation of certain products unavailable from other sources, such as gum arabic; and products to ensure civilian aircraft safety.

I have decided to impose comprehensive sanctions in response to the Sudanese government's continued provision of sanctuary and support for terrorist groups, its sponsorship of regional insurgencies that threaten neighboring governments friendly to the United States, its continued prosecution of a devastating civil war, and its abysmal human rights record that includes the denial of religious freedom and inadequate steps to eradicate slavery in the country.

The behavior of the Sudanese government directly threatens stability in the region and poses a direct threat to the people and interests of the United States. Only a fundamental change in Sudan's policies will enhance the peace and security of people in the United States, Sudan, and around the world. My Administration will continue to work with the Congress to develop the most effective policies in this regard.

The above-described measures, many of which reflect congressional concerns, will immediately demonstrate to the Sudanese government the seriousness of our concern with the situation in that country. It is particularly important to increase pressure on Sudan to engage seriously during the current round of negotiations taking place now in Nairobi. The sanctions will also deprive the Sudanese government of the material and financial benefits of conducting trade and financial transactions with the United States.

The prohibitions set forth in this order shall be effective as of 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, November 4, 1997, and shall be transmitted to the Congress and published in the *Federal Register*. The Executive order provides 30 days in which to complete trade transactions with Sudan covered by contracts that predate the order and the performance of preexisting financing agreements for those trade initiatives.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 3, 1997.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 4.

Remarks on Senate Action on Fast-Track Trade Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

November 4, 1997

The President. Good afternoon. I just wanted to test our stamina in the cold this afternoon. [*Laughter*]

I am very pleased that the Senate has voted with a very strong bipartisan majority to clear the key procedural hurdle to pass trade negotiating authority to expand American exports, create American jobs, and strengthen American leadership in the world.

Let me begin by thanking Senator Lott and Senator Daschle for their strong leadership and for the powerful arguments they made on behalf of fast track and our national interests. Today's vote shows that a bipartisan coalition for American leadership which has sustained us throughout this century can help us meet the challenges of the next century.

The case for extending fast track is plain. Our economy is the strongest in a generation, growing over 4 percent the last year with $125 billion of that coming from exports. The only way to continue to increase incomes and create jobs is to tear down more foreign barriers to American products and services. Foreign nations already enjoy open access to our markets. This legislation will give us the authority to increase access to foreign markets, especially in the fastest growing regions of the world.

The world economy is clearly on a fast track. If we don't seize these opportunities, our competitors surely will. An "America last" strategy is unacceptable. We have a unique obligation to lead. If we fail to lead on trade, our influence will suffer in other

areas important to our security, undermining the trend toward free markets and democracy in other nations, weakening especially our relationships in Latin America, damaging cooperation on issues from drug trafficking to immigration.

Now, in addition to this, of course, we should seek to raise labor and environmental standards in developing countries and to stop abuses like child labor. But this legislation will give us more leverage in pressing those goals. We should seek to do much more in helping American workers and their families when their jobs are lost because of trade or because of technological change, and I will have more to say about that tomorrow. But we cannot raise our own living standards or improve labor and environmental conditions in other parts of the world by withdrawing. What we have to do is to continue to reach out to open more opportunities for Americans and to work with other countries to improve standards there.

In the coming days, I look forward to working with Speaker Gingrich and Representative Fazio. And I look forward to the same sort of determined congressional leadership that has borne fruit today. I call upon all the Members of the House, without regard to party, to make the choice they know is the right one for America when they vote on Friday.

Thank you.

Iraq

Q. What do you plan to do about Iraq?

Q. Mr. President, the Iraqis once again—Saddam Hussein, in particular, seems to be raising questions about your willingness, your administration's willingness, to break ranks with other U.N. Security Council members and possibly use military force in the face of this latest showdown with Iraq. What do you say to Saddam Hussein at this point?

The President. Saddam Hussein should comply with the United Nations resolutions and he should allow us to resume the inspections. If he has nothing to hide, if he's not trying to develop weapons of mass destruction, then he shouldn't care whether Americans or anyone else are on the inspection team. This may be just another dodge. The resolution is clear, the inspection regime is unambiguous, and we have confidence in it, and that's why we participate in it. And that's what he ought to do.

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*]——

Q. ——[*inaudible*]—his threat to target American flights over Iraq what your response would be?

The President. That would be a big mistake. But the U–2 flights—let me say, the U–2 flights, which you reported on extensively in the last couple of days, are flights in which we are involved, but they are carried out under the authority of the United Nations for a United Nations purpose. And we will continue to consult with our allies on that.

But let me say again—the world has an interest, stated in the United Nations Security resolution, in preventing Iraq from developing weapons of mass destruction. That's what this is all about. There is an inspection regime which has clearly been approved by the United Nations. And Saddam Hussein must restore respect and opportunity for that inspection regime. That's all this is about. And we have to be very firm about it.

Q. Mr. President, What do you plan to do——

Q. Mr. President, do you believe at this hour that the United States is headed toward a military confrontation with Iraq, or is this diplomatic mission likely to resolve things?

The President. I believe, at this moment, we should do everything we can to resolve this diplomatically, and we should reserve judgment. This ought to be resolved diplomatically. There is a procedure there, and the Iraqis should let it be carried out by the United Nations.

There was one other question.

Q. How long will you wait, Mr. President?

Nomination of Bill Lann Lee

Q. Mr. President, what do you plan to do to save Bill Lann Lee's nomination, and is there anything you can do to overcome Senator Hatch's opposition?

The President. Well, I'm disappointed in Senator Hatch's statement because I think everybody who knows Bill Lee believes he is superbly qualified to be head of the Civil Rights Division. The Civil Rights Division enforces the laws of the United States against

discrimination, and we need a strong and nationally recognized leader in that position.

You know, in his hearing, no one could say anything bad about this man. I mean, here he is, the son of Chinese immigrants that's worked his heart out all of his life. He's devoted his entire life to fighting for equal opportunity and against discrimination. He is superbly qualified. And that's what I want to say—how can anybody in good conscience vote against him if they believe that our civil rights laws ought to be enforced? That is a question that we will be pressing to every Senator without regard to party.

I had thought there was a bipartisan consensus in the United States for enforcing the civil rights laws of America. I still believe there is in the country, and I think there ought to be in the Senate.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:13 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Saddam Hussein of Iraq.

Statement on Fast-Track Trade Legislation

November 4, 1997

This week Congress has the opportunity to renew decades of partnership between the Congress and the President in building America's economic future and security through trade.

That partnership has been a key component of this Nation's successful economic strategy, which has given America its strongest economy in a generation and helped build this country into the world's greatest trading nation. By working together for over 60 years, Congress and the President have provided a foundation for prosperity at home while bolstering democracy, security, and living standards around the world.

Our predecessors learned the bitter lessons of protectionism firsthand during the Great Depression and wisely set the world on a path toward mutual prosperity. Today, with our economy and our workers, farmers, and firms the envy of the world, America can lead from strength. In a world where economic activity in one corner of the globe can affect economic activity in every other, America's leadership in international trade is more vital than ever.

Over the past 5 years, American exports have helped power and sustain a U.S. economy of unparalleled productivity, strength, and vitality. From year to year, we have added hundreds of thousands of high-wage, high-productivity jobs in our dynamic export industries.

Our challenge today, and for our children, is to sustain that growth and our standard of living well into the next century, while promoting worker rights and environmental protection at home and abroad. To secure our economic future, we must take advantage of quickly expanding market opportunities around the globe that are available for America's workers and firms—if we seize them. Some 96 percent of the world's consumers live outside our borders.

Here at home, we have the world's most open and competitive marketplace. Americans thrive on fair competition, as the sustained growth in our economy has shown. But in some foreign countries, particularly in the new, emerging marketplaces around the world, American products and services are not given a chance to compete. Now is the time for us to unlock those markets and make them as open to fair competition as our own.

Legislation is pending before the Congress this week that will allow us to do that, while addressing important labor and environmental concerns. It makes Congress a vital partner in shaping our trade strategies and strengthens the hand of our negotiators. It tells our trading partners that America is united at the negotiating table in securing the best possible market opportunities for our firms, farmers, and workers.

American leadership has helped prompt tremendous progress towards democracy, stability, and economic security in our hemisphere and around the world. Our sustained efforts to bring about fair and open trade worldwide have been a major reason for our success.

I am committed to pursuing not only more open markets for our companies and working people but more open societies that encourage respect for core labor standards and for the environment. To accomplish those goals,

to build on our strength, and to sustain American leadership over the years to come, Congress must join me in a partnership for the future.

Remarks at a Dinner for Senator John F. Kerry

November 4, 1997

Thank you very much, John, Teresa, ladies and gentlemen. First of all, I would very much like to thank Senator Kerry for explaining the commitments he made in the last election, because we were all wondering why we were here tonight. [*Laughter*] And now we know we've come to help Reverend Kerry keep his vow of poverty. [*Laughter*]

Let me say on a only slightly more serious note, I liked a lot of things about the campaign of 1996. I liked the fact that we were able to go out and finally say that there were two different visions of this country. The American people voted for one of them in 1994; they voted for another one in 1992. They fought us on everything we tried to do with the economy, with crime, with welfare, with the environment. The results were in, and the American people made a judgment.

And John Kerry in many ways had to run the most difficult of all races for an incumbent, because he had to run against a sitting Governor who was immensely popular and was not sort of a cardboard cutout of the contract on America. And I was absolutely determined that if I could do anything to help him get reelected, I would do it. And I loved every minute of every day I ever spent in Massachusetts, and I was tickled that he won.

And I might say, in the campaign that he had to put together to win, with the grassroots support and the intensity, it was—Massachusetts became the only State in the country where every single Republican running for Federal office was removed. And it was a great, great effort. And it is not because—contrary to what a lot people think—the State is a doctrinaire liberal State; that's just not true. Those of you who live there know that. [*Laughter*]

So, I'm glad to be here. I'm also glad to be here because I do consider that John and Teresa are sort of soulmates of mine and Hillary's and our whole crew. They believe in the nobility of public service, and they believe in the imperatives of change.

You know, when I came here back in '93, one of the reasons I ran for President is that I really thought our country was getting in deeper and deeper and deeper trouble and drifting more and dividing more because Washington continued to be dominated by the same old stale debates and name-calling and categorizing that didn't bear much relationship to the real world in which I lived.

You know, on the budget, are you going to cut taxes and explode the deficit, or spend more money and just run it up a little less? On crime, were you tough or soft? That's the dumbest thing I ever heard. I never met anybody who was for crime. I'm still looking for the first person to come and say, you know, "My policy is, vote for me and I'll bring you more crime." [*Laughter*] We should either treat everyone on welfare as if they're pikers who are milking the system, or just give them more money for the same system—all these things that you heard in these debates and it was—it was so jangling. And I realize a lot of it—now I know a lot of it is the way it is presented to the people through the interlocutors. But what we tried to do was to change the way people thought.

And I agree with John—a lot of—I'm not sure that it's all that clear to the American people that that's been done, but it is true. I said, you know, on the economy, why don't we cut the deficit and balance the budget and find a way to spend more money on education and research and technology? If we had the right priorities and right discipline, we could do that. And everybody said I was crazy, but 4 years later—we started with a $290 billion deficit, we have one that's $22 billion now, and we're spending more money on education. We just opened the doors of college to all Americans that are willing to work for it in this last balanced budget, thanks in no small measure to John Kerry's support and the fact that he stepped up to the plate in 1993 and helped us when everybody in the other party said I was bringing a recession to America.

On welfare, we said able-bodied people should be required to work, but don't take

away the guarantee of health care and nutrition from those children, and give child care to the parents, because the most important job any of us ever have is taking care of our children.

On education, we said we want to spend more money, but we want to raise standards, too. On crime, we said, yes, be tough, but how about being smart for a change. Put more police on the streets, and take the assault weapons off the street. If somebody's got a criminal or a mental health history, don't let them buy a gun. That may seem common sense to you, but the leaders of the other party and almost all their members opposed us on every single one of those things.

And we were just determined to break new ground. John understood it from the beginning. He knew that we had to break new ground not only to make the Democratic Party a majority party but, far more important, to bring the country together and to move it into a new century. And I'm proud to be here for that reason.

Today he was one of a majority of our caucus voting to invoke cloture on the fast-track legislation, which I think is a very good thing for America. It will give me a change not only to break down more barriers to our goods and services but also will give me more leverage to do what those who oppose us in our party say they want, which is to lift the labor and environmental standards that other countries observe, as well. So I feel comfortable here because I think we're engaged in an important enterprise.

I also want to say a special word about the campaign finance reform issue because John's worked very hard on that. He didn't take any PAC money running for Senator. I didn't take any PAC money when I ran for President. And I started off being the next-to-least well-known person in the field in New Hampshire.

Now, some say, well, is there any difference between the two parties because the Democrats raised so-called soft money? All I know is what John just said: All of our Senators, 100 percent of them, said bring the bill up, we'll vote for it.

But I think it's also important that you understand what's driving campaign finance reform. I do not believe that campaigns are too costly and require contributions that are too large because people like you are running up to us throwing big checks at us to try to get major influence. I think what happens is people like you worry that people like us are going to get beat if we don't have enough money to buy increasingly expensive advertising. In other words, this is not a supply-driven problem. This is a demand-driven problem. And some of the people that excoriate us the most over this campaign finance problem—I haven't noticed any of them calling me and offering to give all the people who observe stricter limits free or reduced air time. That is the problem. So we have to find a way solve it. It's more likely that we'll solve it because John Kerry is in the Senate. And it's important because the faith of ordinary citizens need to be restored in the day-to-day processes of our institutions—all of them.

You know, when we denigrate other people in terms of their motives and what they're doing to institutions, when we attack people personally, when we pretend that people are somehow ethically inferior to ourselves—when we do that, any of us, whether we're in public life or the press or whatever—we may gain a short-term advantage, but in the end what we do is we increase public disillusionment with all institutions. And that's what all the surveys show is going on.

I had a fascinating conversation with Senator Dole not long after the election. He came by the White House and we sat and talked. And I said, ''You know, Bob, you've been here in this town a lot longer than I have.'' He said, ''Yeah, that's what I tried to convince the voters of.'' [*Laughter*] And we were having a great talk. And I said, ''Now, tell me the truth. Is politics in Washington more honest or less honest today than it was 30 years ago?'' He said, ''My Lord, it's not even close.'' He said, ''It's far more honest today than it's ever been. There's far less corruption, far less impropriety.'' He said, ''It's by far the best it's ever been.''

Why don't the American people think that? And insofar as any of us ever contribute to their not thinking that, we ought to reconsider our positions. We need to fix the campaign finance system because it's over 20 years old; it's no longer consistent with the

present realities of campaigning. But many of the very people who say, ''All those politicians, they're all raising too much money,'' a lot of those people vote for the people who have the most effective negative television ads on, or just the most television ads on.

So we have to say this is an American responsibility. We have to work through it. And we need to find a commonsense solution to this, not a name-calling solution. But we'll do it. We always figure out how to do these things. It's more likely that we'll do it because John Kerry was reelected to the Senate.

Let me just make one general point. If you look at the fight we had over the Contract With America, if you look at what we tried to do with the economy, with the environment, with crime, with welfare, all these issues, if you look at the arguments we have over affirmative action or over whether we should open positions of public service to gays and lesbians, or any of these issues, you see a contrasting view of how we should define our American community. And in a funny way, that may be the most important issue of all.

My three little watch words are: opportunity, responsibility, community. Everybody ought to have an opportunity, everybody ought to be responsible, and everybody who is responsible should be part of our community. And if we can reach across all the lines that divide us to make one America, then everything else will probably come out all right. That's what I believe.

But we are having a debate today that you could see in the '92 election, in the '94 election, in the '96 election, that I predict will play itself out for another decade or so, about how we're going to define America in the 21st century: What will it mean to be an American? How will we define our country? And it's a debate we periodically have.

The first time we had it, ironically, it was the predecessors of the Republican Party, the Federalists, who gave the right answer, when John Marshall became the Chief Justice of the United States and basically said there are times when there must be one Nation, one law guaranteeing the constitutional rights of the American people, the minority as well as the majority.

Eighteen sixty, Abraham Lincoln redefined the Nation, said, ''If I have to give my life, I'll do that to keep the country together and to recognize the rights of people previously oppressed.''

In the Progressive Era, Theodore Roosevelt, coming out against abuses of child labor, the preservation of our natural resources, using the power of the Nation to bring us together and to look to the future and to put our children first, redefined again the importance of our conscious working together as a Nation, and the Government as an instrument of citizens coming together.

Then a funny thing happened. The mantle of carrying the Nation on shifted from the Republican Party to the Democratic Party, and Woodrow Wilson took it up. And then it was reinvigorated under Franklin Roosevelt in the Depression and World War II and then under Harry Truman. And then after the war, there were, frankly, progressives in both parties who shared a consensus that maybe the cold war helped them to hold together. After all, it was a Democratic Congress and President Nixon that produced the EPA and the first Clean Air Act.

Then in the last two decades, you have seen again a splitting apart of the consensus of what it means to be an American. We, as Democrats, believe that individual rights are important. We believe our individual values are important. We believe what happens to all children affects our children. We believe we don't have a child to waste. We're proud of our heritage, but we think we owe everybody else's as much respect. And we believe that our Government should not be a pain in the neck, it shouldn't be any bigger than necessary, but it ought to be strong enough to give people the tools to make the most of their own lives and to build strong families and strong communities.

Increasingly, the other party has said that Government is the problem, and that we're bound together as a community if we say we believe in the same things, but we really don't have any enforceable obligations to one another. I disagree.

But if you look at the real debates we've had—on welfare reform, I had no problem with requiring everybody on welfare to go to work. I had a big problem with taking away

the guarantee of health care and nutrition from their kids, for example. On crime, I had no problem with making people who did terrible things serve longer sentences. But I knew we'd lower crime more if we put l00,000 cops on the street and took the assault weapons off the street. And it turned out that was right. But those were joint decisions we made together for the common benefit of everyone.

I want you to think about the political debates that we see just in the next 2 years, and you remember what I said tonight. And you will see people redefining their own allegiances based on new issues for a new time and what they think binds us together as a country.

I'm convinced that we were able to win the White House because more and more people who thought they were Republican or independent, who lived in suburbs, began to feel common cause with their neighbors and be willing to make common policies that affected us all in ways that they didn't before—on the budget, on crime, on welfare, on education, you name it, across the board.

But I think that's what makes our party special. It's not liberal/conservative. It's whether you believe that you are a piece of the main and a part of the whole, whether you really believe that your family will only be as good as it can be if everybody else's family has a chance, too. That is the single driving passion of our party today, and I think John Kerry embodies it. And I'm proud to be with him tonight.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:23 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to Senator Kerry's wife, Teresa.

Remarks on Fast-Track Trade Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

November 5, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. Mr. Vice President, Senator, Members of the Congress, thank you so much for being here. And to the members of the administration, thank you for your efforts on fast track.

The choice Congress confronts this week will profoundly affect our growth, prosperity, and leadership well into the new century, for Congress must decide whether to extend the President's fast-track authority to negotiate agreements that tear down unfair trade barriers to our exports and create high-wage jobs in our economy.

Yesterday a bipartisan majority in the Senate voted overwhelmingly to move forward on extending fast-track authority. On Friday, the House of Representatives will vote on fast track, and I strongly encourage the House to take the same bold stand for America's future. A Member of Congress who votes for fast track is doing the right thing for America.

If we turn our backs now on trade and fail to seize the opportunities of the global economy, our competitors will eagerly take our place. That is an ''America last'' strategy. It's unacceptable; it won't work.

The rejection of fast track won't create any new jobs or raise any American incomes. It won't advance environmental or labor standards abroad. It would reduce our ability to do both. And I think that is very important. By freezing the status quo, we would simply be saying that we are going to freeze ourselves out of getting a fair deal in other markets; we are going to sit by while other countries get a better deal in other markets; and at the same time, we are going to reduce our influence on the labor and environmental standards in other countries and undermine our ability to continue to grow the American economy and create good, new jobs here.

Still, there are things that we have to do to try to continue to push the elevation of labor and environmental standards around the world as we press for open markets, and I believe we owe it to ourselves and our future to leave no one behind who is willing to work and learn in order to compete and win in the global economy.

Our social compact ever since I came here has always been opportunity for everyone who is responsible and a community in which all Americans have a chance. That's why we've worked hard with Congress to create a package of initiatives which I will include in my next budget to equip all people to reap the rewards of change. We know that the

technological and trade changes going on today favor people with higher skills. We know that they are accelerating the pace of change in our economy and indeed in every economy throughout the world. It is, therefore, imperative that we do more to make sure all our people have a chance to benefit from these changes.

First, we must greatly expand our efforts to help workers who lose their jobs because of technology or trade or other economic changes. At the suggestion of Congressman Bentsen, I'm going to establish a commission on workers and economic change in the new economy. Right now, we're going to commit to provide $750 million in additional funding to retrain dislocated workers. We want to create a special fund to guarantee that there will always be adequate resources to help workers hurt by trade. We want to target funds to help so-called secondary workers; that is, not only workers from a textile factory, for example, that might close but those in a nearby button factory who supply the textile factory.

This is very important. Changes in the economy do bring job dislocation. Most of them come because of technology. Some of them come because of trade. Our efforts here, combined with what we have already done, will mean that while we were cutting spending and balancing the budget during my term of office, we tripled funding for dislocated workers continuing training, to move people back into the economy with the skills they need.

Second, we have to step up our efforts to help communities adjust to this new economy. We should provide more rapid, more comprehensive, more coordinated assistance from all the Federal agencies in a way that is modeled on what we now do in our military base closure efforts, when we're trying to convert the bases to other uses. We should double the funds to help areas that have experienced major plant closings, and we should expand the development bank serving trade-affected areas.

Third, we must develop the untapped potential of our inner cities and rural areas, for too many of these places have not been touched by growth or dislocation. They need more investment. Our budget agreement doubles the number of empowerment zones, with tax incentives to invest in these rural and urban areas. But we must do more. We should increase loans for people who live in distressed rural and urban communities. We should make $100 million in flexible grants available every year in the new empowerment zones to attract new jobs and new small businesses, and we should provide for more skills training for young people in high poverty areas.

By giving a helping hand to workers at home and a strengthened hand to our negotiators as they open markets abroad, we can bring more Americans into the winner's circle of the new economy. We can grow the economy and let more people participate in that growth. There's no reason why our Nation cannot see to it that every American has the tools and conditions to succeed in this new economy. Our prosperity enables it; our understanding of the social contract demands it.

Now, the House faces a crucial vote on Friday. For me, the options are clear: We can rise to the challenges of the future, write the trade rules, continue our remarkable growth; or we can turn our back on the world and fail to compete for new markets, new contracts, and new jobs. I believe that the evidence is clear. We have produced over 13 million new jobs in less than 5 years, because we have expanded the ability of Americans to sell their products and services around the world. It would be a great mistake not to continue that.

We cannot afford to return to a mindset that pretends that we can protect what we have now and never grow in the future. We must seize the opportunities of the future and take care of the people who have difficulties with change. We must do both, but—we must do both.

Thank you very much.

Republican Electoral Victories

Q. Mr. President, you asked voters yesterday to send a message to Washington in the elections. What do you thing the message was on the Republican victories?

The President. Well, they won in places that they had before, and we won the places we had before—in the urban areas where we

had elections. And I think the lesson of this year is that when the economy is up and crime is down, people believe the country and their States and their communities are moving in the right directions, and they tend to stay with incumbent candidates and parties.

I will say this—I was surprised and terribly impressed by the remarkable campaign of Mr. McGreevey in New Jersey. And I was profoundly grateful for a vote which may well have some national significance in Houston, when the people of Houston voted to retain their affirmative action program in city contracting. I say that because that's a second version of the debate that was held in California, and I expect that debate will be held in other communities throughout the country. So that may or may not have national significance, but it might.

But the others, I think—economy is up, crime is down; people think the country and the States and the communities are going in the right direction, and the incumbents all benefited.

Possible Impeachment Proceedings

Q. Could we ask your reaction to the announcement by Congressman Bob Barr this morning that he will ask for a resolution for a preliminary inquiry by the House Judiciary Committee into possible impeachment proceedings against you for, among other things, possible abuse of Presidential power. What would your reaction to such a move be?

The President. Well, Congressman Barr, as I remember, was the man who carried the NRA's water to try to beat the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. He's always had a rather extreme view of these things. I don't really have any comment on that.

Q. Mr. President, going back to fast track——

Iraq

Q. Mr. President, on Iraq, sir, what do you think the signals should be—what signals should Saddam Hussein take—I'm sorry—from the U.N. decision to postpone these U–2 flights over his territory?

The President. Well, as I said yesterday, that was a decision for Mr. Butler to make. But if I were in his position, I wouldn't draw too much of a conclusion from it. They want the United Nations group to be able to talk to Saddam Hussein and to be able to speak directly and frankly. But Mr. Butler has, in his tenure, has done a good job of doing the inspections, and he made it clear that the U–2 flights would be resumed. I personally felt that it was important.

So I think that you've got to say that Mr. Butler's got a good record of doing these inspections, that he's aggressively determined to stop the development of a weapons of mass destruction program, and he did say the flights would be resumed. So if I were Saddam Hussein I wouldn't draw too much inference from it except to say they'd like to have a talk in the most open circumstances possible.

National Standardized Testing

Q. Mr. President, Congressman Goodling says you have an agreement on national testing. What is it, and is it going to turn into a signable bill?

The President. Well, I met with Congressman Goodling this morning, and I do want to thank him, because we have been working for weeks and weeks and weeks to try to work out his concerns and mine. He did not—he told me months ago, when we started talking about it, he did not want to see an inordinate duplication of the efforts already undertaken at the State level and by some large school districts where they're already doing some kind of standardized test.

I said my concern was not to have—was to have some sort of clearly accepted standard of excellence that all our children would be expected to meet in reading and math. And we believe, based on our conversation today, that we at least have an agreement in principle about how our students can master the basics and achieve higher academic standards and be measured for doing that, to hold children's educational performance to a uniform standard without undermining the efforts that are now going on in States, if they actually do measure whether the children know what they need to know.

So the agreement was reached in principle, but there's some complexity in terms of just turning it into language, in terms of how this test would be evaluated compared

with one another and what we propose to do in terms of research over the next couple of years. But the bottom line for the American people is I think we have opened the door to giving people in every State, every school district, and every school the assurance that their children's performance in reading and math can actually be measured and be made meaningful in terms of what every child in America should know, so they will know how they're doing.

And if that—if it can be done, I will be a very happy person, indeed. And I'm hopeful that we have done that. I say that just to give Mr. Goodling a little protection, and the President as well, just because we've reached an agreement in principle; we've got to turn it into the language. I'm very hopeful. This will be a huge thing, long-term, for American education if we have, in fact, worked this out.

Q. Mr. President——

Iraq

Q. On Iraq, we get the impression that if you had your druthers, you'd rather have not had a break in these U–2 flights, that you understand why it's happened, but you don't think it's necessarily a great idea.

The President. I don't think it's fruitful for me to second-guess Mr. Butler now. One of the things that I have seen in his—he hasn't been there very long, but since he's been there he's been quite aggressive. And keep in mind what our goal is here. Our goal is to use these inspections to try to ensure that a weapons of mass destruction program is not developed. And since there is absolutely no reason to believe that Mr. Butler has been anything other than extremely faithful to his task, I think we should let these talks unfold.

I would have been disturbed if the flight had been suspended and there hadn't been a clear statement that they would be resumed shortly. But since he made a clear statement that they would be resumed shortly, I think we have to give him the benefit of the doubt on this, and let's see if we can work through it.

Q. Do you compare notes with President Bush about your joint nemesis, your shared nemesis, Saddam?

The President. It's interesting, when this whole issue first broke was when I was on my way over to the—it was the night before I went over to the Washington Children's Hospital to be with General Schwarzkopf at the STARBRIGHT Foundation announcement, so we had some interesting conversations about it. And I've seen former Secretary Baker since then, and we're all commiserating, and obviously I asked these people for their advice about it.

But we just—look, this is a frustrating policy, the one we're following, because it requires long-term patience and discipline. It's frustrating for him; it's frustrating for us; it's frustrating for everybody else. But you know, there is a reason these United Nations resolutions were passed. There's a reason this inspection regime was set up. We think it's a bad idea for any more dictators who have shown aggression toward their neighbors to develop the capacity to have nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons. We think it's a bad idea. And we know of no way to do that—to avoid that in peaceful terms than to have some sort of inspection regime.

And as I said yesterday, the UNSCOM inspection regime has actually led to the destruction of more dangerous weapons than the Desert Storm did, because it's been done with great discipline over a period of years. So I would ask the American people and our allies around the world not to get too frustrated, to be patient, but to be firm, and let's try to hold on to this inspection regime, because that is the most peaceful way of dealing with this and permitting everyone to go on with their lives.

Q. Are there days when you wish President Bush had gone——

Fast-Track Trade Legislation

Q. One last question on fast track. Mr. President—thank you—there is a certain pocket of people who are affected through fast track, we understand—blue-collar, low-income persons—where education failed them from the beginning, and they went into a trade. What do you say to those people who are losing and plan to lose their job or expect to lose their job because of this?

The President. I would say that we will continue to have some economic disruption

in this country if we don't adopt fast track. If we don't adopt fast track—our market is still the most open market in the world, the most competitive market in the world, and we have the most technological change, and we know that most job changes are caused by technology, not by trade—the vast majority—so if we don't adopt fast track and we just sit where we are, a lot of those people will still confront the same challenges.

My argument is, adopt fast track, give me the power to create more jobs by opening markets, but also do more for those folks. Our programs were organized for a time when the economy didn't change as quickly as it does now. So Secretary Herman, for example, has worked very hard to radically accelerate our response time and to get all these programs working together the way we worked when a military base was closed. That's what we're trying to do.

So my answer would be, we should invest more money to give you more training more quickly and to give you more support while you're going through it. We should put more money into those communities where no economic benefit or burden has been felt because there has been no new investment one way or the other. But that's not a reason not to continue to expand trade. What we should do is both.

The way to preserve the social compact in America is to create more opportunity and then take more responsibility for preserving families and communities. Our policy is the right one. But we will not create or save jobs in the short run or the long run by refusing to open markets to our products. We will not raise labor and environmental standards abroad. We will lose our ability to do that. We will lose our leverage if we decline to open new markets for American products. This increases our political influence on labor and environmental and other issues, even as it opens up our economics.

But the main thing is, I just ask the American people to give me the benefit of the doubt on this. We have worked for 5 years. We have created over 13 million jobs. We have reduced the deficit by over 90 percent before the balanced budget checks in. In the last 2 years, more than half our new jobs have come in high-wage categories, and a third of the growth has come because of trade. This is our only strategy. We're only 4 percent of the world's economy; we're trying to hold on to 20 percent of its income. We've got to sell more to other people. There is not an option. And refusing to do it won't save jobs, won't keep incomes up, and won't help us help other people around the world.

Thank you.

Q. Do you worry about the impact on the stock markets if fast track fails—global markets?

The President. Well, let me say if it passes, I think it will have a very positive impact on the stock market here and around the world.

NOTE: The President spoke at noon in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Australian Ambassador to the United Nations Richard Butler, chairman, United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) charged with dismantling Iraq's weapons of mass destruction; Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, USA (Ret.), capital campaign chairman, STARBRIGHT Foundation; and former Secretary of State James A. Baker III.

Statement on Russian Ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention

November 5, 1997

I warmly welcome the action by the Russian Government today in ratifying the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). This landmark agreement, which the United States ratified last April, is already proving its value in enhancing international security. To date, 104 countries have ratified the CWC, which outlaws the development, production, possession, and use of chemical weapons. Russia's ratification makes it possible for Russia to join the United States in playing a leadership role in ensuring that all of the Convention's benefits are realized. I congratulate President Yeltsin, the Russian Duma, and the Federation Council on successfully completing CWC ratification. Russia's action today is an important step forward in achieving our mutual arms control objectives. I look forward to further progress in the months to come.

Exchange With Reporters at the George Bush Presidential Library in College Station, Texas

November 6, 1997

Iraq

Q. President George Bush, have you given any advice—what advice do you have for President Clinton in dealing with Saddam Hussein in this latest standoff? And do you have any regrets?

President George Bush. I agree with the President's stance of being firm with this man, and he's doing exactly the right thing. It is important that we have people with us in this, and it is important that the United Nations not waver one single bit. So I have no advice.

Q. Do you regret that your administration didn't more aggressively try to depose Saddam Hussein?

President Bush. In what way would I have deposed him? I'm not sure I understand the question. How depose him?

Q. During the war, do you regret not being more aggressive in trying to take him out?

President Bush. No, I have no regrets. The mission was to end the aggression, and we ended the aggression. We tried to do it peacefully without firing a shot. That failed the end of the aggression. His legions are defeated, and they cannot project the offensive force they once had.

Now, if you're asking me if I'm happy he's still there, no. But for those that now say, ex post facto, we should go in and have killed him, then I would then ask the question, whose son, whose daughter would I ask to give their lives in a perhaps fruitless hunt in Baghdad, where we would have become an occupying power? I have no regrets. The military said, "We've accomplished our mission." We ended the war, and we did the right thing. And history will say we did the right thing.

Q. What do you make of his staying power, President Bush?

Q. Mr. President, what do you think of the report from Mr. Butler that says Iraq is tampering with the U.N. surveillance cameras and moving weapons-related equipment?

President Clinton. Of course, that may be why he wants to interrupt the inspections, and why it's so important that they resume immediately. You know, the idea of getting the Americans out may just be a ruse; it may be that there is something that they're covering up, which is exactly why the international community has to resume the inspections.

Q. President Bush, what do you make of his staying power, Saddam's staying power, after all these years?

President Bush. Lots of staying power. A lot of staying power. If you're brutal, you don't care about the lives of your people and the welfare of them, you can stay in power a long time. I thought he'd be gone because of that brutality.

Any others?

George Bush Presidential Library

Q. What do you think of this library, Mr. Clinton?

President Clinton. I like it. It's very impressive. And the displays are particularly interesting to me.

Fast-Track Trade Legislation

President Bush. May I inject an answer to a question that has not been asked? I have great respect and I expect—I'm not trying to speak for President Carter or President Ford—for what President Clinton is trying to do in getting fast track through this Congress, through this Republican Congress. And he is doing the right thing. The Congress must support him in the House of Representatives, as they did in the Senate. And I am passionately committed to his position—President Clinton's position—on free and fair trade.

And I don't know if anyone wants to add to that. But this is an important moment, given what's happening out there.

President Gerald Ford. Well, I strongly reiterate my previous comment to the effect that fast-track legislation is critically important for substantive reasons and for U.S. leadership around the world. We've had that kind of legislation since the day I was President, and we hope to have it because it's important, critically, to the future of the United States as a leader—for the Nation.

So we hope and pray you'll get the votes tomorrow, Mr. President.

President Jimmy Carter. Well, all of us former Presidents have endorsed not only NAFTA earlier but also fast track now. In January, my wife and I and others were down in Latin America and saw the tremendous progress being made there. As a matter of fact, the MERCOSUR countries, which President Clinton visited recently, have already signed separate trade agreements with Mexico, with Canada, and with Europe. And I think, first of all, we're going to get left out if we don't sign fast track and get the negotiations done. And secondly, it's going to be a slap in the face to our natural friends and allies in Latin America.

The last 3 or 4 days I've been calling as many Democratic Congress Members as I could, trying to get the Democrats to come and support fast track. I think we have a much better chance among Republicans than we do Democrats. So I think we've got a lot of work to do, but it couldn't be a more important issue at this moment than to get fast track approved.

Q. How does it look, President Clinton?

President Clinton. It looks like we'd be better off if they were in Congress—[*laughter*]—and if I was. We're working hard. And let me say, the strong position that President Bush, President Carter, and President Ford has taken is immeasurably helpful. You know we have a lot of opposition, and I think you all know where it's coming from. I wish we could have a secret vote in the Congress; we'd pass it three or four to one.

But we're going to do the very best we can, and we're very hopeful. And we've been gaining ground in the last day—we had a great announcement yesterday by a group of Texas Members of the House, supporting it, and we're working on another group today. We're just going to keep working until tomorrow morning and see where we are. But I think we've got a good chance to win.

President Ford. Let us know if we can help make any calls.

Presidential Libraries

Q. What kind of ideas does this give you for your library?

President Clinton. Well, I'd like to have one that's as graphically representational as this one is and both personal—it's beautifully personal. I was over there—I was a little late getting in the line here because I was reading all of your biographical background and looking at your kids when they were young—no, it's wonderful. But I think it has a wonderful balance between the personal and the public service of President Bush.

President Carter. Each library has gotten larger and larger, so I can't wait to see President Clinton's that he's going to build in—[*laughter*].

President Clinton. I don't have as much land. I'll have to build a high-rise. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:40 a.m. in the George Bush Presidential Library at Texas A&M University. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks at the Dedication of the George Bush Presidential Library in College Station

November 6, 1997

Thank you very much President and Mrs. Bush, President and Mrs. Ford, President and Mrs. Carter, Mrs. Reagan, Mrs. Johnson, David and Julie Eisenhower, Caroline Kennedy Schlossberg, Reverend Graham, Governor and Mrs. Bush, Vice President and Mrs. Quayle, and to all the foreign dignitaries and American officials who are here.

The sun is shining on Texas A&M today. And the sun is shining on America today. You know, we have an interesting country, with a lot of religious, racial, and political diversity. Once in a while, we all get together. This morning, I think it's fair to say that all Americans are united in tribute to President George Bush for his lifetime of service to America.

I enjoyed immensely listening to the previous speakers. When Mrs. Reagan spoke—I hope someday Al Gore will be glad that we had lunch once a week. [*Laughter*] When President Ford spoke, I said, I hope I will look that good when I am 25 years younger than he is. [*Laughter*] When President Carter spoke, I thought, thank goodness he

just reminded the whole world that Presidents have to raise all the money for their libraries. [*Laughter*]

In 1942, young George Bush heard Secretary of War Henry Stimson challenge his generation to be, and I quote, ''be brave without being brutal; self-confident without boasting; part of an irresistible might, but without losing faith in individual liberty.'' President Bush not only heard those words, he has lived them. And he has rallied his fellow citizens to serve as well in their communities, for their country, and for the cause of democracy around the world.

There are many things that I, not only as President but as a citizen, am grateful to George and Barbara Bush for. I'd like to just mention a few today. As President and afterward, he has worked to ensure that ''A Thousand Points of Light'' is not merely a striking image but a lasting legacy. I thank him for that initiative and for cochairing the Presidents' Summit on Service.

As President, he summoned all the Governors, including me, to the University of Virginia for a summit on education, where we stayed up more than half the night in a totally bipartisan fashion to write national education goals for our country. And when he was President, Mrs. Bush espoused the importance of literacy and the importance of citizens volunteering to make sure all our children can read. I thought of that when we launched our America Reads initiative, which now has tens of thousands of college students at hundreds of universities all across America, trying to do what Barbara Bush always said we should do, to make sure every one of our fellow citizens could read and read well. And I thank them both for that.

As President and afterward, President Bush stood for American leadership for peace and prosperity, for freedom and democracy. He was the last President of the cold war, but he knew that American responsibility could not end with the cold war. And he showed us that in Desert Shield and Desert Storm. The vigilance President Bush displayed in dealing with Iraq, as we all know, is required again today. And I believe the American people support that vigilance, thanks in no small measure to your example not so long ago. And I thank you for that, Mr. President.

As President and afterward, President Bush pushed America to embrace new alliances of trade as instruments of both economic growth and growing democracy. He launched NAFTA and the talks that led to the World Trade Organization. I was proud to complete those efforts, and I am very grateful for the support he continues to give, along with our other former Presidents, to the imperative of American leadership in expanding alliances of trade, not only for our economic welfare but to support our political ideals.

Tomorrow the House of Representatives will vote on whether to extend fast-track authority to negotiate trade agreements. I hope Congress will follow the lead that President Bush and the other former Presidents have set to expand trade and our vital horizons in the 21st century. I thank you, Mr. President, for that.

For more than 4½ years now, even though our relationship began under somewhat unusual circumstances, I have been very grateful that whenever I called on President Bush, he was always there with wise counsel and, when he agreed, with public support. It's hard to express to someone who hasn't experienced it what it means in a moment of difficulty to be able to call someone who, first of all, knows exactly what you're up against and, secondly, will tell you the truth. And he has done that time and time again. I am persuaded that the country is better off because of it. And I thank you, Mr. President, for your counsel and your assistance.

This magnificent library will be a place for scholars who try to understand what has happened in some of America's most important years. It's a place for citizens who want to know right now what went on in the life and career of George Bush. It's also a place from which any person would draw enormous inspiration, a place for the reaffirmation of our faith in America.

Benjamin Franklin told our Constitutional Convention, ''The first man put at the helm will be a good one, but no one knows what sort will come afterward.'' Mr. President, I think if Benjamin Franklin were here today, he would say that in George Bush, America

has had a good man whose decency and devotion have served our country well. And that is the story this library will tell to generations to come.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:25 a.m. in front of the library building at Texas A&M University. In his remarks, he referred to former First Ladies Barbara Bush, Betty Ford, Rosalynn Carter, Nancy Reagan, and Lady Bird Johnson; David Eisenhower, grandson of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and his wife, Julie, daughter of former President Richard M. Nixon; Caroline Kennedy Schlossberg, daughter of former President John F. Kennedy; Rev. Billy Graham, who gave the invocation; Gov. George W. Bush of Texas, and his wife, Laura; and former Vice President Dan Quayle and his wife, Marilyn.

Remarks on Fast-Track Trade Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

November 6, 1997

The President. Good evening. Today I was proud to represent all Americans in honoring the service of President George Bush at the dedication of his Presidential Library. It was an extraordinary moment for many reasons, but one of the most impressive things to me was that there were four men, two Democrats, two Republicans, who have held this office, all agreeing strongly that for America to continue to lead in the world economy Congress must extend the President's power to negotiate new trade agreements.

A large bipartisan majority in the Senate supports extending this authority. Speaker Gingrich and I are convinced that the authority will strengthen our leadership, and we want the House to follow suit. A vote against fast track will not create a single job, clean up a single toxic waste site, advance workers rights, or improve the environment anywhere in the world, but it will limit America's ability to advance our economic interests, our democratic ideals, our political leadership.

So, once again, before Congress votes tomorrow, I call upon the House of Representatives to vote for American leadership, for America's economic future, and pass the fast-track trade negotiating authority.

Q. Mr. President, how close are you at this point? How close do you think you are in the House?

The President. I think it's a close call. Obviously, I'm here because I'm trying to pull out all the stops, and I want to emphasize the extraordinary moment we had today when the four Presidents were all strongly endorsing fast track. President Ford, President Bush, have spoken out on this. President Carter has actually made a number of phone calls. It is close, but the policy is not close, and I am convinced that a substantial majority of the Congress knows the policy is not close; that it is clearly in America's interest to do this.

Iraq

Q. Mr. President, the Iraqis in a letter today threatened again to shoot down the next U.S. spy flight. There is apparently no give on their side at all. Are you becoming more concerned?

The President. Well, it would be a mistake for them to shoot down a plane. But we have a team there working for the United Nations, and our policy is clear. And I don't mean American policy; world policy. What they need to do is to resume the inspections. And the team is coming home this weekend, and we'll see where we are then and where we go from there.

Yes.

Fast-Track Trade Legislation

Q. What deals have you cut, and are you planning to cut in order to get fast track to go through, and does that include Congressman Smith's language on abortion?

The President. What we've tried to do is to resolve—if there are any issues, economic issues, that affect Congressional districts or States that we can resolve honorably, we've worked hard to resolve those in ways that I think are consistent with what we're trying to do on fast track. If there are other issues that we can resolve that permit the business of the Congress to go forward, we're trying to resolve them. But there has been no agreement of the kind you just mentioned.

Q. Mr. President, can I ask you about your statement that if this were a secret ballot, this would pass by a 3-to-4 margin? Is that

a fairly damning assessment of Members of Congress? It suggests they're so strongly in the grip of special interests that they won't vote their conscience on an issue that directly affects U.S. standing in the world.

The President. Well, they're under a lot of pressure. And you know, we see a lot of evidence that, from time to time in these elections, that if one side is funded and another is not that they can be very—that they can be in trouble. And there are other issues there for them to consider. All I'm saying is I believe if there were a secret ballot, it would pass overwhelmingly.

And what I'm trying to do is to bring the vote tomorrow evening in line with where I think everybody's understanding is. I think the most important thing to do is to heighten the public awareness of this. The level of—though we've been talking about it now for months, I think because this is the authority for the President to continue to negotiate trade agreements rather than a specific agreement with a lot of specifics in it, there's not as much public interest, public awareness, or public involvement in this, and that has made the issue more difficult to lift the level of the national interest on. But I feel I must say I'm encouraged by the developments of the last few days, and we're just going to continue to do it.

Let me just mention one other thing that we've done in this, because I think I should have been talking more about this, but I think it's quite important. In order to address some of the concerns of Congress with regard to labor and the environment and congressional input, we establish in this trade bill a panel of advisers on labor issues, a panel of advisers on environment issues, parallel to that which existed in previous bills of advisers on business issues. That's never been done before. In addition to that, we're going to have a congressional observer group for every one of these trade negotiations the way we have congressional observer groups for NATO expansion, for example, or for the chemical weapons treaty.

Now, those of you who followed this and have been on our trips, for example, like when the congressional observer group went with me on the NATO trip to Madrid, know that this is a critical part of securing congressional approval because the NATO observers are involved in the early negotiations. They know what's going on. Their voices are heard. They are not just confronted with a fait accompli at the end of the day.

All these things have been changed for this particular fast-track bill, so one of the things I'm trying to hammer home to a lot of individual Members is that they—or their representatives, whether they're Democrats or Republicans, and—will have an involvement in how these specific trade agreements are negotiated, far greater than their predecessors have had in my administration and in previous administrations going back 20 years. And I think that's a big plus. One more.

Q. With the outcome still in doubt, have you and Speaker Gingrich considered delaying tomorrow's vote to give you more time to round up support?

The President. We find that the deadline concentrates our attention markedly, and so we're working hard. We think we can get there by tomorrow night, and that's what we're working to do.

Q. Mr. President, is it tomorrow night now?

The President. I'm sorry. I don't know. I haven't talked to the Speaker today. We think we can get there tomorrow, and that is what we are trying to do. I have not received any information. You probably have better information than I about when it is scheduled.

Iraq

Q. A question again about Iraq. What do your intelligence people say are motivating Saddam Hussein? Why is he doing this? Why is he pushing this again to the brink?

The President. Well, we learned, you know, back during the Desert Shield/Desert Storm period that his motivations are somewhat complex and difficult to fathom from time to time. All I can say is that the reason that we have the inspection regime and the reason we are determined to resume it is that, whatever else happens and however long he stays there, the international community has decided that he mustn't be allowed to resume the production of weapons of mass

destruction. So he can have whatever motive he wants.

We have tried to work with the United Nations to deal with the humanitarian concerns of the Iraqi people. We are very concerned about those. But we can't permit a man with his record, the regime with their policies, to get into the weapons of mass destruction business if we can stop it. And that is what the inspection regime is designed to do, and there is a lot of evidence, you know, that it has been quite successful. So all I know is that whatever his motives are, I just want to start the inspections again.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:32 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House.

Proclamation 7049—National Day of Concern About Young People and Gun Violence, 1997

November 6, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

On this day in America, as on every other day, children will die by gunfire, and many of them will be killed because other children are pulling the trigger. This is a stark and sad reality and a call to each of us, not only to raise public awareness of a national tragedy, but also to do everything within our power to end the killing.

There is some encouraging news. The Department of Justice recently reported that violent crime among youths dropped by more than 9 percent in 1996. However, we still have a long way to go in our efforts to save lives and help ensure a brighter future for our children.

One of my Administration's highest law enforcement priorities is to protect our children from violent crime, and we are especially concerned with stopping crimes committed by young people. I am pleased that eight of the Nation's largest gun manufacturers have responded to my Administration's call to provide child safety lock devices with every handgun they sell. We proposed a $60 million increase for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program this year, which reaches almost all of our Nation's school districts. These funds will help communities protect students from violence. My Administration also proposed funding for after-school initiatives in communities across the country to give our young people something positive to say yes to, to keep them off the streets, and to keep them out of trouble. Through our Anti-Gang and Youth Violence Strategy, we are working to provide for more prosecutors and probation officers, tougher penalties, and better gang prevention efforts.

But government alone cannot guarantee our children will grow up free from violence and fear. Parents, teachers, religious and community leaders, businesses, youth organizations, and especially young people themselves have a vital part to play. Parents and other adults must set a good example for the children in their care and teach them right from wrong. Adults who own a gun have a responsibility to keep that weapon out of the hands of our youth. Communities must unite to keep schools safe and to provide young people with positive, fulfilling activities after school and during summers and holidays. Most important, young people themselves have a duty to learn that violence solves nothing; to act responsibly when confronted by peer pressure by relying on their good judgment, and to encourage their friends and classmates to resolve conflicts peacefully.

I am heartened by the knowledge that hundreds of thousands of young Americans across the country will have an opportunity on this National Day of Concern to sign the Student Pledge Against Gun Violence. By making this earnest promise never to take a gun to school, never to use a gun to settle a dispute, and to use their influence to keep their friends from using guns, these young people will take a giant step toward a brighter, safer future.

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 November 6, 1997, as a National Day of Concern About Young People and Gun Violence. On this day, I call upon young Americans in classrooms and communities across the country

to make a solemn decision about their future by signing the Student Pledge Against Gun Violence. I further urge all Americans to help our Nation's young people avoid violence and grow up to be healthy, happy, productive adults.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this sixth day of November, 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., November 10, 1997]

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

Remarks on Fast-Track Trade Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

November 7, 1997

The President. Good morning. Today we received more good news for America's workers and their families: real wages continue to rise, the American economy added another 280,000 jobs in October alone, and unemployment dropped to 4.7 percent. The American economy has now added 13½ million new jobs since 1993, while inflation has remained low and stable. All this proves further evidence that our economy is the strongest it has been in a generation.

This also shows we have to move forward with the strategy that is working, the strategy of balancing the budget, investing in our people, and expanding American exports. That has brought us to this place of prosperity.

The choice before Congress is clear. I think it is imperative that we understand that a key reason more people are working and that wages are rising and that unemployment is down to the lowest level in more than two decades is that we have opened new markets and won new customers for American goods and services.

The vote by the House of Representatives on fast track will determine whether we continue to move ahead confidently with the strategy that has brought us 13½ million new jobs and the lowest unemployment rate in nearly 25 years.

Every time there is a trade agreement, we hear dire predictions of the consequences for American workers. The opponents of fast track would have you believe that if we hadn't done these trade agreements in the last 5 years, we'd still have all the good new jobs we have, and we wouldn't have lost any jobs. That is simply not true. We wouldn't have nearly as many of these good new jobs, and most of our job losses are due to changes in technology and consumer buying choices.

Today, with 4.7 percent unemployment, we see that America's trade policy creates good new jobs; it does not lose them. It boosts incomes rather than undercutting them. It would be a folly to turn back now.

The right answer is to give us the authority to breakdown more trade barriers and to do more, more quickly, to help those who are displaced by economic changes, and to do more to raise labor and environmental standards in other nations. That is our policy.

If America is restricted in its ability to make trade agreements, then our national interest in creating good jobs, protecting the environment, advancing worker rights will be restricted as well. We must not give other nations a boost in the global economic competition so vital to our own economic strength. The question is not whether we are going to have a system of world trade but whether we have one that works for America, whether we have a level playing field or one tilted against us.

Let me just give you one example. Now that Canada has negotiated a trade agreement with Chile, every major economy in the hemisphere has duty-free access to Chile's markets, but one, the United States. And just yesterday, Canada signed a comprehensive agreement with Argentina, Brazil, and other nations ahead of the United States. That's a strategy of "America last." It is unacceptable.

Again, I say the choice before Congress is clear: We can rise to the challenge of the future, write the trade rules on our terms, spur further economic growth and more jobs, or we can turn our back on the world and

fail to compete for new markets, new contracts, new jobs. More than ever, our economic security is also the foundation of our national security. Our strength depends upon our economic allies, our trading partners, and our economy. It affects our ability to get other nations to cooperate with us militarily and against the new threats of terrorism and drugs, organized crime, and weapons proliferation.

If we want to keep our leadership strong and our economy on the right track, Congress simply must give our Nation the power to negotiate pro-growth, pro-jobs, pro-American trade agreements. To maintain the momentum and confidence our economy enjoys, a Member of Congress who votes for fast track is doing the right thing for America.

Iraq

Q. Mr. President, given the statement of Chairman Butler this morning that he got nothing out of Saddam Hussein and given that Saddam Hussein hasn't responded to the international community positively unless military action has been taken, are you going to recommend either U.N.-sponsored or unilateral military action that would involve in some way, shape, or form U.S. forces? And when would that be?

The President. Well, first of all, the delegation that was in Iraq is on its way home now, and they will report, and then the international community must decide what to do. I think it is important that we be resolute, and I think it would be a mistake to rule in or out any particular course of action at this moment.

Q. How long will you be willing to wait——

The President. Wait, go ahead, Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press] and then——

Q. Actually, I was just going to ask you, Mr. President, do you think that—do you see any sign that Saddam Hussein is anything but defiant, that he is willing to give at all? He is still threatening to shoot down the U–2 spy planes, and he's refusing to let the Americans be part of the inspection teams. Do you see any reason for hope here?

The President. No. I don't. But we have to be resolute and firm. Keep in mind what is at stake here. The international community has made a decision, embodied in the United Nations resolution that Saddam Hussein must not be permitted to resume producing weapons of mass destruction. The advisers in UNSCOM, the inspectors there, they are the eyes and ears of the international community. They have been very successful, as you know, in doing their job. That is the issue.

And whether he's firm or weak, in the end, the international community has to be firm to make sure that his regime does not resume its capacity to develop weapons of mass destruction.

Q. Mr. President you seem willing to wait until the U.N. diplomats come back. How much longer are you willing to wait for compliance?

The President. Well, let me say, I think we have to wait until the U.N. diplomats come back. We have to counsel with our allies. We have to give them a chance to be heard and see what we're going to do. But I have seen no indication that any of our allies are weakening on this. Everyone seems to be united in their determination to restore the inspections on terms that the United Nations decides, not on Saddam Hussein's terms.

Q. Mr. President, will you give a visa to Tariq Aziz? And also, will you recommend to the Security Council or to the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. that they do take military action in the Security Council? That is one of the options.

The President. Well, on the Tariq Aziz question, we normally give anybody a visa to come to the United Nations, and that has been our policy. However, I don't think it ought to be used for stonewalling or foot-dragging, and we have that under review.

On the second issue, I can only say what I said before: I think we have to be firm and resolute. At this moment, in my view, it would be a mistake to rule in or out any option.

Fast-Track Trade Legislation

Q. On fast track, Mr. President, what's wrong with leaving the policy as it is now—you negotiate the deal, let Congress tinker with it?

The President. First of all, the main thing that's wrong with it is that other countries aren't interested in negotiating with us this way. No other country has to face that. Every country recognizes that a nation's parliamentary body has the right to vote up or down on the action by the executive. But no one—these deals are very complicated to negotiate; there are always lots of different aspects to it. And you can't say, ''Well, we're going to negotiate it and then subject it to a thousand amendments.'' Even within this framework there are ways to deal with major concerns.

But I asked Ambassador Barshefsky last night, I said, ''Just tell me one more time, do you really think we can negotiate seriously with any country without this authority?'' And she said, ''No. Unambiguously no.''

Let me emphasize, however, something we have done in this. Because I think it's very important, and it's been completely lost in the debate. We have agreed to have congressional observer groups in every single trade negotiation the way we have congressional observer groups now on NATO expansion, the way we have a congressional observer group on the chemical weapons treaty. Any Member of Congress who has ever been on one of those observer groups will tell you that that dramatically increases the effective input of the Congress into the process on the front end. And we have agreed to very specific stages of involvement for the Congress here. And presumably, the observer group in the trade issues would be just like the observer group in NATO. It would include people who are strongly for what we are doing, people who are skeptical, people who may be opposed. All of them get their input.

You know, I took a number of the congressional observers with me to Madrid, to the NATO conference. I would expect that to be done on all these trade issues. So we have offered Congress, including those who have reservations about certain trade agreements, an unprecedented amount of input on the front end into this process.

I strongly support it, by the way. I think it is a good idea, but it ought to be recognized for what it is. The question that Congress should ask themselves is, are we going to have more or less influence over trade policy if this bill passes? Are we going to have more or less input in labor and environmental issues and more advance of that if this bill passes or if it fails? The answer is, more influence in other countries on labor and environmental issues, more input for Congress if the bill passes.

No fast-track legislation has ever proposed this before. I support it. My policy is to push the labor and environmental issues. My policy is to push congressional involvement. And my policy is to do more at home to help people who are dislocated from their jobs for whatever reason. But that is not an excuse to send a signal to the world that we just don't expect to do trade agreements anymore with other countries, and we don't expect to be partners.

And other countries do not understand—what is America afraid of? No other country has 13½ million jobs in the last 5 years. No other country has a 4.7 percent unemployment rate, except for Japan, which has a different system, as you know. This country has out-performed every other country in the world, and the 220 trade agreements that we negotiated had a lot to do with that.

Our barriers are lower on average than virtually every other country in the world. We have more to gain from this economically. What they want is the sort of long-term, stable political relationships that will stabilize democracy and guarantee long-term economic growth for them and give them access to high-quality products. This is a no-brainer on the merits. This is clear on the merits. And it is in the interest of working people, and it is especially in the interest of working people who either have or want to get higher wage jobs, because they are the jobs that are created by the expansion of trade.

One of the reasons you've got these income figures going up now is not only that unemployment is low and therefore the labor markets are tighter but we are slowly changing the job mix in America because as we get into more trade, trade-related jobs pay higher wages. So this is clearly the right thing to do, and I'm determined to keep working until we convince a majority of the House of Representatives that it is.

Thank you.

Q. How close are you?

The President. Close.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz of Iraq.

Proclamation 7050—Veterans Day, 1997

November 7, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Americans have always looked to the future. Planning for next week, next month, or next year, we rarely dwell on the past, but rather look ahead to tomorrow. But each year in November, we pause to look back, to reflect with pride and profound gratitude on the achievements of our Nation's veterans. The service and sacrifice of these millions of courageous men and women is a gleaming thread that weaves, unbroken, through the fabric of American history.

More than two centuries ago, the framers of the Constitution outlined in a few brief words the burden and privilege that generations of American veterans would willingly embrace: to "provide for the common defence . . . and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity . . . ." Since the days of the American Revolution, nearly 42 million patriots have taken up arms to defend America and to guarantee that the blessings of liberty are, indeed, secure. From Lexington and Concord to Fort McHenry and San Juan Hill, from the Argonne Forest to the shores of Normandy, from the frozen terrain of Korea to the jungles of Vietnam and the sands of Kuwait, America's veterans have risked—and more than half a million have lost—their lives to preserve our freedom and defend our national interests.

Today, more than 25 million American veterans live among us. They come from every walk of life and from every ethnic, religious, and racial background. They are our family members, friends, and neighbors, but these seemingly ordinary citizens have accomplished extraordinary things. They have defended our liberty against every challenged, preserved our values, advanced democracy across the globe, and made America the world's best hope for freedom and lasting peace.

For these contributions, and for so much more, we owe our veterans an enormous debt of gratitude that we can never fully repay. To those who have completed their service and returned to civilian life, we owe the opportunity for a good education, a good job, and the chance to buy a home. For those who have suffered injury or illness in service to America, we must provide relief, quality health care, and the opportunity to live out their dreams. To the families of those still missing, we owe the fullest possible accounting and every effort to determine the fate of their loved ones. And to those who have died for us and for our country, whether here at home or on some foreign battlefield, we owe our lasting respect and the pledge to meet America's future challenges with the same valor and generosity that infused their sacrifice.

In recognition of and gratitude for the contributions of those who have served in our Armed Forces, the Congress has provided (5 U.S.C. 6103(a)) that November 11 of each year shall be set aside as a legal public holiday to honor America's veterans.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, November 11, 1997, as Veterans Day. I urge all Americans to acknowledge the courage and sacrifice of our veterans through appropriate public ceremonies and private prayers. I call upon Federal, State, and local officials to display the flag of the United States and to encourage and participate in patriotic activities in their communities. I invite civic and fraternal organizations, places of worship, schools, businesses, unions, and the media to support this national observance with suitable commemorative expressions and programs.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this seventh day of November, 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, 11:05 a.m., November 10, 1997]

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

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Cyprus

November 7, 1997

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

In accordance with Public Law 95–384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous submission covered progress through May 31, 1997. The current submission covers the period June 1, 1997, through July 31, 1997.

The reporting period was marked by two important developments. The first was my appointment on June 4 of Ambassador Richard C. Holbrooke as the new Special Presidential Emissary for Cyprus. This appointment of one of our most capable negotiators demonstrates our commitment to help promote a final political settlement for Cyprus.

The second key development was U.N. Secretary General Annan's June 9 invitation to the leaders of the two communities in Cyprus, President Glafcos Clerides and Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash, to engage in direct talks under U.N. auspices. These were the first face-to-face meetings of the two leaders since October 1994. Two rounds of direct talks were held, the first from July 9 to July 13 in Troutbeck, New York (which is treated in this report), and the second from August 11 to August 15 in Switzerland (which will be covered in the next report). United Nations Special Advisor for Cyprus Cordovez noted that the cordial atmosphere between the parties at Troutbeck was a good beginning for subsequent negotiating sessions. A U.S. diplomatic effort for the U.N. settlement process was led by Ambassador Holbrooke, who met with Messrs. Clerides and Denktash before and after the talks.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 7, 1997

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

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

November 1

In the evening, the President spoke by telephone from the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in Amelia Island, FL, to the Arkansas Millennium Ball in Little Rock, AR.

November 2

In the morning, the President traveled from Amelia Island to Jacksonville, FL, and then to Newark, NJ. Later, he traveled to Staten Island, NY.

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Middlesex, NJ, and in the evening, he traveled to New York City. Later, he returned to Washington, DC.

The President declared a major disaster in Nebraska and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe snowstorms, rain, and strong winds, October 24–26.

November 3

In the morning, the President traveled to Alexandria, VA, and in the afternoon, he returned to Washington, DC.

The White House announced that the President will attend the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Economic Leaders' Meeting in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, November 24–25.

November 5

In the morning, the President met with Representative William F. Goodling in the Oval Office.

The President announced his intention to nominate Rebecca M. Blank as a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The President announced his intention to nominate John Paul Hammerschmidt to serve as a member of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority.

The President announced his intention to appoint Mandell Ganchrow, Gary J. Lavine, Joseph Halfon, and Menno Ratzker as members of the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad.

The White House announced that the President invited Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz of Turkey to the White House for a working visit on December 19.

November 6

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to College Station, TX. In the afternoon, they returned to Washington, DC, arriving in the evening.

The President announced his intention to nominate Gus A. Owen as a member of the Surface Transportation Board.

The President announced his intention to nominate Edward A. Powell, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary for Management at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following individuals as new members of the Commission to Study Capital Budgeting: Willard Brittain, Stanley E. Collender, Orin S. Kramer, Richard Leone, David Levy, James T. Lynn, Cynthia Metzler, Luis Nogales, Carol O'Cleireacain, Rudolph Penner, Steven L. Rattner, Robert M. Rubin, Herbert Stein, and Laura D'Andrea Tyson.

The White House announced that the President invited President Alpha Oumar Konare of Mali to the White House for a working visit on November 19.

November 7

In the afternoon, the President met with Members of Congress in the Oval Office.

The President announced his intention to nominate Donald J. Barry to be the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks at the Department of the Interior.

The President announced his intention to nominate Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund.

The President announced his intention to nominate Winter D. Horton, Jr., to serve as a member of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The President announced his intention to nominate Elaine D. Kaplan to serve as Special Counsel in the Office of Special Counsel.

The President announced his intention to nominate Robert J. Shapiro to be Under Secretary for Economic Affairs at the Department of Commerce.

The President announced his intention to nominate Donna A. Tanoue to be Chair and member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The President announced his intention to nominate Mozelle W. Thompson and Orson Swindle to be Commissioners of the Federal Trade Commission.

The White House announced that the President will host a White House Conference on Hate Crimes on November 10 at George Washington University.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

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

Submitted November 3

John Charles Horsley,
of Washington, to be Associate Deputy Secretary of Transportation, vice Michael Huerta.

Submitted November 5

Rebecca M. Blank,
of Illinois, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, vice Alicia Haydock Munnell, resigned.

Darryl R. Wold,
of California, to be a member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2001, vice Joan D. Aikens, term expired.

Submitted November 6

John Paul Hammerschmidt,
of Arkansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority for a term of 4 years (new position).

Christine O.C. Miller,
of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims for a term of 15 years (reappointment).

Rosemary S. Pooler,
of New York, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, vice Frank X. Altimari, retired.

Robert D. Sack,
of New York, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, vice Roger J. Miner, retired.

Jeanne Hurley Simon,
of Illinois, to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 2002 (reappointment).

Checklist of White House Press Releases

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

Released November 1

Transcript of a radio address by Vice President Al Gore

Announcement of the President's letter to the Governors of the 36 States that have not yet begun to participate in the national registry of sex offenders established at the Justice Department under a 1996 directive by the President

Released November 3

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry: President Clinton's Participation in APEC Leaders Meeting

Released November 4

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry: Sudan: Declaration of Emergency and Imposition of Sanctions

Released November 5

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman, Secretary of Commerce Bill Daley, and National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling on the President's balanced budget proposals

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the upcoming visit of Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz of Turkey

Released November 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of remarks by President George Bush, President Jimmy Carter, President Gerald Ford, and Mrs. Nancy Reagan at the George Bush Presidential Library dedication ceremony in College Station, TX

Transcript of remarks by Vice President Al Gore on fast-track trade legislation

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the upcoming visit of President Alpha Oumar Konare of Mali

Announcement of nomination for two U.S. Court of Appeals Judges for the Second Circuit and a Judge for the U.S. Court of Federal Claims

Released November 7

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Public Liaison Maria Echaveste and Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy Elena Kagan on the upcoming White House Conference on Hate Crimes

Announcement of nomination for U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas

Statement by White House Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles on efforts to resolve all matters in the remaining appropriations bills

Announcement of nomination for U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia

Acts Approved by the President

Approved November 7

H.J. Res. 101 / Public Law 105–68
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes

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