Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, October 9, 2000
Volume 36—Number 40
Pages 2269–2347

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Resignations and Retirements
"Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act"—2320
Congressional candidate John Kelly, reception—2311
Congressional leaders, meetings—2281, 2320
Debt relief—2281
Education legislation—2321
Florida
Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee dinner in Jupiter, telephone remarks—2297
Hillary Clinton, luncheon in Miami—2293
Representative Corrine Brown
Rally in Jacksonville—2299
Reception in Jacksonville—2308
Uncommon Women on Common Ground conference in Jacksonville—2304
Hillary Clinton, dinner—2317
Montana gubernatorial running mates Mark O'Keefe and Carol Williams, reception—2287
New Jersey, Conference on the Progressive Tradition in Princeton—2325
New York City
National Leadership PAC reception—2335
Reception for Gov. Tom Carper—2339
Radio address—2275
Religious leaders, meeting—2281

Addresses and Remarks—Continued

Representative Dennis Moore, reception—2289
Student loan program and student assistance—2277

Bill Signings

First continuing resolution for fiscal year 2001, statement—2270

Communications to Federal Agencies

Military Drawdown for Tunisia, memorandum—2271
Refugee admissions, memorandum—2270

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Briefing Room—2269
Cabinet Room—2281
Rose Garden—2320

Letters and Messages

Yom Kippur, message—2345

Proclamations

Child Health Day—2274
German-American Day—2334
National Breast Cancer Awareness Month—2272
National Disability Employment Awareness Month—2273

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

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

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

Proclamations—Continued

National Domestic Violence Awareness Month—2276
To Implement the African Growth and Opportunity Act and To Designate Eritrea as a Beneficiary Developing Country for Purposes of the Generalized System of Preferences—2283
To Implement the United States-Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act—2286

Resignations and Retirements

White House Office, Press Secretary Joe Lockhart, remarks—2269

Statements by the President

See also Bill Signings
Caribbean Basin Initiative and African Growth and Opportunity Act beneficiary countries—2283
Congressional action on a national blood alcohol content standard to combat drunk driving—2297

Statements by the President—Continued

Energy and water development appropriations legislation—2282
Hate crimes legislation—2334
House of Representatives action on conservation appropriations—2297
National economy—2344
Senate passage of the "Breast and Cervical Cancer Act of 1999"—2311
Smaller Learning Communities grants—2311
Tobacco, urging action on—2334

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—2347
Checklist of White House press releases—2347
Digest of other White House announcements—2345
Nominations submitted to the Senate—2346

Remarks at Press Secretary Joe Lockhart's Last Press Briefing and an Exchange With Reporters

September 29, 2000

The President. Most people think Joe's leaving for purely selfish, monetary reasons. But the truth is, he told me that I was no longer in enough trouble to make it interesting for him—[*laughter*]—that getting up every day and going to work and making policy and helping the Democrats, you know, it's boring him to tears. [*Laughter*] And he said he couldn't stand to be alone in his office crying anymore, and so he had to leave.

So I have one little gift for him, a memorial of our one and only day playing golf together. [*Laughter*] It happened a couple of weeks ago. Here's Joe. [*Laughter*] And the caption is, "Joe, typical day as Presidential Press Secretary, lost in the weeds." [*Laughter*] "Unlike the press corps, I'll give you a mulligan." [*Laughter*]

Let me say seriously, I know what a difficult job this is, and I know it takes a toll on everyone, and I know Joe's spent a lot of time away from his wonderful wife and beautiful daughter, who are here. I remember when I appointed him, there was all this yapping about whether he was heavy enough to do the job. [*Laughter*] He leaves with *gravitas* and gravy toss—[*laughter*]—and a lot of gratitude.

I know that I have a different perspective than the members of the press corps, but I've been following this business a long time, a long time before I showed up. I don't believe I've ever seen anybody do this job better. I admire you. I'm grateful to you. I'll miss you, and I'll try to keep you bored. Thank you, friend.

Press Secretary Lockhart. You don't have to hang around for this part. You don't really want to talk to them. [*Laughter*] I'm still on the clock. [*Laughter*]

The President. You want us to go? Well, wait, I've got to do one thing. I have a gift for your successor, Jake. [*Laughter*]

[*At this point, the President presented Press Secretary-designate Jake Siewert with a helmet.*]

The President. They're going to try to get even with you, and they're also going to try to get even for everything they couldn't get away with with Joe, so I thought you ought to have this. I hope you'll wear it to your first briefing. [*Laughter*]

Press Secretary-Designate Jake Siewert. I worked enough on the Dukakis campaign not to put this on. [*Laughter*]

The President. Joe?

Press Secretary Lockhart. No, I won't put it on. [*Laughter*]

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, can I ask you, I guess on a serious note, about the violence in Jerusalem, and what that might mean to the peace process, and whether you would like to contact Chairman Arafat to see what you can do?

The President. I'm working on all that right now, but I think the less I say about it, the better. I may have something to say tomorrow, but I think today I'd like to say less and try to keep working.

2000 Campaign

Q. What about the campaign? You seemed to be having an awful good time at that fundraiser a little while ago. [*Laughter*]

The President. I was having a good time. It's easier for me when you don't have to run. It's easier. I'm having a good time.

Do the briefing, Joe.

Press Secretary Lockhart. Okay. [*Laughter*]

The President. Keep me out of trouble. Stay bored. [*Laughter*] Bored.

Press Secretary Lockhart. I can do that.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 2 p.m. in the James S. Brady Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Mr. Lockhart's wife, Laura Logan, and daughter, Clare. A reporter referred to Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority. The President's remarks were included in the transcript of the press briefing by Press Secretary Lockhart. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement on Signing the First Continuing Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001

September 29, 2000

Today I have signed into law H.J. Res. 109, a short-term continuing resolution for FY 2001.

The Resolution provides 2001 appropriations for continuing projects and activities of the Federal Government through October 6, 2000, except for those funded by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001, and the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2001, which I have signed into law.

In February, I sent a budget to the Congress that funded critical investments in our future. We need realistic levels of funding for critical Government functions that the American people expect their Government to perform well, including education, law enforcement, environmental protection, preservation of our global leadership, air safety, food safety, economic assistance for the less fortunate, research and technology, administration of Social Security and Medicare, and other important programs. None of the funding bills for the programs that support these functions have been sent to the White House.

I urge the Congress to approve the 11 remaining 2001 spending bills as quickly as possible, in an acceptable form.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
September 29, 2000.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 109, approved September 29, was assigned Public Law No. 106–275. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Memorandum on Fiscal Year 2001 Refugee Admissions

September 29, 2000

Presidential Determination No. 2000–32

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Presidential Determination on FY 2001 Refugee Admissions Numbers and Authorizations of In-Country Refugee Status Pursuant to Sections 207 and 101(a)(42), Respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and Determination Pursuant to Section 2(b)(2) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act, as Amended

In accordance with section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the "Act") (8 U.S.C. 1157), as amended, and after appropriate consultation with the Congress, I hereby make the following determinations and authorize the following actions:

The admission of up to 80,000 refugees to the United States during FY 2001 is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest; provided, however, that this number shall be understood as including persons admitted to the United States during FY 2001 with Federal refugee resettlement assistance under the Amerasian immigrant admissions program, as provided below.

The 80,000 admissions numbers shall be allocated among refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United States in accordance with the following regional allocations; provided, however, that the number allocated to the East Asia region shall include persons admitted to the United States during FY 2001 with Federal refugee resettlement assistance under section 584 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 1988, as contained in section 101(e) of Public Law 100–202 (Amerasian immigrants and their family members); provided further that the number allocated to the former Soviet Union shall include persons admitted who were nationals of the former Soviet Union, or in the case of persons having no nationality, who were habitual residents of the former Soviet Union, prior to September 2, 1991:

Africa	20,000

East Asia	6,000
Eastern Europe	20,000
Former Soviet Union	17,000
Latin America/Caribbean	3,000
Near East/South Asia	10,000
Unallocated	4,000

The 4,000 unallocated numbers shall be allocated as needed to regional ceilings where shortfalls develop. Unused admissions numbers allocated to a particular region may be transferred to one or more other regions if there is an overriding need for greater numbers for the region or regions to which the numbers are being transferred. You are hereby authorized and directed to consult with the Judiciary Committees of the Congress prior to any such use of the unallocated numbers or reallocation of numbers from one region to another.

Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2601(b)(2), I hereby determine that assistance to or on behalf of persons applying for admission to the United States as part of the overseas refugee admissions program will contribute to the foreign policy interests of the United States and designate such persons for this purpose.

An additional 10,000 refugee admissions numbers shall be made available during FY 2001 for the adjustment to permanent resident status under section 209(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1159(b)) of aliens who have been granted asylum in the United States under section 208 of the Act (8 U.S.C. 1158), as this is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest.

In accordance with section 101(a)(42) of the Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(42)) and after appropriate consultation with the Congress, I also specify that, for FY 2001, the following persons may, if otherwise qualified, be considered refugees for the purpose of admission to the United States within their countries of nationality or habitual residence:

a. Persons in Vietnam
b. Persons in Cuba
c. Persons in the former Soviet Union

You are authorized and directed to report this determination to the Congress immediately and to publish it in the *Federal Register.*

William J. Clinton

cc: The Attorney General
The Secretary of Health and Human Services

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 5, 2000]

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

Memorandum on a Military Drawdown for Tunisia

September 29, 2000

Presidential Determination No. 2000–33

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense

Subject: Military Drawdown for Tunisia

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including Title III (Foreign Military Financing) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000, as enacted in Public Law 106–113 (Title III), I hereby direct the drawdown of defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense, and military education and training of the aggregate value of $4 million for Tunisia, consistent with the authority provided under Title III, for the purposes of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 5, 2000]

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

Proclamation 7346—National Breast Cancer Awareness Month, 2000

September 29, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As we once again observe National Breast Cancer Awareness Month, we can be heartened by the progress we have made in the battle against breast cancer. Today we have a better under standing of what causes the disease, and advances in research are leading to improvements in detection and diagnosis and to treatments that are improving patients' quality of life and chances of survival.

Two million Americans today are breast cancer survivors, thanks in large part to earlier detection and more effective treatments. Statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) show that nearly 70 percent of women aged 50 and older have had a mammogram in the past 2 years, compared with only 27 percent in 1987. While these increases were found among women at all income levels, those with lower incomes are still less likely to be screened than those at higher income levels. The National Cancer Institute (NCI) and the Health Care Financing Administration are working together to inform women aged 65 and older that Medicare coverage is available for mammography screenings; and the CDC's National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection provides free or low-cost mammograms to uninsured, low-income, and elderly women. And, to assist the thousands of low-income uninsured women whose breast cancer was detected through federally funded screening programs, my proposed budget for fiscal 2001 includes a new Medicaid option to fund the lifesaving follow-up treatment they need to increase their chances of survival.

Research is one of our most powerful tools in our effort to eradicate breast cancer, and I am proud that my Administration has made historic increases in funding for biomedical research. A number of Federal agencies and programs are adding to our knowledge about the disease. The National Toxicology Program (NTP), which is part of the National Institute of Environmental Health Services, is studying chemical compounds that may cause cancer in humans. Based on data from the NTP, agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency and the Food and Drug Administration are working to reduce human exposure to environ mental agents that might increase the risk for breast and other cancers. The NCI, through the Long Island Breast Cancer Study Project and the Triana Community Health Initiative, is exploring the possible relationship between different sources of pollution and the incidence of breast cancer. Findings from these studies will help researchers and health care providers identify women who are at higher risk for breast cancer and develop better strategies for preventing the disease.

The NCI's landmark Breast Cancer Prevention Trial (BCPT) focused on tamoxifen, an anti-estrogen medication that helps reduce the chance that women who are at higher risk for breast cancer will develop the disease. Building on the success of the BCPT, a current study of tamoxifen and raloxifene will determine whether raloxifene is as effective as tamoxifen, with fewer side effects. The NCI is also sponsoring clinical trials of sentinel node biopsy, a procedure where the surgical removal of a small number of lymph nodes can determine whether cancer has spread outside of the breast.

The American people have also played a role in funding research through activities such as the purchase of the 40-cent breast cancer awareness stamp from the U.S. Postal Service. The sale of this stamp has raised millions of dollars for breast cancer research, and, on July 28 of this year, I was proud to sign legislation authorizing the sale of this special stamp for an additional 2 years.

We are gaining ground in our fight against breast cancer, but we cannot become complacent. This year alone, more than 40,000 Americans will die from the disease, and an estimated 184,200 new cases will be diagnosed. We must continue to raise awareness among our friends, loved ones, and fellow citizens about the importance of screening and early detection and the need to support new research. By doing so, we will one day triumph over this devastating disease and ensure a brighter, healthier future for our children.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim October 2000 as National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. I call upon government officials, businesses, communities, health care professionals, educators, volunteers, and all the people of the United States to publicly reaffirm our Nation's strong and continuing commitment to controlling and curing breast cancer.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 3, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 30, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

Proclamation 7347—National Disability Employment Awareness Month, 2000

September 29, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and the 10th anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). These two landmark civil rights laws have opened the doors of opportunity for people with disabilities and increased our awareness of the enormous contributions that Americans with disabilities can make to our national life.

A decade ago, when we were debating the Americans with Disabilities Act, critics said that making workplaces, public transportation, public facilities, and telecommunications more accessible would be too costly and burdensome. But they have been proved wrong. Since passage of the ADA in 1990, more than a million men and women with disabilities have entered the labor force and, as taxpayers, consumers, and workers, they are contributing to a period of unprecedented prosperity and record employment in our country.

Throughout my Administration, we have worked hard to break down the barriers that people with disabilities continue to face on a daily basis. In 1998, I signed the Workforce Investment Act, requiring that information technology purchased by the Federal Government be accessible to people with disabilities. In 1999, I was proud to sign the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act, which enables Americans with disabilities to retain their Medicare or Medicaid coverage when they go to work, because no one should have to choose between health care and a job. We are also dramatically expanding the income students with disabilities can earn while retaining access to disability benefits; and to lead by example, we are hiring more people with disabilities throughout the Federal Government.

Today's revolution in information and communications technology offers us powerful new tools to expand employment and training opportunities for people with disabilities. Whether translating web pages aloud for people who are blind or visually impaired, creating captioning for those who are deaf or hard of hearing, or enabling people with physical disabilities to control a computer through eye movement and brain waves, these technologies show enormous potential for increasing access to employment and full participation in society. We are exploring ways that Medicare and Medicaid can be enhanced to cover the cost of assistive technology so that people can live and work more independently in the communities of their choosing. And I was pleased to announce on September 21 that dozens of corporate leaders from the technology sector and the presidents of many of America's leading research universities have pledged to make their products and services accessible to and usable by people with disabilities.

A new generation of young people with disabilities is growing up in America today—graduating from high school, going to college, and preparing to participate fully in the workplace. They have a right to make the

most of their potential, and our Nation must make the most of their intellect, talents, and abilities. By working together to break down barriers for Americans with disabilities, we will keep our economy growing, make a lasting investment in the future of our country, and uphold our fundamental commitment to justice and equality for all our people.

To recognize the enormous potential of individuals with disabilities and to encourage all Americans to work toward their full integration into the workforce, the Congress, by joint resolution approved August 11, 1945, as amended (36 U.S.C. 121), has designated October of each year as "National Disability Employment Awareness Month."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 2000 as National Disability Employment Awareness Month. I call upon Government officials, educators, labor leaders, employers, and the people of the United States to observe this month with appropriate programs and activities that reaffirm our determination to fulfill the letter and spirit of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 3, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 30, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

Proclamation 7349—Child Health Day, 2000

September 29, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As parents and as concerned citizens, we have a profound responsibility to ensure that America's children not only receive a healthy start in life, but also that they continue to grow and develop in a nurturing environment where they have the opportunity to reach their full potential.

Recognizing the importance of healthy, happy children to the future of our Nation, my Administration has strived to offer America's families the tools they need to fulfill their responsibilities. In 1997, I was proud to sign into law the Child Health Insurance Program (CHIP), the largest investment in children's health care since the creation of Medicaid 35 years ago. This innovative program allows States to use Federal funds to provide health insurance for children of working families whose incomes are too high to qualify for Medicaid but too low to afford private health insurance. Children with health insurance are more likely to receive the immunizations and other preventive care they need to avoid serious illnesses and to enjoy a healthier start in life. In March of 1997, only 4 States provided such coverage for children. Today, 30 States have plans approved to cover qualified children, and I have proposed an additional $5.5 billion over the next 10 years to cover even more children and to raise awareness of CHIP among families who may not realize they are eligible.

In addition to quality health care, children need nutritious meals every day. I am pleased that our national school lunch program provides healthy lunches to more than 25 million students in more than 96,000 schools across our nation, ensuring that some of our most vulnerable children can look forward to at least one healthy meal each day. We can also be heartened to know that children enrolled in programs funded under the Department of Agriculture's Special Supplemental Program for Women, Infants, and Children not only receive the nutritious food they need, but also are immunized earlier, perform better in school, and spend less time in the doctor's office.

Since 1965, in addition to engaging parents in the early educational development of their children, the Head Start program has provided medical, mental health, nutrition, and dental services to more than 17 million children from birth to age 5. My Administration will continue this investment by increasing Head Start funding in our proposed fiscal

2001 budget by $1 billion—the largest Head Start expansion in history.

It is also our responsibility to ensure that our children feel part of a safe, strong, nurturing community. Through our Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative, my Administration is helping parents, school principals, police, and mental health providers to collaborate on local solutions to school and youth violence. My proposed budget for fiscal 2001 includes an increase of more than $100 million for this program. I have also called on the Congress to allow eligible workers under the Family and Medical Leave Act to take up to 24 hours of additional leave each year to meet family obligations, including school activities such as parent-teacher conferences. America is enjoying a period of unprecedented economic success today; but we will never be truly successful as a Nation until we ensure that all families have the tools and opportunity they need in order to raise healthy children. To acknowledge the importance of our children's health, the Congress, by joint resolution approved May 18, 1928, as amended (36 U.S.C. 105), has called for the designation of the first Monday in October as "Child Health Day" and has requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this day.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Monday, October 2, 2000, as Child Health Day. I call upon families, schools, communities, and governments to dedicate themselves to promoting and protecting the health and well-being of all our children.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 3, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 30, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

The President's Radio Address

September 30, 2000

Good morning. This has been a good week for America. As our athletes continue to pile up medals in Sydney, our economy continues to break records at home. This week we learned that household income had reached an all-time high, poverty a 20-year low; the budget surplus is the largest on record; and for the first time in 12 years, thanks largely to the Children's Health Insurance Program, the number of Americans without health insurance has declined by over 1½ million.

Today I want to talk with you about making the most of this moment, by putting our children's education first and building better schools for them.

This fall our schools opened their doors to the largest number of students in history. We have to work hard to give them the best education in history. We're working to turn our schools around, with higher standards, stronger accountability, and more investment. Reading, math, and SAT scores are up. So are high school graduation and college-going rates. We dramatically increased Head Start, after-school, and summer school programs. The number of students in States with core curriculum standards has increased from 14 to 49, and in State after State, failing schools are being turned around.

With the Vice President's E-rate program, we've helped connect 95 percent of our schools to the Internet, and we're in the process of hiring 100,000 high-quality teachers to reduce class size in the early grades.

But it's hard for students to lift themselves up in schools that are falling down. Across our Nation, students are struggling to learn in schools that are crowded and crumbling. I visited schools all over the country where this is so: a school in Florida where classes were held not in one or two but 12 trailers; a school in Queens, where there were 400 more students than the school was built for; a school in Virginia, where the electrical service in some classrooms is so poor that if you plug in a new computer in the wall, the circuit breaker cuts off.

This is a challenge all across our country, in cities and rural areas, small towns and Native American communities. The average

American school building is now more than 40 years old. The estimated price tag to bring our schools into good condition—$127 billion.

Today I'm releasing a new Department of Education analysis that highlights the nationwide need to build new schools and modernize existing ones. The study provides a State-by-State report card that shows that at least 60 percent of the schools in every State are in need of repair. Many States and local communities are working to fix their schools, but too many school districts simply don't have the tax base to handle the burden alone.

That's why I've proposed a school construction tax credit to help communities build or modernize 6,000 schools and, also, grants and loans for emergency repairs in nearly 5,000 schools a year for 5 years.

The good news is, we have a bipartisan majority in the House of Representatives ready right now to pass school construction relief. But the Republican leadership continues to stand in the way and refuses to bring it to a vote. Every day they stall is another day our children are forced to go to school in trailers, overcrowded classrooms, and crumbling buildings. Congress must act now.

In a larger sense, this is about our priorities and values. The schools I attended as a child were fairly old, but they were very well-maintained. They sent every student a clear message: You are important; we take your education seriously. That's how my parents' generation kept faith with us and how we must keep faith with our children.

But the clock is ticking. At midnight tonight the fiscal year runs out. Congress still hasn't sent me a budget for education and other pressing priorities. Yet, they have found the time, first, to pass huge, fiscally irresponsible tax cuts and then, after I vetoed them, to load up the spending bills with hundreds of millions of dollars in special interest projects. In one appropriations bill alone, there is $668 million in extra projects. That's enough to do emergency repairs in 2,500 schools, to send another one million children to after-school programs, to hire over 15,000 teachers to lower class size.

Not long ago, Senator McCain said, pork barrel spending, and I quote, "has lurched completely out of control." Well, it's time to turn off the pork barrel spigot and deliver for our children's future.

That's why I've told my budget team to seek final negotiations on an education budget that stays true to our values and our children's long-term needs. We're not going to leave the table until we invest in modernizing our schools and continue our efforts to hire 100,000 quality teachers for smaller classes. We're going to keep fighting to strengthen accountability, to turn around failing schools or shut them down or put them under new management, to expand after-school programs and college opportunities for young people, and to ensure a qualified teacher in every classroom.

Our children deserve 21st century schools. In this time of prosperity, we have a responsibility to make sure they get no less. By building stronger schools, we'll build a stronger America in the future.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:48 p.m. on September 29 in the Oval Office at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on September 30. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 29 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast.

Proclamation 7348—National Domestic Violence Awareness Month, 2000

September 29, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Domestic violence transcends all ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic boundaries. Its perpetrators abuse their victims both physically and mentally, and the effects of their attacks are far-reaching—weakening the very core of our communities. Domestic violence is particularly devastating because it so often occurs in the privacy of the home, which is meant to be a place of shelter and security. During the month of October, all Americans should contemplate the scars that domestic violence leaves on our society and what each of us can do to prevent it.

Because domestic violence usually takes place in private, many Americans may not realize how widespread it is. According to the National Violence Against Women Survey, conducted jointly by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institute of Justice, each year in the United States approximately 1.5 million women are raped and/or physically assaulted by their current or former husbands, partners, or boyfriends. Many of these women are victimized more than once over the course of a year. As unsettling as these statistics are, it is also disturbing to realize that the children of battered women frequently witness these attacks, thus becoming victims themselves.

My Administration has worked hard to reduce domestic violence in our Nation and to assist victims and their families. The cornerstone of our efforts has been the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), which the Congress passed with bipartisan support in 1994 and which I signed into law as part of our comprehensive crime control bill. This important piece of legislation, which contains a broad array of ground-breaking measures to combat violence against women, combines tough penalties with programs to prosecute offenders and provide assistance to women who are survivors of violence.

In the 6 years since I signed VAWA into law, the legislation has provided more than $1.6 billion to support prosecutors, law enforcement officials, courts, victim advocates, and intervention efforts. We have quadrupled funding for battered women's shelters, created the National Domestic Violence Hotline, and supported community outreach and prevention programs, children's counseling, and child protection services. The Department of Justice has awarded more than 900 discretionary grants and 280 STOP (Services, Training, Officers, Prosecutors) Violence Against Women formula grants to help State, tribal, and local governments and community-based organizations establish specialized domestic violence and sexual assault units, train personnel, enforce laws, develop policies, assist victims of violence, and hold abusers accountable.

These VAWA programs are making a difference across the country. A recent report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics shows that the number of women experiencing violence at the hands of an intimate partner declined 21 percent from 1993 to 1998. I call on the Congress to reauthorize and strengthen VAWA so that we may continue to build on the progress we have made in combating domestic violence in our Nation.

Through VAWA and other initiatives and programs, we are striving to create a responsive legal system in American communities that not only prevents domestic violence and sexual assault, but also ensures that every victim has immediate access to helpful information and emergency assistance. By taking strong public action against this crime, we are creating a society that promotes strong values, fosters a safe, loving home environment for every family, and refuses to tolerate domestic violence in any form.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim October 2000 as National Domestic Violence Awareness Month. I call upon government officials, law enforcement agencies, health professionals, educators, community leaders, and the American people to join together to end the domestic violence that threatens so many of our people.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 3, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 2, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

Remarks on the Student Loan Program and Student Assistance

October 2, 2000

Give her another hand. Wasn't she great? [*Applause*] Good job. Thank you. You know, I thought I'd be having withdrawal today,

after the Olympics—[*laughter*]—and I was wondering what I would do for an encore, and the answer was, meet Raquel. [*Laughter*] Thank you very much for being here and for your example.

And Secretary Riley, to you and to all these wonderful people at the Department of Education, I thank you for the astonishing work you've done on the student loan program and on student assistance, generally.

When I ran for President in 1991, late 1991 and 1992, I talked a lot about redoing the student loan program and increasing access to financial assistance through grants, work study, tax credits, and an improved student loan program. I'll never forget one night; it was about 1990, I think. I was then serving as Governor of my home State, and I was up in Fayetteville, Arkansas, which is the home of the University of Arkansas. And a friend of mine and I went out to a coffee shop to have a cup of coffee.

And I did what I always do; I went around and shook hands with everybody at all the tables in there. [*Laughter*] And there were three young students there having coffee, so I sat down and started talking to them. Two of them were planning to drop out of school. They were already in college—I'll never forget this. And I asked them why in the world they would do that, given the fact that the economy that they would live in for their adult lives put a higher premium on education than ever before.

And both of them said they had to go ahead and get out and work for a couple of years because they knew they could not meet their student loan repayment schedule. And they didn't want to take the money and not be able to pay it back. And it had a searing impact on me. So I said, "Surely, these people are the exception to the rule," so I started nosing around and come to find out there were a lot of people like this.

And that's basically how we got into the idea of the direct student loan with the option to repay as a percentage of your income. I also found a lot of young people who wanted to be teachers, like Raquel, or police officers or nurses, who instead were taking jobs that they found less rewarding but paid more money so they could meet their loan repayment schedule.

The background to all these things that we're going to talk about here in a minute, for me at least, came alive through the stories of young people I met. And then when I went around the country in 1992, I met more and more and more of them. So, Raquel, I'm grateful to you, but I'm also grateful to all those young people, many whose names I don't even know, who took the time to share their stories and tell me about the personal challenges they faced. And it was very important to me because I never could have gotten through college and law school without loans and grants and jobs. And I wanted everybody else to have those opportunities, as well.

Now, one of the big problems we faced in 1993, when I took office, is that the student loan program itself was in danger because its credibility, its very financial underpinnings were threatened by a very high default rate. Nearly one in four students was failing, for a variety of reasons, to repay their student loans. And yet, again I say, we all knew that we needed more people going on to college, not fewer people. So the trick was how to figure out how to get more people to go to college and do a better job of collecting on the student loans and get people to be more responsible in discharging their student loans.

Since 1993, as Secretary Riley said, we have more than doubled our investment in student aid. We've increased Pell grants; expanded work-study slots from 700,000 to a million; created AmeriCorps, which has now given more than 150,000 young people a chance to earn money for college while serving in our communities; created education IRA's, the $1,500 HOPE scholarship tax credit for the first 2 years of college, and then a lifelong learning credit for the junior and senior years and for graduate school. More than 5 million families already have taken advantage of the HOPE scholarship tax credit in '98 and '99.

We made it easier and cheaper to get loans and for students now to pay them back as a percentage of their future income, and you heard Raquel talking about that.

The Direct Student Loan Program we started, also by fostering competition, have saved students more than $9 billion in loan repayment costs, just from lower interest

rates alone. Taken together, these actions amount to the largest increases in college access and opportunity since the passage of the GI bill after World War II. And we can now say to every student in America, "The money is there. You can actually go on to college." This is profoundly important.

Students are getting the message; two-thirds of them are now going to college. That's up more than 10 percent over the last few years. We have also tried, as I said, to increase responsibility for repaying these loans. Otherwise, the whole thing would be undermined over the long run. And here's what the Department of Education did, and again, it's just another example of Secretary Riley's sterling leadership and the great qualities of the people there. But here's what they essentially did to reduce the student loan default rate.

First, identified more than 800 schools with consistently high default rates that were obviously not serving their students, and they were eliminated from the program.

Second, more flexible repayment schedules were offered. Students no longer have to default on their loans simply because they're going through a period in their lives where they don't have all the resources they need to make full repayments.

Third, we slashed the cost of the loans, themselves, so it's more affordable to pay them back. A typical $10,000 student loan today costs $1,300 less in fees and interest costs than it did 8 years ago. That's astonishing—$1,300 less on a $10,000 loan. I guess that sort of explains why some people thought our attempts to establish this program so—[*laughter*]—that $1,300 was going somewhere. [*Laughter*]

Fourth, students are borrowing less than they otherwise would have because of the increases in Pell grants, HOPE scholarships, and other tax credits, and the work-study aid and other student aid. And finally, of course, a stronger economy has made it easier for students to repay their loans.

But listen to this. Thanks to all these factors, today, the student loan default rate has been cut by two-thirds—actually, more than two-thirds. When I took office, the default rate was 22.4 percent; today, it is 6.9 percent. Here's a really impressive thing: This is the lowest default rate in the history of the student loan program, and it has been achieved while tripling the number of loans given every year. Normally, you think if you give more loans, you'll be loaning more at the margin of risk. This is an astonishing achievement. And Secretary Riley, you should be very proud. I thank your whole team. This is an amazing, amazing thing.

By cutting defaults, increasing collections, and making the system more competitive, we have saved taxpayers and students—the students have saved $9 billion, and the taxpayers have saved twice that much, $18 billion, because of the reduction in student loan defaults since 1993. That is very good news for the American people, a total of $27 billion in savings.

Let me say that this lesson—invest more and have more accountability and have the programs work based on how the real world, the real lives of these students is unfolding—that's the kind of thing I think we ought to do in education generally. And I'd like to say just a few words about the education budget and priorities now pending before the Congress.

For more than 7 years, we've tried to invest more in our schools, in more teachers, smaller classes, more Head Start, more after-school and summer school programs, hooking up 95 percent of the schools to the Internet. We've also demanded more from our schools: higher standards, more accountability for results, more responsibility for turning around failing schools. Secretary Riley points out when we took office, there were only about 14 States with real standards and a core curriculum. Today, there are 49 States. And we got a change in the Federal law to require the States to identify their failing schools and have strategies to turn them around.

We wanted to go further, in terms of the standards for the tests that the students take, through the nonpartisan national association for student testing, called NAGB. And we also would like to pass legislation that requires States to turn around the failing schools in a fixed amount of time or shut them down or put them under new management.

But we have made a lot of progress. Math and reading scores are rising across America—some of the greatest gains in some of the most disadvantaged schools. The number of students taking advanced placement courses has risen by two-thirds in 8 years: among Hispanic students, by about 300 percent; among African-American students, by about 500 percent—taking advance placement courses. College entrance exam scores are rising, even as more students from more disadvantaged backgrounds take the test. That is not an education recession. That is an education revival.

But on the other hand, no serious person believes that American education is where it ought to be. We have the largest and most diverse student body in the history of our country. We have what is immensely frustrating to me, which is evidence that every problem in American education has been solved by somebody, somewhere, but we have still, after almost 20 years of serious effort in education reform, not succeeded in institutionalizing what works in one or two schools right across a school district or right across a State.

So there are lots and lots of challenges still out there. And what I believe we should be doing is to emphasize further changes in the direction we have been moving. We need more investment, and we need more accountability. And we need to understand the central importance of teachers, of principals, of modern facilities, and of genuine, effective accountability systems.

Now, that's my problem with the present congressional budget. The majority in Congress is pushing a budget that would neither increase investment or accountability. It abandons the bipartisan commitment we made just last year to hire 100,000 new highly qualified teachers to reduce class size in the early grades. It fails to guarantee investments in building or modernizing classrooms, when we know that the construction and repair deficit in America's classrooms is over $120 billion today. It shortchanges investment in after-school programs, in improving teacher quality, in our efforts to turn around schools or shut them down or reopen them under new management.

Even though they claim to be for accountability, the one proven strategy we've gotten that I've seen over and over and over work—from small rural schools in Kentucky to urban schools in California and New York and Ohio—a strategy to identify the schools, turn them around, shut them down, or put them under new management, they failed to support this strategy.

It underfunds our GEAR UP program to get disadvantaged students focused on and prepared for college. It fails to give hard-pressed middle class families a $10,000 tax deduction for college tuition, which they desperately need.

Now, we've got a $230 billion surplus, folks. This Congress voted to get rid of the estate tax, to give a $6.5 million tax break to some Americans. They voted for a marriage penalty relief that didn't just relieve the marriage penalty but gave other upper income Americans huge tax breaks. The least we can do is adequately invest in education. More Americans will make more money, including already wealthy Americans, by having an educated work force in this country, than by anything we can do in giving specialized tax cuts. And we ought to do it and do it now.

We have evidence that, if you invest more and demand more, you can turn the schools around, improve student achievement, get more of our young people going to college, and, as we've seen today in stunning fashion, make the student loan program work better for more students and for the American taxpayers as well.

This is worth fighting for. We now have lots and lots of evidence that if we invest more, and do it in an intelligent way, we can produce real results for the American people. There is no more powerful example than what Secretary Riley and the Department of Education, along with people that have worked with them throughout the country, in college and university after college and university, and more responsible, active students, have done to turn this student loan program around.

Now, it will be available for more and more and more students, and it will do more good, for more and more and more students. We need more stories like Raquel Talley's.

We need more young people like her, who want to give their lives to the education of our children. And we ought to do whatever is necessary to make sure, number one, they can go to college, get out, and succeed, and number two, when someone like her goes in the classroom, the rest of us do whatever we can to make sure she succeeds in the classroom, as well.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:05 a.m. in Presidential Hall in the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Raquel Talley, student loan recipient who introduced the President; and NAGB, the National Assessment Governing Board.

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

October 2, 2000

Debt Relief for Poor Countries

The President. Just before you all came in, I looked around this table and I said, "I imagine this is the most amazing group of Americans who has gathered together here in this room since Theodore Roosevelt inaugurated it in 1902." And I thank them all for coming. I think it shows you the depth and breadth of commitment of congressional, religious, and civic leaders to convince Congress to appropriate the entire $435 million that we pledged in debt relief to the world's poorest countries and to authorize the International Monetary Fund to do its share as well.

It's not often we have a chance to do something that economists tell us is the financial imperative and religious leaders say is a moral imperative. It's not often that we find an issue that puts John Kasich and Maxine Waters on the same side, economists and evangelicals in the same room. All of us feel a common obligation to do the right thing.

In the most indebted countries, one in ten children dies before his or her first birthday; one in three is malnourished; the average adult has only 3 years of schooling. This is a terrible omen for our shared future on this planet, and it is wrong.

More than a year ago, religious leaders organized a very successful global campaign for debt relief. It touched many of us here today and generated strong bipartisan support in the Congress. The United States developed a plan with other creditor nations to triple debt relief available to the world's poorest nations, provided they agreed to put the savings from debt payments into health and education. Here are the results so far.

Last year Bolivia saved $77 million and spent it on health and education. Uganda used its savings to double its primary school enrollment. Honduras now intends to offer every child 9 years of schooling, instead of 6. Mozambique is buying much needed medicines for Government clinics, especially important there in light of the terrible floods they experienced.

Now, other nations are watching to see if the United States will do its part. If we don't, it's possible that some nations will do all the work that we should have done to qualify, or that they needed to do to qualify, but they won't get any relief at all.

Now, let me remind you, we are talking here about one-five-thousandth of our budget to lift the burden of debt around the world for years to come. We're talking about giving as many as 33 nations a chance for a new beginning and about doing good works that our different faiths demand of us. This is a remarkable opportunity that we must seize now, and we must not let other issues divert us from it.

Again, I'm profoundly grateful to all of you for coming and to you, especially, Representative Kasich, for making sure that this is a broad bipartisan group. So I'd like to open the floor to you to say a few words.

[*At this point, Representative John Kasich, Representative Nancy Pelosi, and Archbishop Theodore McCarrick, U.S. Catholic Conference, made brief remarks.*]

The President. Thank you. I'd just like to make one more point that I think none of us made, but it's worth making. And again, I want to say this is an amazing group. Rabbi, we thank you for coming. Reverend Robertson and all the Members of Congress. Bono, thanks for coming back from Ireland.

There is another point that should be made here. Some of the people who have not supported us have said, "Well, so many countries have problems of their own making, they've got to solve their own problems." The unique thing about this debt-relief initiative is that the money has to go to meet the human needs of the people. It cannot go to pad the government; it cannot go to pad private pockets; it cannot go to build military arsenals. It can only go to meet long-term human needs.

So that if we can do this, one of the best long-term benefits will be we will be providing a breathtaking incentive for good governance in these countries, which will enable them to do things for their own people that would have been unimaginable just a few years ago. So that's another reason that I am profoundly grateful to all of you for this.

Now, we'll take a couple of questions and we've got to——

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, two questions. First, over the weekend, did you personally see the videotape of the 12-year-old Palestinian boy who was shot over the weekend, and have you got a reaction to it? And secondly, sir, what assurances have you received in the last 24 hours from either Prime Minister Barak or Chairman Arafat that they are doing all that they can to bring a cessation to the violence?

The President. The answer to your first question is, I did see it.

Q. Your reaction, sir?

The President. The first time I saw it, I didn't know what the result was, and I kept wondering if there was something else that the father could do to shield the child. I mean, I was literally watching as if it were someone I knew. It was a heartbreaking thing to see a child like that caught in the crossfire.

I've talked to Chairman Arafat. I've talked to Prime Minister Barak. We've had virtually constant contact with them. I am convinced that they must do everything in their power to stop the violence, and I think they are now trying. And we're going to do everything we can. We have—as you know from the statement I put out yesterday, we've offered some ideas, and we've been working on this all day. So we'll just have to see if we make some more progress tomorrow morning over there. I think it will be better tomorrow. I hope it will.

Debt Relief for Poor Countries

Q. On the debt relief issue, the holdup seems to be Senators Gramm and McConnell. What can you offer them to get this moving?

The President. Well, I don't know what else we can offer them but the evidence. I think if we just keep working at it, we might get there. We have such a good, broad bipartisan group here that I think in the end that we'll be able to work it out with them. And we're certainly working on it.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, in your talks with the Israelis and Palestinians, do you get the impression that the recent violence is helping them move along towards wanting to reach an agreement? Or is it hurting things?

The President. Well, in the short run, it's hurting them, because they can't do anything on the peace process until people stop dying and the violence stops. But when the smoke clears here, it might actually be a spur to both sides as a sober reminder to what the alternative to peace could be. So we have to hope and pray that will be the result.

Thank you all very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:40 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Rev. M.G. (Pat) Robertson, president, Christian Coalition; musician Bono; Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; and Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of Representative Kasich, Representative Pelosi, and Archbishop McCarrick.

Statement on Energy and Water Development Appropriations Legislation

October 2, 2000

Today Congress passed a deeply flawed energy/water appropriations bill that threatens major environmental harm by blocking our efforts to modernize operations on the

Missouri River. An anti-environmental rider attached to the bill would not only jeopardize the survival of three threatened and endangered species but would also establish a dangerous precedent aimed at barring a Federal agency from obeying one of our Nation's landmark environmental statutes. Accordingly, I will veto this bill when it reaches my desk.

While this bill funds scores of special projects for special interests, it fails to provide sufficient funding for priorities in the national interest—including environmental restoration of the Florida Everglades and the California Bay-Delta, and our strategy to restore endangered salmon in the Pacific Northwest. It also fails to fund efforts to research and develop nonpolluting sources of energy through solar and renewable technologies that are vital to America's energy security.

I urge Congress to resolve these issues in an environmentally sound manner and to quickly produce an energy/water bill I can sign. While we are now in the first week of the new fiscal year, Congress still has sent me only two of the 13 appropriations bills. Congress should complete its work without delay.

Statement on Caribbean Basin Initiative and African Growth and Opportunity Act Beneficiary Countries

October 2, 2000

I am pleased to release today a list of countries eligible for trade benefits under the Caribbean Basin Initiative and African Growth and Opportunity Act legislation enacted last spring. By expanding our trade relationship with 34 sub-Saharan African countries and 24 Caribbean Basin countries, we will help promote economic development, alleviate global poverty, and create new economic opportunities for American workers and businesses. This action truly marks a new era of stronger relations between the United States and our friends in the Caribbean, Central America, and Africa.

Proclamation 7350—To Implement the African Growth and Opportunity Act and To Designate Eritrea as a Beneficiary Developing Country for Purposes of the Generalized System of Preferences

October 2, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

1. Section 111(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (Title I of Public Law 106–200) (AGOA) amends Title V of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the "1974 Act"), to provide, in new section 506A(a) (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)), that the President is authorized to designate countries listed in section 107 of the AGOA as "beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries."

2. Section 112(a) of the AGOA (19 U.S.C. 3721(a)) provides that eligible textile and apparel articles that are imported directly into the customs territory of the United States from a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country shall enter the United States free of duty and free of quantitative limitations, provided that the country has satisfied the requirements of section 113(a) of the AGOA (19 U.S.C. 3722(a)) relating to the establishment of procedures to protect against unlawful transshipments, and section 113(b)(1)(B) of the AGOA (19 U.S.C. 3722(b)(1)(B)) relating to the implementation of procedures and requirements similar to those in chapter 5 of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

3. Section 112(b)(3)(B) of the AGOA (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(B)) provides special rules for certain apparel articles imported from "lesser developed beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries."

4. Section 112(c) of the AGOA (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)) provides that the President shall eliminate the existing quotas on textile and apparel articles imported into the United States (a) from Kenya within 30 days after that country adopts an effective visa system to prevent unlawful transshipment of textile and apparel articles and the use of counterfeit documents relating to the importation of the articles into the United States, and (b)

from Mauritius within 30 days after that country adopts such a visa system.

5. In order to implement the tariff treatment provided under the AGOA, it is necessary to modify the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS), thereby incorporating the substance of the relevant provisions of the AGOA.

6. Sections 501 and 502 of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2461 and 2462) authorize the President to designate countries as beneficiary developing countries for purposes of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP).

7. Section 604 of the 1974 Act (19 U.S.C. 2483) authorizes the President to embody in the HTS the substance of the relevant provisions of that Act, and of other acts affecting import treatment, and actions thereunder, including the removal, modification, continuance, or imposition of any rate of duty or other import restriction.

8. I have determined that it is appropriate to authorize the United States Trade Representative (USTR) to perform the functions specified in sections 112(c) and 113(b)(1)(B) of the AGOA and to make the findings identified in section 113(a) of the AGOA and to perform certain functions under section 604 of the 1974 Act.

9. For Sierra Leone, I have determined that it is appropriate to authorize the USTR to determine the effective date of its designation as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including section 301 of title 3, United States Code, sections 111, 112, and 113 of the AGOA, and sections 501, 502, 506A, and 604 of the 1974 Act, do proclaim that:

(1) In order to provide for the preferential treatment provided for in section 112(a) of the AGOA, the HTS is modified as provided in the Annex to this proclamation.

(2) The following countries are designated as beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries pursuant to section 506A(a) of the 1974 Act:

Republic of Benin
Republic of Botswana
Republic of Cape Verde
Republic of Cameroon
Central African Republic
Republic of Chad
Republic of Congo
Republic of Djibouti
State of Eritrea
Ethiopia
Gabonese Republic
Republic of Ghana
Republic of Guinea
Republic of Guinea-Bissau
Republic of Kenya
Kingdom of Lesotho
Republic of Madagascar
Republic of Malawi
Republic of Mali
Islamic Republic of Mauritania
Republic of Mauritius
Republic of Mozambique
Republic of Namibia
Republic of Niger
Federal Republic of Nigeria
Republic of Rwanda
Democratic Republic of São Tomé and Principe
Republic of Senegal
Republic of Seychelles
Republic of Sierra Leone
Republic of South Africa
United Republic of Tanzania
Republic of Uganda
Republic of Zambia

(3) For purposes of section 112(b)(3)(B) of the AGOA, the following designated beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be considered lesser developed beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries:

Republic of Benin
Republic of Cape Verde
Republic of Cameroon
Central African Republic
Republic of Chad
Republic of Congo
Republic of Djibouti
State of Eritrea
Ethiopia
Republic of Ghana
Republic of Guinea
Republic of Guinea-Bissau
Republic of Kenya
Kingdom of Lesotho
Republic of Madagascar
Republic of Malawi

Republic of Mali
Islamic Republic of Mauritania
Republic of Mozambique
Republic of Niger
Federal Republic of Nigeria
Republic of Rwanda
Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe
Republic of Senegal
Republic of Sierra Leone
United Republic of Tanzania
Republic of Uganda
Republic of Zambia

(4) The USTR is authorized to determine whether each designated beneficiary sub-Saharan African country has satisfied the requirements of section 113(a) of the AGOA relating to the establishment of procedures to protect against unlawful transshipments and section 113(b)(1)(B) of the AGOA relating to the implementation of procedures and requirements similar in all material respects to the relevant procedures and requirements under chapter 5 of the NAFTA. The determination or determinations of the USTR under this paragraph shall be set forth in a notice or notices that the USTR shall cause to be published in the *Federal Register*. Such notice or notices shall modify the HTS by listing the countries that satisfy the requirements of sections 113(a) and 113(b)(1)(B) of the AGOA. To implement such determination or determinations, the USTR is authorized to exercise the authority provided to the President under section 604 of the 1974 Act to embody modifications and technical or conforming changes in the HTS.

(5) The USTR is authorized to determine whether Kenya and Mauritius have satisfied the requirements of section 112(c) of the AGOA. The determination or determinations of the USTR under this paragraph shall be set forth in a notice or notices that the USTR shall cause to be published in the *Federal Register*. Within 30 days after any such determination by the USTR, the USTR shall cause the existing quotas on textile and apparel articles imported into the United States from such country to be eliminated by direction to the appropriate agencies or departments. To implement such determination or determinations, the USTR is authorized to exercise the authority provided to the President under section 604 of the 1974 Act to embody modifications and technical or conforming changes in the HTS.

(6) The USTR is authorized to determine the effective date of the designation of the Republic of Sierra Leone as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and, therefore, the date upon which Sierra Leone will be considered a lesser developed beneficiary sub-Saharan African country. The determination of the USTR under this paragraph shall be set forth in a notice that the USTR shall cause to be published in the *Federal Register*. To implement such determination, the USTR is authorized to exercise the authority provided to the President under section 604 of the 1974 Act to embody modifications and technical or conforming changes in the HTS.

(7) Pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the 1974 Act, Eritrea is designated as a beneficiary developing country for purposes of the GSP.

(8) In order to reflect in the HTS the designation of Eritrea as a beneficiary developing country under the GSP, general note 4(a) to the HTS is modified by inserting in alphabetical sequence "Eritrea" in the list of independent countries.

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

(10) This proclamation is effective on the date of signature of this proclamation, except that (a) the modifications to the HTS made by the Annex to this proclamation, as further modified by any notice to be published in the *Federal Register* as described in paragraph 4 of this proclamation, shall be effective on the date announced by the USTR in such notice, and (b) the designation of the Republic of Sierra Leone as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country shall be effective on the date announced by the USTR in the *Federal Register*.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:03 a.m., October 3, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

Proclamation 7351—To Implement the United States-Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act

October 2, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

1. Section 211 of the United States-Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act (Title II of Public Law 106–200) (CBTPA), which amends section 213(b) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA) (19 U.S.C. 2703(b)), provides that certain preferential tariff treatment may be provided to eligible articles that are the product of any country that the President designates as a "CBTPA beneficiary country" pursuant to section 213(b)(5)(B) of the CBERA (19 U.S.C. 2703(b)(5)(B)), provided that the President determines that the country has satisfied the requirements of section 213(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the CBERA (19 U.S.C. 2703(b)(4)(A)(ii)) relating to the implementation of procedures and requirements similar to those in chapter 5 of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

2. Section 211 of the CBTPA, which amends section 213(b) of the CBERA (19 U.S.C. 2703(b)), provides that eligible textile and apparel articles of a designated CBTPA beneficiary country shall enter the United States free of duty and free of quantitative limitations, provided that the President determines that the country has satisfied the requirements of section 213(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the CBERA relating to the implementation of procedures and requirements similar to those in chapter 5 of the NAFTA.

3. Section 212 of the CBTPA, which amends section 213(a) of the CBERA (19 U.S.C. 2703(a)), provides duty-free treatment for certain liqueurs and spirituous beverages produced in Canada from rum that originates in a designated beneficiary country or the Virgin Islands of the United States.

4. In order to implement the tariff treatment provided under the CBTPA, it is necessary to modify the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS), thereby incorporating the substance of the relevant provisions of the CBTPA.

5. Section 604 of the Trade Act of 1974 (the "1974 Act") (19 U.S.C. 2483) authorizes the President to embody in the HTS the substance of the relevant provisions of that Act, and of other acts affecting import treatment, and actions thereunder, including the removal, modification, continuance, or imposition of any rate of duty or other import restriction.

6. I have determined that it is appropriate to authorize the United States Trade Representative (USTR) to perform the functions specified in section 213(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the CBERA and certain functions under section 604 of the 1974 Act.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including section 301 of title 3, United States Code, sections 211 and 212 of the CBTPA, section 213 of the CBERA, and section 604 of the 1974 Act, do proclaim that:

(1) In order to provide for the preferential treatment provided for in section 213 of the CBERA (19 U.S.C. 2703), as amended by the CBTPA, the HTS is modified as provided in the Annex to this proclamation.

(2) The following countries are designated as CBTPA beneficiary countries pursuant to section 213(b)(5)(B) of the CBERA:

Antigua and Barbuda
Aruba
Bahamas
Barbados
Belize
Costa Rica
Dominica
Dominican Republic
El Salvador
Grenada
Guatemala
Guyana
Haiti
Honduras
Jamaica
Montserrat

Netherlands Antilles
Nicaragua
Panama
St. Kitts and Nevis
Saint Lucia
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Trinidad and Tobago
British Virgin Islands

(3) The USTR is authorized to determine whether each designated beneficiary country has satisfied the requirements of section 213(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the CBERA relating to the implementation of procedures and requirements similar in all material respects to the relevant procedures and requirements under chapter 5 of the NAFTA. To implement such determination or determinations, the USTR is authorized to exercise the authority provided to the President under section 604 of the 1974 Act to embody modifications and technical or conforming changes in the HTS. The determination or determinations of the USTR under this paragraph shall be set forth in a notice or notices that the USTR shall cause to be published in the *Federal Register*. Such notice or notices shall modify general note 17 of the HTS by listing the countries that satisfy the requirements of section 213(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the CBERA.

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

(5) This proclamation is effective on the date of signature of this proclamation, except that the modifications to the HTS made by the Annex to this proclamation, as further modified by any notice to be published in the *Federal Register* as described in paragraph 3 of this proclamation, shall be effective on the date announced by the USTR in such notice.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:03 a.m., October 3, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

Remarks at a Reception for Montana Gubernatorial Running Mates Mark O'Keefe and Carol Williams

October 2, 2000

Thank you very much. Well, first of all, thank you for your warm welcome, and thank you for being here for Carol and for Mark O'Keefe. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for making the trip from Montana. Thank you, Senator Baucus, for your friendship and support and wise counsel to me over these last 8 years. Thank you, Pat Williams, for casting that deciding vote, putting your own neck on the line, and giving America a lifeline. I want to thank the other Members of Congress and former Members who are here, including Bob Matsui and his wife, Doris. And thank you, Bruce Morrison, for being here. I know your wife runs this joint. [*Laughter*] Nancy, thank you very much.

Carol, thank you for running. And I want to say a little more about this wonderful house in a moment. Thank you, Maggie O'Keefe, for coming out here from Montana and for being a teenager involved in public life. I think that's a good thing. And I want to thank Carol and Pat for something else. I want to thank you for your wonderful daughter, Whitney, who's been so great to Hillary and me these last several years, who is here.

You know, I love Montana. I think that the vacation that Hillary and Chelsea and I had in Montana when Ted Schwinden was Governor and took us around and up in a little helicopter at dawn over the Missouri River, in 1985, was one of the best family vacations we ever had. I still have a vivid memory of every part of it. Chelsea had the opportunity to work there last summer—the summer before last, now—for a few weeks on a ranch, for which I am very grateful.

And I had the opportunity to campaign there and to meet, among other things, with a large number of tribal leaders. I never will forget the experience I had there in 1992, which was one of the seminal events for me in steeling my determination to try to do

something to get the relationship between the United States Government and our tribal governments right, and to try to do more to empower the Native American population to be part of our prosperity and part of our national life. And I think that's one of the important parts of our administration's legacy. I've worked very hard on it, and I thank the Indian leaders who are here.

I think it's quite appropriate that Carol came here tonight to represent the ticket and to let me know that Pat and I are going to be part of an imminent spouses' club here in the next few months. [*Laughter*] Actually, I kind of like it. The only thing I do not like about it is that—Hillary used to tell me how nervous she was when I would go into a debate and how she actually hated to sit in the audience because she would claw at the side of chairs. And at least if she watched it on television, she could scream and yell and beat the table, you know?

So I watched her debate on television the other night, and I was absolutely a nervous wreck. [*Laughter*] And my mother-in-law was so upset, she actually went in another room to watch it on another television. I said, "You can misbehave in front of me. I'm going to." She said, "No, I want to do this all by myself when I'm pounding the table." [*Laughter*] So I finally know now what she and you, Carol, have been through all these years. But except for those moments, I kind of like being a spouse.

It's appropriate that we're meeting here at this beautiful place. The Sewell-Belmont House, I believe, is the oldest house in Washington, DC, outside Georgetown. And someone told me tonight that I might be the first President to come here since Thomas Jefferson. When you go back through, just imagine that Thomas Jefferson was here. This does have one of the largest collections of suffragist memorabilia in the United States, and it was one of the first places designated as one of America's treasures by my wife and her millennium commission when they were going around the country trying to identify the places that were profoundly important to our past.

I say all that because I think it is obvious to anybody who even goes to the Jefferson Memorial and reads what Mr. Jefferson had to say about slavery, that when he wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Founders wrote the Constitution, they knew good and well that they were setting out perfect ideals that we were nowhere near realizing. After all, when we got started, only white male property owners could vote. And it took us a long time. And we still haven't completely integrated our ideals with the reality of life in America.

But to be here in honor of a great woman from Montana and her running mate, Mark O'Keefe, who had the vision to want to be her running mate, in a place where so much of the history of American women is memorialized, at a time when—we just left a century where women didn't get to vote until the second decade of the 20th century—and now we're celebrating a great frontier State that not only gave us Jeanette Rankin but now has given us a woman nominee for Lieutenant Governor, and a wonderful woman, a longtime friend of mine, nominee for the House of Representatives. This is a great night, indeed.

The only thing I need to say to all of you about all this is that you know what I feel about the national elections, and you know how important I think it is to build on the changes and the prosperity of the last 8 years and why I think it's important for Al Gore and Joe Lieberman to be elected and why I think it's important that we win the Senate and the House. Yes, I want Hillary to be the Senator from New York. I think it will be good for New York and good for America. But I think it would be a great thing if the policies and the ideas we have embraced could be ratified by the American people in a vote, in which we are going to be outspent nationwide, way over $100 million in these national elections but where the American people know that we have been right on the issues, and we're right on the issues facing our future.

But what's that got to do with a Governor's race, a Lieutenant Governor's race in Montana? A great deal, for two reasons. Number one is, we have to keep the American economy going in order for Carol and Mark to be able to successfully implement their economic plans for Montana, to make sure every person in that State is a part of our future,

and in order for them to have the economy that would generate the tax revenues to implement their education plans for Montana.

But second, and more important, it runs the other way. Most of the important social progress we have made in the last 8 years—whether it is cutting the welfare rolls in half or seeing a steep decline in crime or any of the other things that have happened here to improve the fabric of our Nation, including an increased high school graduation rate, a record college-going rate, increased test scores in math and science, a two-thirds increase in the number of our kids taking advance placement courses, all these things—the Federal Government can do certain things here, but who runs the politics of a State and who drives the vision of a State is pivotal to the success of anything that the next President and the next Congress can do to shape the future of Americans at home.

I was just looking the other day, for example—one of the things that I'm proudest of is that the Democrats insisted on including in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 a Children's Health Insurance Program, the biggest expansion of health care for our kids since Medicaid was established when Lyndon Johnson was President. And in 2 years and a couple of days, we have enrolled 2½ million people in that program.

But there are at least 6 million children eligible for that program. There is a dramatic difference—dramatic—in the enrollment levels from State to State. And what is the determining event? The leadership at the State level, starting with the Governor and someone else who is passionately committed, who is assigned to do this. That's just one example.

So I know that most of the people in Washington, a lot of you may be here because Pat and Carol are old friends of yours. Maybe you're here because you have ties to Montana. But what you need to understand is, if you believe in what we have been doing the last 8 years and you want more positive changes to occur in this direction, it is profoundly important not just to help in the congressional races and to make sure we prevail in the Presidential race but to make sure that we win every single solitary Governor's race and Lieutenant Governor's race we can.

That's why this is important, quite apart from the way I feel about Carol and Pat and Whitney and my feelings for Montana and the gratitude I feel because we won there in 1992. This is a big deal. If you really believe that we changed America, we turned it around, we're going in the right direction, and you want it to amount to something, then you've got to help them.

And I'm very grateful to all of you. I just saw Congressman Pomeroy back there, from neighboring North Dakota. Thank you for being here.

So remember what Carol said. Thanks for being here. And if you can send her a little more money between now and election day, you ought to do that, too.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:20 p.m. at the Sewell-Belmont House. In his remarks, he referred to Mark O'Keefe, candidate for Governor in Montana, and his daughter Maggie; Carol Williams, candidate for Lieutenant Governor in Montana, and her husband, former Representative Pat Williams; Bob Ream, chair, Montana Democratic Party; former Representative Bruce Morrison and his wife, Nancy; former Gov. Ted Schwinden of Montana; the President's mother-in-law, Dorothy Rodham; and Nancy Keenan, candidate for Congress from Montana.

Remarks at a Reception for Representative Dennis Moore

October 2, 2000

Thank you very much. First of all, I would like to thank all of you for being here today. I want to thank Dennis and Stephane for presenting themselves to the people of Kansas and for giving the people of Kansas a chance to send a Democrat to Congress who represents what the Republicans say they're for. [*Laughter*] And I really appreciate that.

I'd also like to say, I thank the Members of Congress who are here, but I am particularly grateful to Jim Slattery and Peter Hoagland, who are here, because without them, I wouldn't be here, because they helped me turn this country around in 1993 and 1994, and I thank them for that.

Now, after Secretary Glickman sort of threw down the gauntlet—[*laughter*]—I completely forgot what I was supposed to talk

about because I wasted 2 minutes back there thinking about whether there was anything I could still do to him. [*Laughter*] Now, I'm at a loss. There's a lesson in that somewhere. [*Laughter*]

Actually, I was thinking that I kind of resented that Al Gore has gotten all this credit—[*laughter*]—for naming Joe Lieberman to the ticket. I mean, I know it's a big deal to have the first Jewish Vice Presidential nominee. But I mean, come on, now, look at American history. That is nothing compared to the first Jewish Agriculture Secretary. [*Laughter*] I mean, just with a decision, I destroyed one of the great stereotypes in American life. [*Laughter*] Nobody thinks "Jewish farmer" is an oxymoron anymore. [*Laughter*]

Not only that, if those Republicans would have listened to Dan and me back in 1995, we wouldn't have had to have all these bailouts the last 3 years with the farmers because of their failure to farm act that I warned about back then, which is just one of the reasons Dennis ought to be reelected, because he'll have a chance next year to rewrite the farm law. And I hope it will be done in a way that really supports the farmers of this country—all the farmers of this country, without regard to where they live, what they produce, or how big they are. And it's very important that we have people who have Democratic values and the understanding of agriculture that anyone from Kansas has to have in order to serve in the United States Congress.

Let me just say a word or two very briefly. I realize that I'm preaching to the saved here—I'll explain that later, Dan. [*Laughter*] Glickman and I get a lot more leeway since we're not on the ballot. [*Laughter*] It's amazing what you can say. [*Laughter*] I say, this one story. Jon Corzine, who is our nominee for Senator in New Jersey, and who spent like $38 million of his own money winning the nomination, got up and—Rush Holt and I—he may still be here—I did a deal for Rush Holt the other day in New Jersey, in Princeton.

So Jon comes to the event, and we were elated to see him. He's a great friend of mine, has been for many years. So here's Corzine, a candidate now, gets up and tells the following story, as a candidate. He said, "You know, I spent almost $40 million getting nominated, so I was convinced that everyone in New Jersey knew who I was—everyone." So he said, "I was campaigning the other day in a nursing home, and I went up to this lady, and I said, 'Ma'am, do you know my name?' And she said, 'You know, sonny, I don't, but if you go up to the nurse's station, they'll tell you.' " [*Laughter*]

I told him, I said, "Jon, that's not a bad joke, but you need to let me tell that." [*Laughter*] "Until you get past the election, I don't believe I'd tell that one again." [*Laughter*]

So anyway, here we are. Let me be serious just for a moment. This is a different country than in it was in 1992. The country is in better shape. We have done it by a combination of new ideas and old-fashioned values. I was down in Texas the other day with my first Treasury Secretary, Lloyd Bentsen. And I said to him something which is true. People, now that I'm about to leave office, they come to me all the time and say, "What great new idea did you bring to the economic policy process in Washington?" People ask me questions like that all the time, you know—"what great new sweeping reform?" And I always have a one-word answer: Arithmetic. We restored arithmetic. That's what the Democrats brought back. And those of us in the heartland, we still think 2 and 2 ought to add up to 4.

So I'm profoundly indebted to people like Steny Hoyer, who helped me turn this budget deficit around. And last week, we had a couple of announcements—let me just mention the announcements we had last week. Last week the annual report came out which showed that the Government budget—which was supposed to be $455 billion in the hole this year; when I took office, that was the estimate—will have a $230 billion surplus, the biggest in history. It showed that poverty figures were the lowest in 20 years, the biggest drop in child poverty in 34 years, the biggest recorded drop in Hispanic and African-American poverty in history.

And furthermore, it showed that, for the first time in a dozen years, there were actually more people with health insurance this year than there were last year, thanks largely

to the Children's Health Insurance Program that the Democrats insisted be part of the 1997 Balanced Budget Act.

What's that got to do with the House race in Kansas? I'll tell you exactly what. Those of us who have been here for the last 8 years, or who were part of any segment of it, worked very hard to turn this country around. And the economy is going in the right direction. The crime rate is going down. The welfare rolls have been cut in half. The school dropout rate is down. The college-going rate is at an all-time high. Now, with the change in the trend lines on health insurance, every single major social indicator is going in the right direction. And notwithstanding all the troubles around the world today, this country has been an unmitigated force for peace and reconciliation across racial and religious and ethnic lines on every continent in the globe.

Now, the question is, what do we mean to do with this? Have all the problems gone away? Not on your life. There are still big challenges out there, and there are still great opportunities out there. And I said this over and over again—there are a lot of young people in this audience tonight, so I want to make this point, and maybe you will avoid this. There is nobody in this room tonight who is over 30 years old who has not made at least one mistake in your life of some significance, not when times were really tough but when times were going so well, you thought you didn't have to concentrate. Now, that is the big challenge in this election.

Things are going well. People feel good. I want everybody to feel good. Not only that, our Republican friends, after we beat back the contract on America and we beat back their attempts to shut the Government down and we beat back several other of the more extreme things they tried to do, they now sound more like us than ever before. It's really encouraging. I don't mean to put it down. The rhetoric is important. But if you strip the rhetoric away, there are huge differences between what our policies would be—differences in our economic policies, our education policies, our health care policies, our commitment to grow the economy and preserve the environment. And there will be big differences in our farm policies next year, when I'm not around, but I think that our crowd will be sticking up, as I said, for farmers of all sizes, from all parts of the country.

There will be differences in how we'll deal with the challenge of the aging of America. The fastest growing group of people in America are people over 80. Within just a few years, there will only be two people working for every one person drawing Social Security. We'll have to re-imagine the whole nature of getting older in America, what it means, how we're going to work, and what we're going to do. And it is really, really important. The one thing I have learned, every single House seat and every single Senate seat is important.

And when I made the comment I did about Dennis at the beginning, I was not just kidding. Every time I go out into the country and I listen to our friends in the other party speak, I normally don't have much objection to what they say. They talk about being fiscally conservative. They talk about being compassionate. They talk about this, that, and the other thing. All I can tell you is that this guy does that. And he has had a remarkable impact in a short time.

He is widely respected in the House. You look at all the House Members that have come here tonight. Believe me, every one of them had something else to do. He must have a dozen House Members here, including one of the most senior and most respected and important leaders in the House, Steny Hoyer. And I'm just telling you, it really matters. When a person like Dennis gets elected from a district like his district in Kansas and then does everything that he hired on to do, keeps his word, and serves well, that person needs to be reelected.

And this country has huge challenges to face. You know, when Al Gore says the best is yet to be—I mean, some people probably think it's a campaign slogan, but I'm not running for anything, and I have to tell you, I believe that. Because the country is kind of like a big ocean liner, you know, you just can't turn it on a dime. That's how come the *Titanic* hit the iceberg. [*Laughter*] They saw the iceberg, but they didn't see it in time to turn it around.

So we got turned around, and we're going in the right direction, but all the far horizons are still out there. The young people in this

audience, the young women in this audience, when you have your first children, you'll come home from the hospital with your baby and with a little gene card, made possible by the human genome project. And it will be a little scary, because it will tell you every little problem in your child's genetic makeup. But it will also tell you what you can do to minimize the impact of those problems, maybe even thoroughly correct them surgically or with medicine. And within a decade, I'm convinced that young women will be bringing babies home from the hospital that have a life expectancy of 90 years. Now, you can just remember 10 years from now, look back and see if I was right.

Dan Glickman has worked so hard on research on biofuels, and we're just that close in cracking the chemical mystery that will allow the efficient conversion of biofuels, so that instead of taking 7 gallons of gasoline to make 8 gallons of ethanol, you'll be able to do it with one gallon of gasoline. Then everybody will have the equivalent of 500 miles to the gallon. And when you put that with fuel cells, alternative fuel vehicles, mixed fuel vehicles, it will radically alter the future of our country.

It is clearly the most effective thing we could be doing to change the energy future of America and to make ourselves more secure. Because if we pumped all the oil that was available to us that's on land owned by Americans, it wouldn't keep us going very long. The only way to have a secure energy future is to take available energy conservation technologies and the development of alternative fuels and different kinds of engines, and go into the future in a whole different direction. We can do that. That's going to all happen while you're around.

But we still have these big questions. We've got the most diverse student body in history and the biggest one. Can we give them all a world-class education? What is it going to mean to be 85 in 20 years, and how is it going to be different from now? And it better be different, unless we want it to financially burden the country in an awesome way.

How are we going to deal with the fact that AIDS, TB, and malaria now kill one in four people around the world, and we need those people to be our trading partners? What are our responsibilities to alleviate the debt of the poor nations of the world? I think they're quite heavy.

I had a meeting today—I never thought I'd see a meeting like this in the White House. We had in the White House today John Kasich; Connie Mack; Representative Baucus, a Republican from Alabama; Senator DeWine; Senator Lugar; Congressman Leach—all these Republicans—and Maxine Waters and Nancy Pelosi, Joe Biden, Pat Leahy—we had our whole crowd there. We had David Sapperstein, a rabbi friend of mine who is one of the most liberal religious advocates in Washington, sitting three seats down from Pat Robertson. [*Laughter*]

Why were they there? Because they believe that we have a moral obligation to alleviate the debt of the world's poorest countries. And they know if we do it in a way that allows them only to spend the money on education and health care, those countries will be stronger, better partners for us. It means less war, less famine, more prosperity, less bloodshed for the Americans of the future.

And as soon as we walked out that door, the leadership of the other party in the House attacked me and attacked us all. Now, when you get to the right of Pat Robertson, you're working at it. [*Laughter*] You're working at it, and they worked at it.

Meanwhile, Dennis Moore has worked at your business. He deserves to stay in. And it will be an important signal about whether our country is really rewarding centrist, moderate, progressive, unifying politics. That's what got us where we are, and that's what will take us into the future, if we make the right decisions on election day.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:08 p.m. at a the Frederick Douglass Museum. In his remarks, he referred to Representative Moore's wife, Stephane; former Representatives Jim Slattery and Peter Hoagland; and Rev. M. G. (Pat) Robertson, president, Christian Coalition. Dennis Moore is a candidate for reelection in Kansas' Third Congressional District.

Remarks at a Luncheon for Hillary Clinton in Miami, Florida

October 3, 2000

Well, thank you very much for coming and for coming on such short notice, in this typically Florida sunny day. [*Laughter*] Actually, on the way over here, Chris, I was speculating about whether this beautiful pond of yours out here would come into the house if the rain came. [*Laughter*]

So I want to thank you. And thank you, Irene, for opening your home to me once again. And I want to thank Philip and Michael and Stuart and Alex and all the others who worked on this event today. I'll be quite brief. I hope you're all going to watch the debate tonight. I think it will go well.

This has been a very interesting election to me, because the American people have an unusual decision to make in every one of these Senate races and House races and in the White House, because things are going very well for the country. The economy is moving in the right direction; the society is moving in the right direction. In every major area of our national life, there has been substantial progress in the last 8 years.

And what the people of every State and the people of our Nation have to decide is, what do we intend to make of this moment? And it's very interesting to me that the political rhetoric of our friends in the other party has changed rather dramatically, so they're now arguing over whether they or we are the real new thing, instead of whether we should take some big move to the right, which was their preferred line of rhetoric until the voters decisively rejected it over and over again.

And I can just tell you, I see this everywhere. But there are these big issues out there. Are we going to have a tax cut we can afford, that will permit us to save Social Security and Medicare for the baby boom generation, continue to invest in the education of the largest number of children in American history in our schools, and meet our responsibilities to the future by paying down the debt? Or are we going to say, "Times are good. I want my mine now" and have a combination tax cut and Social Security privatization plan that will throw us back into deficits, raise interest rates, and get this country in trouble? You listen and see if that's adequately debated tonight.

I am telling you, I've spent a lot—I think that I have earned the right to make comments about the state of the American economy. I believe I have. And people ask me all the time, "Well, it's amazing what's happened here. What great new innovation did you bring to economic policymaking?" And I always smile and say, "Arithmetic." [*Laughter*]

I remember back in '92, when the then-Presidential candidate, George Bush, used to refer to me in disparaging terms as the Governor of a small southern State. Remember that, when he used to say that? I was so naive, I thought it was a compliment. [*Laughter*] And I still do. [*Laughter*]

But I knew something about arithmetic and not having rosy scenarios and not pretending money was there that was wasn't. So we brought arithmetic back and made a lot of people mad doing it. In 1993 I had an economic plan that raised taxes and cut spending so that it displeased everyone, but it got rid of the deficit. This year we had a surplus of $230 billion, instead of the deficit of $290 billion I inherited. When I leave office, we will have actually paid the national debt down by $360 billion. That's worth about $2,000 a year on a home mortgage, average home mortgage. It's stunning. So all I can tell you is, I think that this is a big issue. It's a big issue in the New York Senate race. It's a big issue in the national Presidential race.

Second thing I think is a big issue is health care. And we're having this huge debate which I think has been muddied—our friends in the Republican Party have desperately tried to muddy up the debate over this Medicare prescription drug issue. Look, here's the deal: The pharmaceutical companies, mostly Americans, but sometimes the Europeans, have helped to develop drugs that lengthen and improve the quality of life. Everybody knows that. The older you live, the older you get, the more likely you are to need medicine. Everybody knows that, right?

If you get to be 65 in America, you have a life expectancy of over 82 years, the longest in the world. Everybody knows that. What

a lot of people don't know is that more than half the people in this country who are over 65 cannot afford the medicine that their doctors prescribe for them, to either lengthen or improve the quality of their life.

So the question is, what are we going to do about it? For the most of the time when I was around here, our friends in the other party said nothing. At one time we had a chance to give drugs, at least, to poor people, when we had a deficit, and they said no. So now we've got a surplus, and our position is, led by the Vice President and Hillary and others, is that we ought to have a Medicare-based prescription drug benefit that goes to everyone who needs it; that the poorest people ought to get it for free, and others ought to pay in proportion to their ability to pay a little bit but that we ought to provide it to everyone who needs it.

Their position is that we ought to subsidize the cost for up to 150 percent of the poverty rate, after which people ought to buy insurance. And their position is, therefore, with heavy money from the drug companies to attack our position as being a huge expansion of big Government. Now here are the facts. Did you ever follow this debate and wonder what's really going on? It's hard to figure out what's really going on, right? Like why in the wide world would they be against people getting these drug benefits?

Over half the people who can't afford their drug prescriptions have incomes above 150 percent of the poverty line, which is about, as I remember, it's about $16,000 for a couple or something. Hardly a king's ransom. Now, why would they be against this? And why would they call it a big Government program, since Medicare is Government financing of private medicine, right? That's what we propose, public financing of private medicine. That's what Medicare is. It has an administrative cost of 1½ percent, as compared with an average administrative cost in private health insurance companies of about 12 percent, 14 percent. It is not big Government. It's private medicine financed by the American people.

Now, why are they for what they're for, and why are we for what we're for? Here's the problem. You see all these stories about people going to Canada to buy drugs, and now we may pass legislation which says that you can—that our pharmacies in America can re-import drugs from Canada, made in America, and sell them cheaper. Do you ever wonder what that's about? Here's what that's about.

We are blessed to have these pharmaceutical companies in America. They do great things. They hire tens of thousands of people and give them great jobs. They uncover medical miracles. It costs a lot of money to develop these drugs, and then they spend a whole lot of money to advertise them, once they develop them, while they're still brand named, before they become generic. And every other place they would like to sell their drugs has price controls, which means they have to recover from Americans only, 100 percent of the cost of developing the drug and advertising the drug.

Once they do that, it then becomes profitable for them to sell the same drug a lot cheaper in Canada or Europe. Now, they are afraid, the drug companies are, if all the seniors in the country can get their drugs through Medicare, that Medicare as a big buyer will acquire so much power in the market, we can buy drugs for our seniors made in America almost as cheaply as seniors in Canada can buy drugs made in America. And they don't want that to happen. Why? Because they're afraid they can't recover all their costs and their profits.

Now, they have a legitimate problem, because they labor under price controls in Europe. But the answer to their problem is not to keep seniors in Florida and throughout the United States away from the medicine they need to lengthen their lives. That's what this whole thing is about. You're never going to read that in a newspaper. That is what this is about. That's why the drug companies are putting millions and millions of dollars into the Republican campaigns from President on down.

Now, I'm not demonizing them. I'm glad there are American companies. I'm glad we've got them in our country. I understand they've got a problem because there are price controls in Europe and Canada and other places. But their idea is, it is an acceptable price to pay to maintain the status quo to

keep the senior citizens of this country without the medicine they need, and they're wrong about that. The Republicans are with them, and Al Gore, Hillary, and the other Democrats are with the people of this country, and I think we're right about it.

What I would do, if I were still in office, I'd go to them and say, "Look, this is not a way to solve your problems. Sticking it to the American senior citizens is not a legitimate way to solve your problem." This insurance deal is phony. Let me just tell you—I've got to say something nice about the health insurance companies, after all the fights I've had with them.

The health insurance companies, to be absolutely fair to them, told the Republicans from the get-go their idea would not work. They told them that they could not write an insurance policy that people could afford to pay the premiums on that would provide adequate drug coverage. They told them that.

Nevada, the State of Nevada, a small place, a laboratory of democracy—that's what our Founders said the State should be—passed the Republican plan. You know how many insurance companies have offered the insurance to buy the drugs? Zero. We've got some State legislators here. Ask them. Zero; not one. Why? Because it doesn't work economically for them. And they're not going to do it.

So this really comes down to the fact that the Republicans would help a few of our seniors, because we've moved the debate so far, and they don't want to be out there three sheets to the wind lost in it. But they don't want to help all of them, because they're afraid that if Medicare can buy drugs for seniors in the private marketplace, they will have so much market power, they'll get the price down, and it will cut their profit margins because they can't make up any of the cost of production in Europe or Canada.

My view is, let's take care of the American citizens, and then the drug companies will find a way to get all the rest of us to help solve their problem. We'll find a way to solve their problem. They're not going anywhere, and they're not going broke. And I'm proud they're in America, and I'm proud of what they do. I'm not demonizing them, but they're wrong about this. Their idea is, the only way to maintain their profit margins is to keep the American people from making sure the senior citizens of this country have the medicine they need. They're wrong about it. Let's solve their problem once we fix the health care needs of the seniors. This is a huge issue.

Same thing on the Patients' Bill of Rights. Health insurance companies don't want it because every now and then they'll have a big settlement when somebody gets the shaft. Well, that's the whole point of protecting people. But even the Republicans admit it will cost less than $2 a month per premium, per health insurance premium—less than $2 a month to have the protections of the Patients' Bill of Rights. You get to see a specialist if your doctor says so. If you've got a doctor for cancer treatment or an obstetrician and you're pregnant and you change jobs before the treatment is over, you get to keep your doctor. If you get hit by a car going out of here, you get to go to the nearest emergency room. You don't have to pass up three other hospitals to get to the emergency room 40 miles away that your health care plan covers. If you get hurt, you get to sue. Otherwise the Bill of Rights is just a bill of suggestions.

Now, that's what we say. They say it will add to the cost of health care. It will. I did it for the Federal Government. You know how much it cost us? I put in all these rights for everybody insured by the Federal Government—Medicare, Medicaid, the Federal employees—do you know how much it cost? One dollar a month. So they say—and even the Republicans admit it will cost less than $2 a month. Now, would you spend $1.80 a month to make sure that if one of the other people here at this event got hit by a car—God forbid—on the way out of here, could go to the nearest hospital? I would. And I think most Americans would.

Now, that's what this debate is about. And so the American people have got to decide. There are big differences on education. There are big differences on all these issues. And I want you to watch the debate tonight. And I thank you for helping Hillary. As you know, there's a lot of interests that would like to whip her, and I think half of them think it's their last chance at me. [*Laughter*]

But she's doing well. She did well in her debate. I'm immensely—I'm so proud of her. But it's very important that she not be outspent, three to one, on the way in.

In politics, you can get outspent. But you have to have enough to get your message out and to answer all the incoming fire. And you've helped make that possible today. And one thing I have learned is, every one of these Senate and House seats is important. This is not just important to me, although, obviously, it is. It's important to you and to the American people.

The last thing I'd like to say is, I took a little time today on the economy and on the Patients' Bill of Rights and on the drugs to make a point. The American people are very oriented toward the issues this year. They want to make an intelligent choice. Clarity of choice is our friend. I think our friends in the other party have moderated their rhetoric a lot from the Gingrich years, but a lot of their policies haven't changed all that much.

So in order for the American people to make the right decision, they need to be quite clear on what their choices are. And while most people are very issue-oriented, how many people do you know who could tell you the real difference in Gore's economic plan and Bush's; in Gore's position on Medicare drugs and Patients' Bill of Rights, and Bush's? It may be more important in Florida even than the senior issue and Gore's education plan and Bush's. I read the papers, and sometimes I see people writing about it who don't really understand what the differences are.

So the last thing I'd like to ask you—I thank you for helping Hillary. If you know anybody else who's not here and would want to help us in the last month, ask them. [*Laughter*] But after this debate tonight—every one of you knows people who don't come to events like this, who have never been to a political fundraiser, who have never been involved in public service.

I want to thank Buddy MacKay for being here, for doing such a good job. Let me just say, in his service as our Special Envoy to the Americas, we passed an historic Caribbean trade initiative, and we passed the sweeping plan to help Colombia, and the nations bordering Colombia, to try to roll back the tide of the narcotraffickers and their relationship with others that are trying to bring down democracy in that country. So I'm very proud of him.

You all know people. Chris said that he had somebody minding the store, because he didn't like to come to political events. But you know people that are going to show up and vote on election day, because they're patriotic; they love their country; they think they ought to be there when the voting comes. But they'll never come to an event like this. Maybe they can't afford to come, maybe it doesn't interest them, but they will sure vote.

So the last thing I want to ask you is, you know, I think that the Clinton/Gore administration has done a good job for Florida. We moved the Southern Command here. We had the Summit of the Americas here, the first one in 30 years. We have worked very hard with all the affected interests to save the Everglades, and that's just the beginning. I think we've dealt well with all the natural disasters.

I just wish that you would do what you can, every day, to make sure people understand where we were in '92 and where we are today, what we've done in Florida, and what the real differences are. And I only dealt with two today, on health care and the economy, but as I said, I could have gone on about the environment and education and nuclear arms control, where the differences are breathtaking and, I think, very troubling—very important to our future.

So I ask you, do what you can. This is a close race. By the nature of things, if you look at all of American history, when you have this kind of setup, unless one candidate can preform reverse plastic surgery on another, the way George Bush did to Michael Dukakis in '88, these kinds of races tend to be quite close. But the Vice President and our party, we've got the record; we've got the ideas; we've got the issues. What we need is clarity, clarity. So please—please—go out and tell people that.

And the last point I want to make is this: There's an overriding philosophy behind everything that I've tried to do. I like the fact that there are more people than ever that

can afford to live in homes like this. But I also think the people that are catering this event ought to have the same chance to send their kids to college that Chris and Irene do, and Democrats believe that. We believe everybody counts; everybody has a role to play; and we all do better when we help each other.

So if you can get the issues out and that simple message, I think we'll have a good night on election night.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:50 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to luncheon hosts Chris and Irene Korge; Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush; and former President George Bush and his opponent in the 1988 Presidential election, former Gov. Michael Dukakis of Massachusetts.

Statement on Congressional Action on a National Blood Alcohol Content Standard To Combat Drunk Driving

October 3, 2000

Congress took a courageous step today to save lives by keeping drunk drivers off the roads. This morning, House and Senate conferees approved a Transportation spending bill that includes a critical measure to help set a nationwide impaired driving standard of .08 blood alcohol content (BAC). This commonsense nationwide limit will save an estimated 500 lives a year and prevent thousands of injuries.

Our progress on .08 BAC marks a new milestone in our ongoing effort to crack down on drunk driving. It is the result of years of hard work by safety advocates across the country. I applaud Mothers Against Drunk Driving and the more then 400 young people visiting Washington today who have put a national spotlight on this critical safety measure. I also want to commend the tireless efforts and leadership of Senators Frank Lautenberg and Richard Shelby, Representatives Frank Wolf and Nita Lowey, as well as U.S. Transportation Secretary Rodney Slater. Today's remarkable achievement shows that when we work together, we can make America's streets and highways safer for all.

Statement on House of Representatives Action on Conservation Appropriations

October 3, 2000

I am pleased by the bipartisan agreement approved by the House today providing guaranteed funding to protect critical lands across America. By doubling our conservation investment next year and guaranteeing even greater funding in the years ahead, this agreement is a major step toward ensuring communities the resources they need to protect their most precious lands—from neighborhood parks to threatened farmland to pristine coastlands.

While we had hoped for even more, the very real gains achieved in the Interior appropriations bill would not have been possible without the many conservation, wildlife, and recreation groups, and citizens around the country, who worked so hard to secure dedicated conservation funding. I commend the many Members of Congress who came together in a true bipartisan spirit to make this a national priority.

I also am pleased that the bill provides critical funding for cleaner water, energy security, Native Americans, and the arts, and that objectionable riders that threatened serious harm to our environment have been fixed or dropped.

A century ago President Theodore Roosevelt put America on the path of land stewardship. With this agreement, we enter a new century better prepared to honor and fulfill this vital conservation vision.

Telephone Remarks to a Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Dinner in Jupiter, Florida

October 3, 2000

[*The President's remarks are joined in progress.*]

The President. —— on the tarmac at the Miami airport for over an hour, and the pilot said we still couldn't take off because of the heavy rains and winds. And I really looked forward to coming. I must say, I feel a little jinxed. Every time I come to Jupiter or try

to, something happens. Once before, when I was coming there, you may remember, I tore my leg up, and it took me a couple years, but I finally got back there. And I hope I can come back and see you.

I want to thank the Barots for hosting this dinner tonight. I want to thank Congressman Wexler for being there and for being such a good friend and supporter. I want to thank the candidates who are there, my longtime friend Elaine Bloom, Patsy Kurth, Jean Elliott Brown. Thank you for running for Congress.

And I want to tell the young dance troupe how sorry I am I didn't get to see you dance. I looked forward to it, and I hope I can see you dance either here or in Washington at the earliest possible opportunity. But I really thank you for the efforts you made.

And I want to thank all of you who came out tonight to help our House Democrats and our candidates. I feel good about this election, but it's a long way between now and election day and we have to work very, very hard.

I think it should be clear from the campaigns that have been run by the challengers here in Florida what the stakes are and what the differences are. And the only thing I promised myself is that I would do everything I could between now and election day to help us win the House back and to win as many Senate seats as possible. As you know, I'm especially interested in the one in New York.

But I have learned that 8 years of experience teaches that every single Senate seat, every single House seat is profoundly important. We have a different economic policy. We have a different crime policy. We have a different education policy, a different health care policy, a different environmental policy. And we have a very different view about what our relationships with other countries around the world ought to be, and America's responsibilities beyond our borders. And for all these reasons, I think it is imperative that we elect every person we possibly can.

I want to thank those of you who have supported me these last 8 years. It has helped us do the things that we've done in America and, especially, in Florida, from saving the Everglades to moving the Southern Command here, to trying to help revive the economy in every part of the State.

I want to thank those of you who have come to our country from other nations and who have made it a stronger, more diverse, more interesting place, far more well-prepared for the new century. And I want to urge you to do everything you can, to talk to all your friends, people who would never come to an event like this, between now and election day, about why it's imperative that we keep this economy going and keep paying down the debt; why it's important that we invest in the education of our children and the health care of our seniors; why it's important that we find ways to preserve the environment, even as we grow the economy; and why it's important that we make a safer world for our children.

The Democrats are right on all these issues. And I can tell you that there is a huge difference between having the votes of a majority, and not. And so every one of these people deserves your support. And again, I am profoundly grateful, and I am just sick I'm not there. I really looked forward to being there, and I didn't give up until we had sat on the tarmac for an hour, and the Air Force said there was no way. And they told me it would take over 3 hours to drive there, because the fog is so thick in Miami, you can't see your hand before you.

So I hope you'll give me a rain check. And I thank you again for being so generous and good and supportive to our candidates for the House.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:30 p.m. by telephone from the Biltmore Hotel in Coral Gables, FL. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Gopi and Dilip Barot; and Elaine Bloom, State Senator Patsy Kurth, and Jean Elliott Brown, candidates for Florida's 22d, 15th, and 16th Congressional Districts, respectively. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary did not include the complete opening remarks of the President.

Remarks at a Rally for Representative Corrine Brown in Jacksonville, Florida

October 4, 2000

Thank you. Now, I would say that you're ready to win this election. Senator Holzendorf, thank you for getting us off to a good and rousing start. I want to thank Corrine's colleague, Representative Alcee Hastings, from Florida, my great friend and a great Representative. Thank you for being here.

And I'm here to say, based on personal experience, that Corrine Brown does deliver. I saw this beautiful elevated rail coming in here. I know how hard she's fought for transportation, for affordable housing, for Head Start and education, for a Patients' Bill of Rights. Not only that, I saw those billboards. I think you're the prettiest candidate in this race. You're pretty to me. [*Laughter*] When I was a little boy, my mother used to say, "Pretty is as pretty does." [*Laughter*]

Didn't the Vice President do a great job last night in that debate? I was so proud of him. Look, this is a rally, and we can cheer, and I know I'm up here preaching to the saved. But I want to ask you just for a few minutes to kind of listen and let me say a few things from the heart. I'm not running for anything this year, and most days I'm okay about it. My party has a new leader. My family has a new candidate. Thanks for the plug, Corrine. I wish you could vote in New York, but we need you here. But I want to tell you something.

This is a big race, not just for President but every Senate seat and every House seat counts. If anybody has learned that over the last 8 years, I have. Every one of them counts. If I've been able to do any good for you and for our country, it's only been because of people like Alcee Hastings and Corrine Brown, who stood with me and helped me to build this country and helped me to move it forward.

I want to thank the people of Florida. The first electoral victory I got, of any kind, when I ran for President, was in December of 1991 in the straw poll at the Florida Democratic Convention. I am grateful. We nearly won here in 1992, and we only spent a little bit of money, and they spent millions. And so, in 1996 I said, "Look, we've been good for Florida. We had the Summit of the Americas. We moved the Southern Command to Florida. We saved the Everglades. We brought the economy back. We're going to win in Florida." And we did. And when we won Florida, everybody said, "The election is over. Bill Clinton and Al Gore have been reelected. If they can win in Florida, they're going to win America."

I tell you that not to look back but to look forward. In America, our public life is always about tomorrow. I have worked as hard as I could to turn this country around. And what I want to say to you is, it is all on the line in this election. We made some big progress last night in clarifying for the American people the choices before them. But what I want to talk to you about for a few minutes today is a little more about those choices, because every one of you when you leave here, between now and election day, will come in contact with scores, maybe even hundreds, of other people, your friends that you work with, go to church with, go to social events with, take your kids to events with, who never have come to a political rally like this but who will vote on election day or who may decide not to vote on election day. And I want you to pledge to yourselves, for yourselves and your children and our future, that when you leave here, you're going to do your dead-level best to make sure every single American understands the nature of the choice and why they should vote—why they should vote for Corrine Brown, and why they should vote for Bill Nelson, and why they should vote for Al Gore and Joe Lieberman in this election.

First of all, there's that minor matter of the record. I don't want to comment on all the stuff we saw last night, but I got tickled in that debate when they were talking about the economy, and the Republican nominee said, "Well, you know, I think the economy has done a lot more for Clinton/Gore than Clinton/Gore has done for the economy; the American people brought America back." And Al Gore said, "The American people did bring America back, and they do deserve most of the credit, but they were working

pretty hard in 1992, also, and it didn't come out this way."

Now, look, there are big differences here. And the clearest ones, in a way, are on the economy. They want to go back to the way they did it before. And they think they can afford to do it because we cleaned up the mess that they left before.

Now, let me just remind you of something. Before I took office, the deficit was $290 billion. It was supposed to be $455 billion this year. The debt of America had quadrupled under the 12 years of the Republican administration. And don't let them tell you the Democratic Congress did it. The Congress actually appropriated less money than they asked for in the previous 12 years.

Now, what's happened since then? We turned the biggest deficit in history into the biggest surplus in history. And when I leave office, we will have paid down $360 billion of the Nation's debt. What has that meant to you? What has that meant to you? Twenty-two million new jobs; the lowest unemployment in 30 years; the lowest minority unemployment ever recorded; the highest homeownership ever recorded; the most number of small businesses ever created, year after year after year; lower interest rates that save money on home mortgages, car payments, college loans, credit cards, the whole 9 yards. It has been good for America.

Now, what is Al Gore's plan? What is Corrine advocating? We want to give you a tax cut out of part of this surplus for retirement savings, to send your kids to college, for child care, for long-term care. We want to give extra tax cuts for low-income working people, especially if they've got a lot of kids. We want to do all that, but we're not promising as big a tax cut as they are. When you take account of all the calculations, ours is barely more than a third of what they promise. Why? Because we think we need to save money for education, for health care, for the environment, and we want to keep paying down the debt.

Now, here's something that didn't get pointed out that I hope will come out later. Every economist that has studied this—just about every one will say interest rates will be a percent lower for another 10 years if we stay with the Democratic plan as compared with the Republican plan. Why? Because they can't pay off the debt. They've got this huge tax cut. Their plan to partially privatize Social Security will cost another trillion dollars. And that's before they make all their other spending promises and keep them, which means you're right back in the soup again. And they just hope we've got enough cushion built up that nobody will notice.

But interest rates will be a point lower if you stick with them. Do you know what that's worth to you in 10 years? Another $400 billion-plus in effective tax cuts; $290 billion in lower home mortgages—$390 billion—$30 billion in lower car payments; $15 billion in lower college loan payments. I think that's the kind of tax cut America needs. And it will be good for you, and we'll get this country out of debt.

You heard the Vice President say last night that they want to give tax cuts to people making over a million dollars, that are more than they proposed to spend extra in education and health care. What we want to do is give wealthy people a tax cut if they'll invest in the areas of America that aren't part of our prosperity today, so that we can all go forward together.

Now, these are big differences, folks. And it's not like you hadn't had a test run. We tried it their way for 12 years and our way for 8 years. If you liked it their way, you should vote for them. If you liked it our way, you better vote for Al Gore, Joe Lieberman, Bill Nelson, and Corrine Brown.

Now, let's look at health care. There's a big difference here. When I became President, Medicare was supposed to go broke last year—broke. We added, through reforms of Medicare, 27 years to the life of the Medicare program—27 years. And we passed a bill that said you could keep your health insurance if you changed jobs, if you got sick. And we did more for preventive care on breast cancer, prostate cancer, diabetes—big issue, diabetes. The Diabetes Federation said we've done more than anybody since the creation of insulin.

And we passed the Children's Health Insurance Program that's now provided health insurance to 2½ million kids. And last year, for the first time in 12 years, the number

of uninsured people in America dropped by more than 2 million. We are making progress.

So what's our health care plan, and what's the difference in where she is and where they are—Corrine? Well, we're for a real Patients' Bill of Rights, and they're not. We're for a Medicare drug program that all seniors can buy into on a voluntary basis.

Now, let me say, there's a lot of discussion about that, but I saw the other side's ad they're running down here, on the Vice President's drug program. Folks, it's a bunch of bull. I saw it. They say that our seniors are going to be forced into a Government-run HMO. They paint this big, dark picture about it. Have you seen the ad? It's unbelievable. The only good thing about it is, it's hard to follow, so maybe nobody will pay too much attention to it. [*Laughter*]

Let me tell you, that big, Government-run HMO—they're talking about the Medicare program. It's not Government medicine. Medicare goes to private doctors, private hospitals, private nursing homes. It's not a Government program. It's a financing program that has an administrative cost of under 2 percent, as compared with 10 to 14 percent for HMO's.

Now, this drug program of ours is totally voluntary. Do you know what the difference in our program and theirs is? We just let everybody who needs it buy in. And if you're poor, we pay your premium. If you have catastrophic illnesses and you have huge drug bills, we pay it. Otherwise, you've got to pay a monthly premium and a co-pay, but at least you get drug coverage if you need it.

Now, their program is—although, they phase it in over several years—their program is, if you've got 150 percent of the poverty line or less, they'll do more or less what we do, and if you're over that, you've got to buy an insurance policy. Now, the problem is, the health insurance companies say they can't write a policy that you can afford that will be worth having. The health insurance companies—I've got to give it to them, because I've been in a lot of fights with them. I take my hat off to them on this. They've been perfectly honest. They said, "This is crazy. You cannot write a health insurance policy for drugs that people can afford that will be worth having." And half the people who need this help are over 150 percent of the poverty line. That's just about $14,500, I think, for a couple. So it's not real.

Nevada adopted the Republican plan—whole cloth. You know how many health insurance companies have offered to provide drug insurance? Zero. Not one. You've got to give it to the Republicans, though. Evidence never phases them. Don't bother them with the facts. They just stick with their story. You've got to give it to them.

Now, this is a huge deal. If you live to be 65 today, your life expectancy is 82. With the human genome project, young women in this audience will soon be bringing babies home from the hospital that have a life expectancy of 90 years. But if you want people to live longer and live better, they've got to be able to get the medicine they need.

You've got to explain this to people. You know what's really going on? You couldn't tell it from the debates, and you sure can't tell it from looking at the ads. You know what's really going on? The big drug companies don't want this to pass. Now, that may not make any sense to you. I mean, why wouldn't the company making drugs want to sell more of their product? Most of you who are in business like to sell more of whatever it is you're selling.

Here's why. They do have a legitimate problem. And I'm glad they're in America; they do a great job. They develop all these lifesaving drugs, and they give tens of thousands of Americans good jobs, and I'm glad they're here. Here's their problem. They develop these drugs; they spend a lot of time and money developing the drug. Then they spend a lot of money advertising the drugs. And they can't recover either their cost of developing the drugs or the cost of advertising the drugs from their sales in Europe or Canada or anywhere else, because all those other countries have price control. So they make you pay 100 percent of the cost of developing and advertising the drugs. And once you do that, they can sell those drugs in Canada, in Europe, and anywhere else, and make a ton of money because they've already taken their overhead out of you.

Now, I'm still glad we've got those companies here, and I'm glad that we're getting

those good medicines. But what they're worried about is, if Medicare buys drugs for the seniors in America who join this program, they'll have so much market power that America's seniors might be able to get their medicine made in America almost as cheaply as Canadians can get medicine made in America.

That's what this whole deal is about. And every time you see one of those ads, you just remember that. This is all about why the drug companies don't want Medicare to provide lifesaving, life-lengthening, life-improving medicine to seniors, because they're afraid that they won't have anyplace they can recover the cost of developing and advertising the drug.

So they've got a real problem. But it is nothing compared to all these old folks choosing between food and medicine every week. So my answer to that is, let's take care of the American people, and then we'll figure out a way to take care of the drug companies' problem. We'll take care of their problem but not at the expense of the American people.

This is a huge difference. And she's right, and they're wrong. You've got to decide, but I think it's pretty clear. You've got to make this clear to people. We have the money to keep people alive. We have the money to keep people healthy in their later years. And we approve and applaud these pharmaceutical companies, but they shouldn't be trying to solve their problem at the expense of America's seniors. Take care of America's seniors. Then we'll find a way to take care of the drug companies' problem. That's what we've got to do.

Take education. You heard them both talking about education last night. I've been working at this for over 20 years, and I can tell you something I couldn't say 20 years ago, when I started working with then-Governor Bob Graham, and later, Governor Lawton Chiles. We now know something we didn't know when we started. We actually know how to turn around failing schools. We know that all our children can learn.

So you've got two candidates focused on accountability. I actually think our accountability measures are better than the ones that the Republican nominee proposed, but we don't have time to go through that. Anyway, they're both genuinely for accountability. And they think the Federal dollars ought to follow performance. That's good.

Our focus is on failing schools: turn them around; shut them down; or put them under new management. But the difference is, our proposal is accountability-plus, and theirs is accountability-minus. That is, their proposal is accountability: block-grant the money; let people decide how to spend it, whether it works or not; and give people vouchers if it doesn't work. Our proposal is accountability: if people are in failings schools and they want out, let them go to a public charter school or have other public school choice; and help the schools succeed.

What is our record? When we started on our program to connect all the schools and classrooms to the Internet, 14 percent of the schools were connected; 3 percent of the classrooms were. Today, 94 percent of the schools are connected; 65 percent of the classrooms are. That's our proposal.

Our proposal is, with all these teachers retiring, let the National Government help the school districts pay for 100,000 more teachers to get classroom size down in the early grade. Our proposal is, with the largest and most diverse school population we've ever had, help the schools build or drastically realter 6,000 schools and repair another 5,000 a year for the next 5 years, so the kids will have decent places to go to school; double the number of kids in after-school programs and summer school programs and let every kid who needs to be in a preschool program be in one. We've got the money. We ought to do it. Help the schools succeed. Accountability plus support. Big difference. Huge difference. She's right, and they're not.

Now, on health care—let me just say this again—we can do the following thing: We can provide the Medicare prescription drug benefit; we can provide a long-term care tax credit for people who are taking care of their elderly or disabled relatives at home of $3,000 a year; we can take the parents, the working parents of the children that are now eligible for the Children's Health Insurance Program and put them in the program—that will take care of 25 percent of the people in America without health insurance—we

can provide—in our budget we've got $220 million to help low-income women deal with breast and cervical cancer and get treatment they otherwise could not get; and we fully fund the Ricky Ray Fund in honor of the young man from Florida who died shortly after I was elected—a young man who I had the pleasure to meet, and he and his family—I'll never forget them. That fund now provides care for people who got infected with HIV through blood transfusions.

We can do all of that if we want to do it. That's in our budget. These are choices you have to make. There are choices on the environment. Do you like what we did on the Everglades? Don't you think we ought to keep cleaning up the environment and growing the economy? Big choices. We favor doing both. They say you've got to relax the air pollution rules. They say maybe we ought not to have these 43 million acres I set aside in the national forests. They say maybe we ought to take another look at the national monuments I protected for all time to come.

We don't have to do that. We proved you can grow the economy and improve the environment. We've got cleaner air, cleaner water, more land saved than any administration since Theodore Roosevelt. We proved that. We cleaned up 3 times as many toxic waste dumps as they did in a dozen years in our 8. But again, the evidence doesn't get in the way of them. They're sticking with their story. Never mind the evidence. You've got a clear choice here.

Same thing on crime. Crime's come down 7 years in a row, the lowest crime we've had in 27 years now. And we've done more to put 100,000, now 150,000, police on the street and to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and children. And there hasn't been a single hunter in north Florida miss a day in the woods in a hunting season yet—not a day, not a minute, in spite of all the stuff they said.

So what's their proposal? "We've got no business putting these police on the street," and they want to reverse it. I mean, we got the lowest crime rate in 27 years, and part of it's because we put these police on the street. They want to reverse it. You've got a clear choice here. She's right, and they're not. And you've got to think about it. So I ask you to think about these things.

If I could be given one wish for America, as I look out on this vast and diverse crowd, believe it or not, it would not even be for a continuation, unbroken, of our economic prosperity. I would wish, if I only had one wish, that we keep making progress and learning to live together across the racial and religious and other lines that divide us, because this is one thing I think we all agree on, without regard to party. The most important thing about America is not its Government, it's its people. And if we're getting along together, we're plenty smart enough to figure out how to solve any problem that comes along. If we're getting along together and we celebrate our own heritage but we believe that what God has given us in our common humanity is more important than what's different about us, even though we're proud about what's different about us, then everything else is going to work out.

Now, I think the Government does have a role in that. We're for strong hate crimes legislation. Their leadership is against it, including their nominee. We're for strengthening the law that requires equal pay for equal work for women, and they're not for that. We're for that, and they're not for that. So that's one where Corrine and Alcee are right, and their leadership is wrong.

So I want you to go out from this place and say, yes, we had a good rally, and we cheered for Corrine. But you better think about it. If you like what's happening to the economy and you want it to go on, you better keep paying this debt down and invest in America's people and not reverse our economic policy. You better keep investing in education and not only have high standards for our kids but put the investments there that will enable the children to meet those standards, and support the teachers in teaching those kids.

And we want a health care system that doesn't mess up our drug companies and doesn't bankrupt our HMO's. But we can have a Patients' Bill of Rights and a Medicare drug benefit and a long-term care tax credit and do these other things for our health care system and still take care of the people that

are giving us the medicine and the health care.

And we want America to keep going until we're the safest big country in the world. And we want to keep cleaning up the environment, while we improve the economy. And most important of all, we want to build one America. And on every single one of these issues, there are huge differences. Look, folks, I've done everything I could to turn this country around, to get us together, and move us forward.

But when the Vice President says, when the Vice President says in these debates, "You ain't seen nothing yet," that's not just an election year slogan. I'm not going to be there, and I believe that. I believe that, because it takes a long time to turn a country around. It's like a big ocean liner in the ocean—that's why the *Titanic* hit the iceberg. They saw the iceberg, but they didn't see it in time to turn it around. Now, we got it turned around before we hit the iceberg, but we still haven't reached the far shore of our destination.

So the best is still out there. But now it's all back in your hands. We've got to make the right choices. There is a clear choice. It just has to be clear to every single American.

I will never be able to thank you enough for what you have done for me. But the most important thing is what you will do for yourselves, your children, and your grandchildren by getting out, voting for her, voting for Bill Nelson, voting for Al Gore and Joe Lieberman on November 7th.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:10 p.m. in the Exhibit Hall at the Prime Osborne Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to State Senator Betty S. Holzendorf; Bill Nelson, candidate for U.S. Senate from Florida; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush. Representative Brown is a candidate for reelection in Florida's Third Congressional District.

Remarks to the Uncommon Women on Common Ground Conference in Jacksonville

October 4, 2000

[*The President's remarks are joined in progress.*]

The President. ——and when the actors were supposed to get their curtain call, they pulled back the curtains and all the real people were standing there. It was an amazing thing. But Kerry, you know her husband, Andrew, is in my Cabinet, of course. And her mother is a great friend of mine, and one of her brothers served in Congress with me during my Presidency. But she has done an astonishing thing here, and I urge you to look at the book and read it. It's really amazing. There are a lot of brave women out there around the world, doing things that stiffen the spine when you read about it.

Let me just say a few words about a couple of women's issues that I think are quite important. And I hadn't really prepared anything to say, but we're close to an election in which I believe the American people will make choices which, whether we consciously are aware of it or not, will shape a lot of how we live for the next 20 years. And one of the biggest challenges we face, I think, is how to broaden the circle of prosperity to include people that aren't part of it and then how to figure out how both to continue to open opportunities for women and allow people to balance work and family, because the most important work of society is still raising children, and so we have to figure out how to balance these things.

And the truth is that our country is better at creating jobs, starting businesses, and expanding the economy than nearly any country in the world. In the last several years, we've been, by far, better than anybody else in the world, but if you look over a long period of time, we do pretty well with that. But we lag significantly behind a lot of other countries in figuring out how to balance work and family.

So I would just like to say that, for whatever it's worth, I think the family and medical leave law has now allowed some 25 million people to take some time off when a baby is born or a family member is sick without losing their jobs. I think it should be expanded. A lot of you are small-business people. The big debate that we always have is, how burdensome will it be to small business if we expand it? Should we exempt smaller businesses? If so, where should the cutoff be at number of employees, and what kind of leave should we have?

But that's something I hope all of you will sort of debate, discuss, and go forward with, because when we finally—it was the first bill I signed as President and, I think, still one of the finest pieces of legislation I've ever been involved in. It's made a huge difference. Still, after all these years, it's not unusual at all for me in any given crowd of any kind of people to have at least one person come up to me and thank me for the family leave law and explain how it's affected their lives. It's already happened to me once today, and it happens everywhere.

But it's still rather limited in its reach. And we've got to decide what to do about it. But it's important. It's an important part of balancing work and family.

Another, I think, very important thing is strengthening the equal pay laws that the country has. I've got some legislation before the Congress now I've been trying hard to pass for more than a year to strengthen the equal pay laws. And there's an even more extensive bill up there that goes beyond what I have proposed, that maybe should be a law, but I can't even pass what I've got up there. [*Laughter*]

And again, the issue is, how much can we do on this? What kind of burden is it? Is it a burden for small businesses? And I think a lot of women who are active in business are in a unique position to offer the right kind of perspective. But the main thing is, we need to keep taking action on this, because there is still, even though we've made dramatic progress since President Kennedy signed the first legislation, there's still significant differences in providing equal pay for equal work. There's still a big gender gap in access to high-tech jobs. There's still a significant gender gap in people who hold positions of big responsibility in corporate America. Maybe Cathy talked about that a little bit; I don't know. But we've got to—there's a lot of these challenges that are out there, and I believe the National Government does have a responsibility, at least on the equal pay front.

And for the whole time I've been President, I've had six or seven women Cabinet members, including the first female Secretary of State and the first female Attorney General, who is from here in Florida. So we've tried to set a good example, but I think that these are very important issues that we will have to continue to work on.

Then there's a whole big cluster of health care issues that I think need a lot of emphasis. I've got legislation before the Congress now to spend a couple of hundred million dollars to provide medical care to poor women with breast or cervical cancer who otherwise wouldn't be able to access medical care. I think that's important.

But there are a lot of big issues here that I think need tending to. This whole issue of whether we should have a Patients' Bill of Rights or not, that essentially says you have a right to see a specialist if your doctor says you should; you have a right to keep your treatment if you're undergoing chemotherapy or you're pregnant and you change jobs and your employer changes health care providers, you should still be able to keep the same physician during treatment; and if you get hit and you have to go to the emergency room, you get to go to the closest one, not the one that is otherwise covered by your HMO; and if you get hurt really badly by a bad decision, you can sue. Otherwise, it's a bill of suggestions, not a bill of rights. This is a big issue.

Now, a lot of the HMO's are not for it because they think it will add to the cost of health care. And if you provide health care for your employees, you've got to be concerned about that. All I can tell you is, I have two pieces of evidence that it's affordable. One is, I put it into effect for all people covered by Federal health plans—Medicare, Medicaid, Federal Employees Health Insurance, military's and the military retirees'—and it's cost us a buck a month a premium.

The Congressional Budget Office of the Republican majority estimated, even though they won't support it, that it would cost less than $2 a month a premium, about $1.80. And their argument is that the population as a whole is a little bit higher risk than those that are insured by the Federal Government, which may or may not be so, but there's an argument for that. But anyway, I'd pay $2 a month so that you could go to the nearest emergency room if—God forbid—you got hit by a car leaving here. But this is a big family health issue, and there are others. So I just would point that out.

Then, let me say, something else that I think may not be seen as a women's issue but I think it's quite important is, what are the implications of the human genome project, and how does it relate to the explosion in Internet and computer technology? This is going to affect all of you. Young women coming home from the hospital within the next decade, I predict, will give birth to babies with a life expectancy of 90 years. I believe we'll move pretty quickly from where we are now, 77, to 90.

Now, secondly—and the reason that will happen is not because everybody will start having perfect babies but because you'll get a gene map. Mothers and fathers will get gene maps of their kids that will tell them what their problems are. And then over the course of their life, a lot of those problems will be solved because we'll be doing experiments we haven't done and people will know to take their kids in for the solution. Or if you have, for example, a 50 percent probability, your baby does, of developing some kind of cancer in his or her thirties, you'll also learn that there are five or six things you can do that will cut the odds of that dramatically. So it will be a good thing.

Simultaneously, all your health records are going to be on somebody's computer, and so are all your finance records. How do we enable the people that do business, how do we enable the Internet economy to flourish, and protect your rights of privacy? I think you ought to be able to say so before somebody gets into the health or financial records. And working through that is going to be a big issue, and it will affect women, particularly those that are trying to manage a home and a work life. And they go to basically the core of family values in our society.

So they will provide a—that will be a big challenge, too. And I've sent some legislation up to Congress—I don't think it will pass this year because it's controversial, because some of the people involved don't think we ought to have as many protections as are in my bill for the privacy of medical and financial records. But it's something, no matter who the President is, you all have to deal with. And it ought not to be a partisan issue. It ought to be something that we deal with almost in a family way, as well as a business way. But it's an issue that I would think that the women of America who are in the work force would have a special concern about. And so I hope you'll think about that.

So those are just some of the things that I wanted to mention. I think that we're moving into what should be the most exciting and prosperous time in the history of the country, if we make the right decisions. And I'll just mention two big ones that I think are important.

I think we ought to keep paying the debt down, because I think one of the reasons that we were able to—for example, our Small Business Administration in the last 8 years tripled the number of loans to women entrepreneurs over the previous 8 years. But one of the reasons we were able to do it is, the economy was growing against the backdrop of lower interest rates. And it's very significant, because if you pay the debt down over the next 12 years—basically, if you keep interest rates a percent lower over the next decade—it means lower business loans, more business investment, more growth. It also means about $390 billion in lower home mortgages, $30 billion in lower car payments, $15 billion in lower college loan payments.

And I would like to see it become an American commitment, not a party commitment, because I think it makes sense. In a global economy, where all these financial markets are global, fiscal conservatism should be embraced by the more liberal and the more conservative party as good economics and good social policy, because if you keep interest rates lower, obviously you spread the benefits of the economy wider. So I think

that is very, very important, and I would hope that everybody would agree.

The other thing that I think is hopeful is that we are engaged in a massive national debate now about how we can go about providing world-class education to all of our children. The only thing I can tell you is this: In 1979 Hillary and I started working on these issues when Bob Graham was the Governor of Florida. We did a lot of work together. And then when Lawton Chiles became Governor, he and I were very close, and we worked on these things. We didn't really know 20 years ago what we know now about how to have uniformity of excellence in education and whether every failing school could be turned around. We now know that they can be turned around and that all children can learn. It's not just a slogan.

And it's actually happening out there. In the last—in the decade of the nineties, reading and test scores went up. The dropout rate went down. The college-going rate is at an all-time high. The number of kids taking advance placement increased by two-thirds. The number of Hispanic kids taking advanced placement increased by 300 percent. The number of African-American kids increased by 500 percent, taking advanced placement tests.

I was in a school in Harlem the other day where 2 years ago—a grade school—2 years ago, 80 percent of the kids were doing reading and math below grade level—2 years ago. Today, 74 percent of the kids are doing reading and math at or above grade level—in only 2 years. They've got a new principal. They adopted a school uniform policy. They adopted a high expectations/high accountability policy. They lowered the class sizes. They cleaned up the school, and they turned it around in 2 years.

I was in a poor school in western Kentucky a couple months ago, that 4 years ago was one of the worst schools in Kentucky. Over half the kids were on school lunch programs. They were desperately poor. And in 4 years they went from—listen to this—12 percent of the kids doing reading at or above grade level to almost 60 percent; 5 percent of the kids doing math at or above grade level to 70 percent; zero percent of the kids doing science at or above grade level to 63 percent.

And the trick for America is not—this is not rocket science now. People know how to do this. This is happening. It happens in Florida. It happens in every State in the country. And what we have not learned how to do is how to do it on a uniform basis.

And so I hope that one of the things that will be debated—I spent—both Hillary and I probably spent more time in the 12 years before we came here working in schools than anything else we did. And I still think it's the key to the future of the country. You've got the largest and most diverse student population in the history of America, the first time we've had more kids in school than we did in the baby boom generation after World War II. And the good news is the schools are getting better, and the real good news is we actually know how to turn them all around. But it requires more than even a debate in the Presidential election. It requires much more than legislation from Congress. It also requires people's involvement.

But for whatever it's worth to those of you that are involved in the schools, we're now awash in evidence that this is a problem we can solve, and therefore, when you have that, there's no excuse for not solving it. So I urge all of you, in whatever way you can, to make your contribution to that.

I've already talked longer than I meant to. And I didn't have any idea what I was going to say when I got here. [*Laughter*] But I'm glad I got invited. There is one thing I'd like to say officially—I don't know how many of you are here from Dade County in south Florida, but they had the worst weather down there yesterday that I have seen in the 17 years I've been going down there. And there's still a lot of serious flooding. The Governor has asked for an emergency declaration, and we're reviewing it now, and I hope to have it issued shortly. But we're going to do what we can to help. But for those of you who have friends and neighbors down there who don't know, it was really bad—I mean, really bad.

And among other things, for all us political junkies, the flood, lightning and wind knocked out the cable system last night, and

we had to race to another place that had satellite TV so I could see the debate. [*Laughter*] But there are a lot more serious problems down there, and we're going to do what we can to help them.

I want to thank all the people here on the platform for putting this together. And I want to thank you for meeting here. Thank you for having me. Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3 p.m. at the Prime Osborne Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to author Kerry Kennedy Cuomo and her husband, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Andrew M. Cuomo, her mother, Ethel Kennedy, and her brother, Joseph P. Kennedy II; Cathy Bessant, president, Bank of America (Florida); and Gov. Jeb Bush of Florida. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary did not include the complete opening remarks of the President. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Reception for Representative Corrine Brown in Jacksonville

October 4, 2000

The President. Now, listen, we're going to forgive you for that minor election year exaggeration. [*Laughter*] Let me tell you folks, were you all—you weren't in the rally, were you?

Audience members. No-o-o!

The President. Well, we had a good one, and I thank you for making it possible. I just want to say more briefly what I said in there. I am grateful to the people of Florida for the opportunity they've given to me and Hillary and to our administration to serve. The first victory I won, of any kind, running for President was the December 1991 straw poll at the Florida Democratic Convention, and I'm very grateful.

We almost won here in '92 and spent no money. And I had a big fight within our own camp. I kept telling them, "We can win in Florida." So when we didn't win in '92, I said, "There will be no debate in '96. We're going all out." In the meanwhile, of course, we had the Summit of the Americas here; we moved the Southern Command here; we saved the Everglades; we helped to bring the economy back; and we got a big victory in Florida in 1996. And what Corrine said was true: When it came on the television early on election eve that Bill Clinton and Al Gore had carried Florida, everybody said, "Katie bar the door. It's over," and all that. And I would like it if you would send that message again on the night of November 7th.

I also want to say that if I have been able to help our country, it's important to me that you understand that it wouldn't have been possible had it not been for the support of people like Alcee Hastings and Corrine Brown. And she has done a great job in Congress. She does deliver. As a matter of fact, she works me to death. [*Laughter*] When people see her coming in the White House, if she wants something, we finally decided just go on and tell her yes before we even hear what it is—[*laughter*]—because we know if we don't, we just know she'll wear us out until we're all exhausted, and we'll wind up saying yes anyway. [*Laughter*] So we just say yes on the front end now. [*Laughter*]

She has done a really good job for you, and she deserves to be reelected. And in a larger sense, her election and every election this year, from anybody who has been involved in the last 8 years, is a decision by the people about whether to keep changing in the direction we're going or whether to turn back around and go back to where we were and change in another direction.

And I can only tell you again—I don't want to repeat everything I said out there, but there are huge differences. I thought the Vice President did an excellent job in that debate last night. I was very proud of him. But it's important to me that you understand that—like I said, I'm not running for anything. We've got another candidate in my house now—[*laughter*]—and she's going to win, I think. But it's important to me that you understand that everything that I have tried to do this last 8 years to turn the country around, to bring the country together, to get it moving forward, is sort of like setting the table for a banquet, but the banquet hasn't been held yet.

And I can give you—we're paying off the debt, but we're not debt-free. We've had the longest economic expansion in history, but

it hasn't extended to everybody who's willing to work. We've reduced, just this last year, the number of uninsured people, for the first time in a dozen years, but there are still working families with children out there that need health insurance and senior citizens that need medicine.

We've got—the test scores in our schools are going up, and the dropout rate's going down, and the college-going rate is at an all-time high. There's been a huge increase, two-thirds, in the number of our kids taking advanced placement courses; 500 percent increase in the number of African-American children taking advanced placement courses for college in the last decade. But we're not anywhere near where we need to be yet.

So the question is, what is it that we propose to do? We've got the country turned around, pulled together, moving in the right direction. We're going to change. The question is, how are we going to change? And the point I've tried to hammer home—and I want to, by the way, before I go any further, I want to acknowledge the presence in the audience of somebody else who hasn't been introduced here, your former Lieutenant Governor, my Special Envoy to the Americas, Buddy MacKay. I want to thank him for the great job he's done.

But there's a big difference in the Republican and Democratic economic approaches. You heard a little bit of it last night. But just to simplify, basically, they want a tax cut that's almost 3 times as big as ours, the one that the Vice President and Corrine support, and a partial privatization of Social Security, which would cost another trillion dollars to fund. And that's before they keep any of their spending promises. So that puts them into spending the Social Security money or into a deficit, the way we talk about it.

That's why the Vice President says, "I'd like to give you one that big, but I can't, not responsibly, because we've got to have money for education, for health care, and we've got to keep paying the debt down."

But what you should understand is, every time I go to one of these big-dollar fundraisers where we've got a bunch of rich people, I say, "Why are you for us? You know, if you go to them, he's going to give some of you millions. Why are you for us?" And I make them say what I'll say to you, what they always say is, "Because your deal worked. It's better to have low interest rates, where businesses can borrow money and expand, the stock market grows, people can be hired, incomes go up. And I'd rather pay a little more money on a higher income than less money on a lower income, where more people are working and the economy's growing." This is a huge, huge idea difference here.

You know, they really believe if you lower taxes, mostly on upper income people and you give them more money to invest, it will grow the economy, even if the Government's in deficit. We really believe that if you have a Government that's in deficit and you're growing the debt, you're going to have high interest rates; it's going to stagnate the economy; and nothing else is going to work very well; plus which low interest rates is the best middle class tax cut in the world.

I have an economic study which indicates that the difference between our plan and theirs would keep interest rates a percent lower for a decade. That's $390 billion in lower home mortgages, $30 billion in lower car payments, $15 billion in lower college loan payments. That's a $435 billion tax cut, in the form of lower interest rates. And you get that for free by paying down the debt. So it's a huge choice. You've got to decide.

We have big differences in health care. We're for a Patients' Bill of Rights. They're not. We think all Americans ought to have—all seniors ought to have access to affordable, voluntary prescription drug coverage, and they don't. We think that this Children's Health Insurance Program, which has insured 2½ million kids, should be expanded to include the working parents of those kids. That would take care of 25 percent of all the people without health insurance in this country. It would also, by the way, dramatically alleviate the burden on hospitals today for uncompensated medical care.

We believe that families ought to have a long-term care tax credit to take care of their elderly or disabled family members. More and more people are doing that, and more and more people are going to have to do that because we're all living longer. If you live to be 65 in America, your life expectancy is

82. And with the human genome project—I said to a woman's group I just met with, and I'll tell you again—I believe that the young women who are still having kids, in this audience, within the next 10 years will be coming home with babies that will have a life expectancy of 90 years. But it means we have to plan for this; we have to prepare for this; we have to adjust our society for this.

So these are big differences. There are big health care differences. In education, both our sides are for accountability. I think our accountability plan is a little better than theirs, and I won't go into why now because you don't have all day to talk about it. But the difference is, in addition to accountability, we want to help people meet the standards.

So I'll just give you one example. When Al Gore started leading our efforts to hook all the classrooms and schools up to the Internet, 3 percent of the classrooms and 11 percent of the schools were connected. Today, 65 percent of the classrooms and 95 percent of the schools are connected to the Internet. We want to put 100,000 teachers out there, for smaller classes in the early grades, and make sure they're certified to teach what they're teaching, qualified.

We want to build—provide States with tax relief on school bonds to build 6,000 new schools or radically remodel them and to repair another 5,000 a year for 5 years—huge issue in Florida. You've got people in all the housetrailers and coming out of the windows in these old schools, and there are more kids than ever before in the schools but a smaller percent of the parents owning property and being in the—elections than ever before. And I think—we've got the money; we ought to have some tax relief here and some direct funding to help repair these schools and modernize them. It's a big issue. I think it's important.

So, we're for that, and they're not. So there are big differences in the economy, health care, education; big differences in the environment; big differences in crime; big differences in how we go about living together on equal terms. We're for strengthening the equal pay for equal work law for women. We're for a hate crimes bill that covers everybody, and they're not.

So I believe, on all these issues, in addition to what Corrine does for the district, she's right, and they're not. That's what I believe. If you believe that and if you believe the same about the Presidential race, then it's very important that between now and election, you give her some more money if you can, because she's being outspent. But beyond that, you think about all the people you come in contact with every day who are your friends. Some are Democrats; some are Republicans; some are independents. Nearly every one of them intends to vote. Almost none of them come to things like this. Is that right? Most of your friends never come to events like this and would never have a chance to have an encounter like this.

So I think it's very important that in addition to everything else, if you just make up your mind that part of the duties of citizenship for you—since you came here, you heard this, you know something about it already, otherwise you wouldn't be helping her—is that every day between now and the election you're going to take a little time to talk to somebody. You might make the difference in whether they vote or not. You might make the difference in the person they vote for.

Because the most important thing—I've always believed if the American people have enough time and enough information, they nearly always get it right. Otherwise, we wouldn't still be here as the oldest democracy in the world. We'd be on the ash can of history. We'd be history. And the reason we're still here doing better is, not necessarily—not primarily because of the leaders but primarily because people are pretty smart, and they're fundamentally good, and our system is fundamentally wise. And freedom works, but for it to work, people have to have enough information and enough time to digest it, and they have to understand what the differences are and the nature of their choice.

So the way I want you to think about this is: Confusion about the choice helps them; clarity about the choice helps us. I believe that with all my heart. I think if people say,

"I want somebody that will meet the big challenges of the future. I want somebody that understands the future. I want somebody that supported the right kind of change in the past, and here are the choices before me in the economy and education and health care, the environment, crime, the whole 9 yards," we win, if they understand.

You can help that. So I want to ask you for her, for Al Gore and Joe Lieberman, for Bill Nelson, go out there and make sure people understand with clarity the choice before them. If you do, trust the people will have a great celebration the night of November 7th.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:40 p.m. in Boardroom A at the Prime Osborne Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Bill Nelson, candidate for U.S. Senate from Florida. Representative Brown is a candidate for reelection in Florida's Third Congressional District.

Statement on Smaller Learning Communities Grants

October 4, 2000

I am pleased that today the U.S. Department of Education is awarding $42.3 million in grants to help school districts create Smaller Learning Communities in large high schools across the country. Nearly three-quarters of American high schools have more than 1000 students enrolled, and the grants announced today will help States and local communities create smaller learning environments to enhance the safety and academic achievement of our Nation's teenagers. The Vice President and I have a longstanding commitment to ensuring that all children have access to a first-class education, and these grants provide support to State and local communities to work toward this goal by investing in what works. We know that smaller schools provide more personal attention and greater academic support than larger schools and outperform large schools on most measures of school success, including grades, test scores, attendance, and graduation rates—and this impact is even greater for minority and low-income students.

Today I challenge Congress to extend the benefits of Smaller Learning Communities to more districts and schools by funding this program at the $120 million level proposed in my FY 2001 budget. Right now, the Republican leadership has proposed an education budget that shortchanges America's students by flat-funding the Smaller Learning Communities Program, and by failing to provide adequate funds to: reduce class size; improve teacher quality; turn around failing schools; expand after-school opportunities; build and modernize new schools; help students prepare for college through GEAR UP; and make college more accessible and affordable for all Americans. Congress must act now so that our children can receive the first-class education they deserve.

Statement on Senate Passage of the "Breast and Cervical Cancer Act of 1999"

October 4, 2000

I am extremely pleased that the Senate unanimously passed legislation today providing an important new health coverage option to low-income, uninsured women with breast cancer. With passage of the "Breast and Cervical Cancer Act of 1999," the Senate has virtually assured that the Congress will present me with legislation that I was pleased to include in this year's budget and that I will be proud to sign into law. I would like to thank my wife Hillary for her constant advocacy on behalf of this legislation. Her longstanding advocacy for women with breast cancer is well known and has been the inspiration behind this administration's unwavering commitment to this issue. I look forward to final passage of this important bill and the new security it will provide for thousands of women with breast cancer.

Remarks at a Reception for Congressional Candidate John J. Kelly

October 4, 2000

Let me say, first of all, I'm here for several reasons. One is, whatever I've been able to

accomplish these last 8 years would have been impossible without the support of the Democratic Members of Congress. And in some ways, their support when we were in the minority in Congress has been even more vital than when we were in the majority, because if they stick with me, we can still do most of what we want to do for America.

As some evidence of how important this race is to them, we have one of the true leaders of our Democratic caucus, Representative Nancy Pelosi from California, is here. Thank you, and Representative Brad Sherman from California back there. Congressman David Minge from Minnesota was here; he just walked out. Is anybody else here, Tom? Is anybody else here? I don't want to make anybody mad. [*Laughter*] I'm getting to you.

I also—I want to thank Tom Udall, who took me around Santa Fe a few days ago. We had a wonderful time, and I actually got to do something I rarely do. I got to shop a little. And I informed him that he took me to the right places, and the women who live in my house are very happy with the selections he helped me make. [*Laughter*] And I thank him for that.

The second thing is, I feel deeply indebted to New Mexico. New Mexico voted for Al Gore and me twice, gave us strong support, and has contributed immensely to the success of this administration. And Bill Richardson, who was here earlier, has done a fabulous job. Ann Bingaman served in the Justice Department with great distinction. Of course, John was an outstanding United States attorney, and Jeff Bingaman has been a leader on technology and environmental issues, on so many issues where what we're trying to do in the White House can only be done because he's been out there for years in the Senate doing the same things, even better. And I'm very grateful to you, Jeff Bingaman. Thank you.

Now, if John hadn't asked all the Georgetown people to raise their hand, I was going to do it, because the press, which is covering this, is always looking for the dark underbelly of these fundraisers. [*Laughter*] There is always some sordid, hidden motive behind everything we're doing. And I just wanted to know what it is. [*Laughter*] For the first time in 26 years, I am not on the ballot. And you all were about to have the DT's—[*laughter*]—and so now you've got somebody to help. And I appreciate, more than I can say, all of our classmates for being here.

John was a year behind me at Georgetown. I met him 35 years ago. I liked him then. I admired him then, and I still do. You heard him talk a little about his career. I think we need more people in the United States Congress who spent big chunks of their lives helping people that most of the rest of us forget about, who know what life is like for people who will never be able to come to a fundraiser in Washington or even in Albuquerque. I think that's really important.

I also think he and Suedeen are the kind of people we want to hold up as Representatives of the Democratic Party in the new century. They represent everything that I think is the best about America. And the other thing I want to tell you is, he can win this race. In 1998—little known fact—our nominee for this congressional seat in 1998 won the election on election day and was defeated by the advance balloting in New Mexico, 3 weeks in advance, because it all moved to us in the last 5 days there. But he won; our guy won on election day. And we weren't in harness enough with the national mood until the last week, so that that's one more House seat we would have won had we been where we were on election day 3 weeks out. So he can win.

Now, in a larger sense I want to say, I know I'm kind of preaching to the saved here, but there are a lot of people here who have friends not only in New Mexico, but a lot of John's friends have come here from other States. Some of you have come from New York, and if you did, I hope you'll vote for Hillary. I'll get a little plug there.

But I would imagine most of you watched the debate last night. I thought the Vice President did an outstanding job. But I want you to know what I believe. I believe when Al Gore says, "You ain't seen nothing yet," it's more than a campaign slogan. I believe that the best stuff for America is still out there.

We spent an enormous amount of time in the last 8 years kind of turning around the ship of state, and that can't be done on the

dime like that. It's like a big ocean liner. You know, the *Titanic* hit the iceberg in spite of the fact that the crew saw it way before they did it. They just didn't see it in time to avoid the iceberg. It takes time to turn around. And we've done that. And now, virtually every indicator is going in the right direction: Not just the lowest unemployment in 30 years, but welfare has been cut in half. We've got the lowest crime rate in 27 years. We had, last year, for the first time in a dozen years, we had a decline in the number of people without health insurance in America, a huge turnaround. And things are going in the right direction. So the question is, what do we do with all this?

You heard John tell you what he thinks we ought to do about it. What I want to say to you is, I've been here 8 years, and I'm not running for anything, but in America, our public life is always about tomorrow. That's why we're still around here after over 200 years. And we may never get a chance in our lifetime like we have now, to seize all the big opportunities, to meet all the big challenges, to build the future of our dreams for our kids.

And I believe I know better than any single American that in that endeavor, every last Senate seat and every last House seat matters—every single one. And I hope—I believe after last night, the American people have more of an idea of what the genuine differences are. But let me tell you, I spent a lot of time not only living this job but studying the respective positions of the candidates. And there's a huge difference in where not only our nominees for President but our whole party is on economic policy, on health care policy, on education policy, on environmental policy, on arms control and national defense policy, on what it will take to build one America that brings us together across all the racial and religious and other lines that divide us—massive differences.

And the only reason I'm taking this time to talk to you is that every one of you will see hundreds of people between now and election day. And most of you have most of your friends among people who will never come to an event like this, but they will vote, because they love their country, they want to be good citizens. They will show up and vote. But they will never have an encounter like this. They do other things with their lives. You need to be sure that every day you take every opportunity to tell everybody you really have a chance to talk with about what the choice is. What is the nature of the choice?

Last night you heard in the debate the discussion about tax policy. And the Republican nominee said to the Vice President, "Well, your tax cut leaves some people out." Well, our Democratic tax cut is only about a third of the size of theirs. But there's a reason for that. We think we have to save some money to invest in education, health care, the environment, and we think we've got to keep paying the debt off.

Now, keep in mind, if you pay the debt off, as opposed to continuing—or returning to deficit spending and getting into the Social Security surplus, which their plan inevitably will do—when you add up their tax cut, the trillion dollars it costs to partially privatize Social Security without bankrupting it for the people who will be guaranteed their benefits, and all their spending promises, they go back to deficit spending.

Interest rates will be a point lower over the next decade under the plan John Kelly will vote for. Do you know what that's worth? Three hundred ninety billion dollars in home mortgage savings, $30 billion in car payment savings, $15 billion in college loan savings, God only knows how much in credit card savings. Lower business loans means more businesses started, more jobs added, more incomes raised, and a higher stock market.

And it also means you get rid of the third biggest item in the budget. Interest on the debt is the third biggest item in the budget—Social Security, defense, interest on the debt, Medicare—and we'll get rid of it.

When I took office, they told me the deficit would be $455 billion this year, and we'd be spending almost 15 cents a dollar on the debt. We got it down to 12 cents. And we will have paid $360 billion of the debt off when I leave office. But this is something that the progressive party ought to be for, even though it sounds conservative. Why? Because we live in a global economy where we're competing for dollars. We need to free up money for the private sector to invest and

create jobs. And keeping interest rates low is a broadbased, middle-class tax cut that benefits everybody.

How do I know? We've had the lowest African-American and Hispanic unemployment ever recorded in America, the lowest poverty rates among those minority groups ever recorded in America. Are they too high? Yes, but we're moving them in the right direction. Last year we had the biggest drop in child poverty since 1966, because we have a stable and growing economy. And now we've got to spread it to everybody.

The point is, people have a choice to make here. To pretend that there's no choice is dead wrong. There is a clear choice. And you have to decide, since a lot of you here, since you could afford to be here, would get more out of their tax cut than ours in the first year, you have to ask yourself, "Why am I here?" "I went to Georgetown. I have to be, right?" [*Laughter*] No, I mean besides that.

And the answer is, you and everybody else in America will be better off if we focus tax relief where it's most needed, to help people deal with child care and long-term care and college education and saving for retirement and if we keep those interest rates down and keep the economy going strong, where everybody will make more money.

It's not as if we haven't had a test run. We tried it their way for 12 years. We tried it our way for 8 years. The evidence is there. People need to understand the difference.

We have a very different health care policy. We're for the Patients' Bill of Rights that really is a bill of rights, not suggestions, and they're not. And to be fair to them, they say, "Well, this may cost too much on the health insurance premiums for small-business employers, and it may cost the HMO's too much. And they may raise health care premiums, and they're too high already." That's their argument.

So the problem is, we have evidence. I put in a Patients' Bill of Rights for everybody insured under the Federal Government—Medicare, Medicaid, military, Federal employees, and the retirees who get their health care under the Federal Government. Do you know how much it costs us? One dollar a month per premium. And their office, the Republican Congressional Budget Office, estimates that the cost for the general population would be less than $2 a month.

Now, I would pay $1.80 a month to know that if one of you goes out of this fundraiser—God forbid—and gets hit by a car, you can be taken to the nearest emergency room; you won't have to pass three on the way to get to the one that is covered by your health plan. And I think you would, too. This is a big issue, and it's a difference.

But there's a choice here. This Medicare drug deal—I can't do a better job than the Vice President did last night. I thought he made a great show of it, because he said what our position is. But you need to know what's going on here. We've got the money to provide prescription drugs under Medicare. If we were starting Medicare today, would we do it without a drug plan? Of course not. But in 1960—Medicare was enacted when we were beginning our Georgetown careers, and medicine was about doctors and hospitals. Now, medicine may be about staying out of the hospital by taking medicine that makes you live longer and live better. And every day there are older people in this country choosing between medicine and food.

Now, we say, "Since Medicare is an efficient, popular, effective Government program, let people buy into Medicare and get drug coverage. It also has, by the way, an administrative cost of about 1½ percent, as opposed to 10 to 14 percent for most HMO's, so it's the most efficient way to do it. And let everybody who needs it have a chance to buy it. We'll give poor people—we'll pay their premiums. And then if people have catastrophic bills, over a certain amount, we'll pay that, and everybody else will pay a copay and a monthly fee."

They say, "Let's don't do that. Let's phase it in over 5 years, cover people up to 150 percent of the poverty line, and then cover everybody else by letting them buy an insurance policy." The problem is—and I have to give it to the health insurance companies. As many fights as I've had with them, I have to take my hat off to them. They've been scrupulously honest in this debate. They have been terrific. They have said, "Look, this is nuts. You can't design a health insurance policy that anybody can afford to pay for that

will cover an acceptable amount of medicine. The insurance market won't do it."

Nevada has adopted the Republican plan. That's what they adopted. Do you know how many health insurance companies have offered drug coverage in Nevada since they adopted it? Zero. None. Not one. Why? Because it won't work. I've got to give it to our adversaries; evidence never phases them. [*Laughter*] You've got to kind of admire that.

But what's this whole deal really about? Do you know what it's about? It's about the drug companies, and they're not for this. And you may say to yourself, "That doesn't make any sense. I'm in a business where the more customers I have, the better I do. How could you be in the business of making drugs and not want to sell more of them?" It's a good question, and here's the answer. Now, let me say, you don't have to demonize the pharmaceuticals to do this. I am proud of the fact that those companies are part of America. They have—every single week they come up with some new breathtaking discovery. They provide tens of thousands of wonderful jobs to Americans, and I thank God they're in our country. You do not have to demonize them. But they're wrong on this, and let me explain why.

Here's their problem. It costs a fortune to develop these drugs, and then they spend a whole lot of money advertising the drugs. And they want to sell the drugs worldwide, but because Europe and Canada and everybody else is under price controls, they have to recover 100 percent of their development and their advertising costs from us. That's fine for me; I can pay it. And what they're worried about is if Medicare, all of a sudden, is representing millions of American seniors—it's not price controls—they're just worried that Medicare will become such a big buyer, they'll have so much power in the market, that senior citizens in America will be able to buy drugs made in America almost as cheap as they can buy them in Canada. And they're worried, therefore, that since they can't recover their costs anywhere else, that their profits will be drastically reduced, thereby undermining their ability to continue to develop new drugs and do all that. It's a legitimate problem. But surely to goodness, the answer to the problem is not to tell old people they can't have medicine they need.

Now, what's our position? Our position is, "We've got the money. Take care of the people who need the drugs. Keep them well. Let them live longer. And then we'll help the drug companies figure out how to solve their problem. They're big. They're strong. They've got a lot of influence around here. We'll figure out how to solve this." [*Laughter*] But surely, the answer to the problem is not to deprive people of the medicine they need. This is crazy. We're right on this, and they're wrong. It's a big reason to be for John Kelly.

I could go through the same drill on energy and the environment. And Jeff Bingaman could give a speech better than me.

I could go through the same drill on education. Both sides are now for accountability. That's good. I would like to point out that when we took office there were only 14 States with core academic standards, and we required it as a condition of Federal aid. There are now 49. We tried to have a voluntary national test that could then be administered and judged and used as a basis of giving out Federal aid, and the other side said no. So we required all the States to identify their failing schools and take steps to turn them around.

And what Al Gore wants to do is say, "Turn them around; shut them down; or put them under new management." They say the answer to the need for more choice is to go to vouchers. We say the answer to the need for more choice is, since we don't have enough money in the school system as it is, since we only give 7 percent of the total budget—it was 9 in the sixties. When we came to Georgetown, the Federal Government was giving 9 percent. It got down to nearly 5 when I took office. We got it back to 7. We've got the biggest bunch of kids in school ever, and we know how to turn these schools around. So we say, "Create charter schools and other forms of public school choice, and let the kids go wherever they want to. But don't take the money—that money—out of the school system, because we don't have enough money as it is. You need competition."

Now, and we say, "And by the way, we ought to help them. So we ought to finance more teachers for small classes in the early grades. We ought to finance after-school and summer school and preschool programs for everybody that needs it. And we ought to help them build schools or repair schools. And we've got a plan to build 6,000 schools and repair 5,000 a year for 5 years."

Why? Because they need help. You've got more kids than ever before, but a smaller percentage of their parents are property owners. And therefore, it's not like at the end of World War II, when even in Hillary's hometown in Park Ridge, Illinois, which voted 4 to 1 for Goldwater, they had high school millages, because they wanted to make their schools good. And they could do it. It's different now.

So we say, accountability-plus. Big difference. Anyway, I could go through all these issues. If you—on arms control, we're for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and they're not. I think that's a big difference.

So here's the deal. If somebody comes up to you on the street and they say, "Why should I vote for Al Gore," if you live in New York, "Why should I vote for Hillary," if you live in New Mexico, "Why should I vote for John Kelly—that incumbent Congresswoman seems a perfectly intelligent, nice person to me," you need to be able to say, "Look, we're not into personal criticism. We're not into personal attacks. We just want the American people to understand what the choice is."

I'm telling you, if the people understand what the choice is and what the possibilities are, we're going to be fine. John will win if they understand what the choices are.

Now, the money is important. Why? Last year, in '98, when we won seats in the sixth year of a Presidency for the first time since 1822, we got outspent by $100 million. So you don't have to have as much money as they do. And we have too many positions that are against the money to have as much money as they do. [*Laughter*] Just on the Patients' Bill of Rights and the medicine alone, we can't get there. But that doesn't matter. That doesn't matter. What matters is that you have enough to get your message out, and you have enough to answer the incoming fire. If you do and they have more, well, that's nice for them, but it's not fatal for you. So that's important.

But I am telling you, you have got to be able to say, not just with your checkbooks but with your voice, why are you for these people? What difference would it make if John wins, or not? You need to be able to say, "There are economic consequences, health care consequences, education consequences, environmental consequences, public safety consequences, and national security consequences."

And finally, there's a lot of one-America consequences. One of the reasons I'd like to see him in the Congress is that I know how much he cares about Native Americans and about righting our relationship with the Native American tribes, not just in New Mexico but around the country. We're for the hate crimes legislation, and they're not. We're for stronger equal pay laws for women in the workplace, and they're not.

But having somebody who knows and cares about what's happening to people on these reservations and in the vicinity is profoundly important. I went to Shiprock the other day with Tom, and we were talking about this at the Navajo reservation. And it's magnificent. God, it is so beautiful. It's magnificent. And the people are so impressive. But I was introduced by a 13-year-old girl that won a contest in her school and won a computer. And she couldn't log onto the Internet because her family didn't have a telephone. Over half the families don't have telephones. Over half the families don't have jobs.

And here we are with 4 percent unemployment, and they're stuck there because they made a deal with America over 100 years ago that said they'd give up their land and their mineral rights and everything else in return for the Federal Government meeting certain responsibilities in a nation-to-nation relationship. And frankly, we took the money and ran. And ever since then, even though there have been a lot of well-meaning people involved, they've been kept in a kind of semi-dependency that has never, never been fair. It has never worked, and it's all the problems of the old welfare system times 50.

And if you believe, as I do, that intelligence and enterprise are equally distributed among all people, this is an unconscionable situation. I have done everything I could to turn it around. This new markets legislation that I think we will pass this time will help. But whether you live in New Mexico or not, whether you ever know a Native American or not, I'm telling you, as an American citizen this ought to be important to you. We need somebody who cares, who knows, who has worked among and understood these issues. This is profoundly important.

It is an important part of redeeming the promise of America that we keep working on this until we get it right. So you give people those answers, and we'll win.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:32 p.m. at the Washington Court Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to former Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Ann K. Bingaman, wife of Representative Jeff Bingaman; Mr. Kelly's wife, Suedeen; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush. Mr. Kelly is a candidate for New Mexico's First Congressional District.

Remarks at a Dinner for Hillary Clinton

October 4, 2000

Thank you. You are doing nothing to disabuse people of their stereotypes about Irish politicians—[*laughter*]—nothing. I want to thank Ted and Vicki for letting us come to this beautiful place, and thank you all for being here for Hillary.

The things that Ted says are so brazen, it's almost hard to get up and talk after him. [*Laughter*] I mean, you've got to go some to have more of that whatever that is than I do. [*Laughter*] He makes Terry McAuliffe look repressed. [*Laughter*] I'm having a good time, actually, going out and campaigning for other people. Now, 6 years ago, I went to Massachusetts to campaign for Senator Kennedy. It was more fun then, because it was quite bracing. He actually had a race then, and Massachusetts was the only place I was still popular. [*Laughter*] So we needed each other. It was wonderful. [*Laughter*] It was great.

I'd like to begin by once again thanking Senator Kennedy for 8 years of support, advice, friendship, prodding, and stunning production, for being one of those people that didn't go in a hole and feel sorry for himself when we went from being in the majority to the minority in the Senate but just got up the next day and tried to figure out a new strategy to get done what we needed to get done and to stop those things from being done that we oppose. There is nobody like him in the Congress, nobody.

When I was a young man, one day in the summer of 1966, I received a call from a man named Lee Williams, who was then the administrative assistant to Senator Bill Fulbright. And he said, "How would you like a job working on the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee?" I was an undergraduate at Georgetown. And I, frankly—as it turned out, it was just a few months before I discovered that my father had cancer, and we were going to be in terrible financial straights, and if I hadn't gotten this job, I couldn't finish college, it turned out.

So he offered me a job. He said, "Are you interested in a job?" I said, "Sure I am." I had slept about 2 hours the night before. You know, I was 19 years old. I thought I was going to live forever. And he said, "Well, you can have a part-time job for $3,500 a year, or you can have a full-time job for $5,000 a year." I said, "I'd like two part-time jobs"—[*laughter*]—which I thought wasn't bad for 2 hours sleep. So he laughed, and he said—this was a Friday morning—he said, "You're just the guy I'm looking for; be here Monday."

So I packed my bags, and I went to Washington. And I was not quite 20 years old, and I was just full of awe for everything. And there were some truly great figures in the United States Senate then, people who argued about civil rights and argued about foreign policy, including the war in Vietnam, and argued about what we ought to do to help the poor and how we were going to deal with the great issues of the day. And it made a searing impression on me.

Those 2 years I worked in the Senate, in my last 2 years at Georgetown, I watched the Foreign Relations Committee hold those great hearings on Vietnam, on whether there

was a domino theory, what China's future was going to be. And I watched, obviously, a President that I admired very much, President Johnson, try to push through legislation I believed in and kept getting in deeper and deeper trouble over Vietnam. I learned a lot about America and American politics.

And I saw the young and handsome Senator Edward Kennedy inspiring all these young people, along with his brother Robert, to public service in those years. It's a long time since then. And I want you to know, I asked him a question at dinner, and everybody around the table heard it. I said, "Are you as idealistic today about our country and our system as you were when you entered the Senate, shortly after your brother was elected President?" He said, "More." That's why he's one of the 8 or 10 greatest Senators in the history of our country.

And by the way, I said, "Me, too." I feel I will leave office more idealistic than I was the moment I took my hand off the Bible from taking the oath of office on January 20, 1993. I will. I feel that way about our country. Just look at the last 8 years. We've got a lot of evidence that our challenges as a people yield to intelligent, sustained effort in the same way that all other challenges of life do.

So that brings me to how come you're here and why he threw this party for us. When Hillary—I'll never forget this—the last thing in the world I expected to be doing about a year and a half ago was this. [*Laughter*] I mean, I thought, we were talking about what a great last year we were going to have; we were going to take all these trips together; we were going to do all this stuff and how great it would be. And then Senator Moynihan announced that he wasn't going to run. I can't remember exactly when that was. And then a few days later, Charlie Rangel and, I don't know, several other House Members, called Hillary and said, "You really ought to think about doing this." They knew that we were going to move to New York when we left, I think, and so they said that.

She said, "Bill, this is crazy." I said, "I don't know; you want to do it?" She said, "I don't know." So she went up and started looking around and talking to people, and she came back, and she said, "I think I'd like to do this. Do you think I should?" I said, "I'll give you the same advice I give young people fresh out of college that ask me this. If you can stand to lose—can you stand to lose? If the answer to that's yes, then you go to question two. Do you have a reason for wanting the job that's bigger than the fact that you'd like the title, something that relates to the people you want to represent and not to just the fact that it would be nice to be a Senator? If the answer to that's yes, then the third question is, are you prepared to pay the price it takes to win?"

I said, "You've got to understand. This means that all those trips we were going to take we're not going to take. All those relaxing weekends we were going to have at Camp David, just sitting around with our friends and watching movies, we ain't going to have them." And I went through a lot of other things. I said, "Now, if the answer is you're not paralyzed by the thought of defeat; you have a reason for wanting the job that's bigger than the fact that you'd like to have it, that relates to the people you want to represent; and you're prepared to do what it takes to win, then I think you should do it." I think she wanted me to say yes or no. [*Laughter*] So about a day or so later, she said, "Okay, I want to do it. So here we go."

I'd just like to say a couple things. First of all, on a purely personal note, for 30 years, all she's done is helped other people, mostly me. But she also served on the board of the Legal Services Corporation, under President Carter, and she started the legal services clinic at the law school, when she and I were teaching at the law school, almost 30 years ago. Her first job was with what was then called the Washington Research Project, now known as the Children's Defense Fund, when we got out of law school. Then she went on the board of that. Then she helped me get elected attorney general and Governor. And then when I got elected Governor, she founded something called the Arkansas Advocates for Families and Children and built the State's first neonatal level three nursery so we could keep these tiny little infants alive. And now in our little State, that children's hospital is the seventh largest children's hospital in America.

And for 30 years, I just watched her do stuff for other people—mostly me, but also

for other people. And this is the first time she ever asked anybody to help her. So I'm trying to do my part. And I'll never get even; I'll never get caught up. But I really appreciate it, because what I want you to know is—you heard that debate last night, so we'll start with that. I thought the Vice President did a really good job, and I was really proud of him. I hope that over the course of these three debates—I think we made a good start last night—that the American people will see two leaders representing two parties, that show genuine respect for one another but have clear differences. And I hope that these debates will clarify those differences, so people will know what the choices are. And I think we made a big start last night. And I think Mr. Lehrer deserves a lot of credit, because he had a little flexibility there, and they spent at least 3½ minutes on every topic, instead of 90 seconds on this, and we'll go to 90 seconds on that, 90 seconds on the other thing. So we're doing that.

But I was happy when she decided to do this, because I think it's important that we have people in the Senate who understand these big issues and understand the big choices and who are capable of clarifying them, number one.

Number two, one thing I've learned watching Ted is that he's effective because he's both dogged and flexible, because he has both passion and organizing ability. He stays with stuff. And I personally have never worked with anybody that had the same combination of intellectual ability and passionate commitment and organizing ability and doggedness that Hillary does. And I think she's really well-suited for this kind of job. And I know how much she cares about this stuff.

I say this all the time, but I'm not running for anything. I don't have to say this. I really do believe when Al Gore says, "You ain't seen nothing yet," that may be a campaign slogan, but I happen to believe it's true. I feel like we've just sort of set the banquet table in the last 8 years, but we haven't served the meal yet. It takes time to turn a country around. I mean, this country was in a—I know people took a big chance on me 8 years ago, but it wasn't that big a chance, because the country was in a ditch, and we had to change. [*Laughter*]

I've often wondered, late at night, how many people strolled into the voting place and said, "God, I just don't know if I can vote for this guy. He's just Governor of this small southern State, and he looks like he's 30 years old, and they said terrible things about him, but, oh, heck, what the heck, I'll give it to him."

So now it's different, and things are going well. And the last bad social indicator we had began to bend when we learned a couple days ago that last year, for the first time in a dozen years, we had 1.7 million fewer people without health insurance, thanks to the Children's Health Insurance Program that we fought so hard for in 1997. But we have still a long way to go.

So we got things moving in the right direction, and the real question is, what are we going to do with this? Are we going to sort of splurge it away, saunter through it, wait for it to come to an end, or build an edifice? You know, build the future of our dreams for our kids. That's what this is all about.

The reason I wanted Hillary to run, once she answered yes to the three questions, is that we need every good hand we can, every stout heart we can, every good mind we can, and everybody with a steel will we can, determined not to squander but instead to make the most of this moment. And we need every voice we can, bringing clarity to the choice, so the American people, whatever they decide, it's always got to be all right with those of us that are in the arena. I mean, they usually get it right. Otherwise, we wouldn't be around here after 224 years. America would be on the trash heap of history. So you've got to believe in the system. Every time people get enough information and enough time, with the right argument, they nearly always get it right. Otherwise we wouldn't still be here, still rocking along, still building a more perfect Union.

So we need people with talent. And I can just tell you, I know I'm biased, but I've known hundreds of people who do this stuff, and I've never known any citizen activist who had remotely the combination of qualities that would make a great Senator that she does. That's what I really believe. I always—

I remember when we were going together. I said, "This is terrible. I'm going home to Arkansas, and I'm going to try to run for office, and I feel terrible that you're going to do this, because you ought to be doing it, too." The only thing that anybody can say anymore, after all I've been through, that makes me mad, is when somebody suggests that the only reason she can do this is that she's my wife and First Lady. If she hadn't been my wife and First Lady, she could have done it 25 years ago. Now, that's the truth.

So, thanks. We're in a hard fight. We're a little ahead. I think she's going to win. I think the Vice President and Senator Lieberman are going to win. But I think the big problem is making people understand, number one, this is a gift, this moment—countries just get a moment like this once every 50 years or so—and number two, understanding what the nature of the choice and the consequences are. I am absolutely convinced, if people get the feeling this is a really important election and then have a pretty clear idea of what the choices are and what the consequences are, we're going to do great.

Clarity is our friend; cloudiness is our foe. And you helped us tonight by making sure that she'll be able to hold up her end of the deal in New York. I just want to urge you to keep doing whatever you can and not just financially, I mean really just talking to people. People have got to understand, this is a big deal. I mean, I feel that we spent so much time just trying to get all the things going in the right direction and get the country coming together and giving people a sense of possibility again, and I think people have that. They have this. Why do you think the issues are so important?

One reason Al Gore got such great ratings out of the speech at the convention, and it lasted more than Governor Bush's did, is it was more specific. I once said to him, I said, "the Presidency—the election for President is the world's greatest job interview. And sometimes people forget that. You're asking people to hire you. And unlike a lot of other jobs, you get to both interview for the job, and tell people at the same time what you think the job is. And it changes over time."

So that's what we're doing. You've done a good thing here, helping Hillary tonight. She won't let you down. And we need every great soul we can get in the Senate. You're doing a good thing by helping our side in this election. You've just got to make sure that we have—that people really understand and care about it.

I've lived long enough now to see tragedy change things. I've seen Senator Kennedy go through tragedy after tragedy and keep serving, but the times that he had to serve in changed. He's going to have the best time to be a Senator that he's had since the first term he was in the Senate, if we win the White House, if we pick up some Senate seats, we pick up some House seats. It will be the best time you've had since you started.

And you have to wait a long time when things go bad to make them just right again. And so I say to you, not in a maudlin way, that this is a gift. We have been given a gift. If I had any role in it, I'm grateful. I did the best I could, and I've got a few more cards to play before I'm done. But you've got to make sure you do this election right, because it may be 50 years before we get another chance. We've got to do it right.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:22 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to dinner hosts Senator Edward M. Kennedy and his wife, Vicki; Terence McAuliffe, chair, 2000 Democratic National Convention; and Jim Lehrer, who moderated the first Presidential debate.

Remarks Following a Meeting With Congressional Leaders and an Exchange With Reporters

October 5, 2000

"Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act"

The President. Good morning. I want to thank Senator Daschle and Congressman Gephardt and the distinguished Members of the House and Senate who have come here today for a meeting on education. And I want to direct my remarks toward that and then call on Senator Robb and Representative Berkley to talk. But before I do, I would like to say a few words about the "Breast and

Cervical Cancer Treatment Act," which passed the Senate unanimously yesterday.

This bill will help thousands of low-income women with cancer get the early, affordable treatment which can save their lives. I just spoke with Speaker Hastert, and he said that he expected the bill to pass the House immediately, so that help can start flowing to women for whom it could be a matter of life and death.

I was glad to include this initiative in my budget, and I'll be proud to sign it into law. It is a good example of how we can work together for the good of the American people.

Education Legislation

Unfortunately, so far we still don't have that same approach on our most important priority, education. So far, the majority party has not joined us in providing the investments necessary to support a strategy that has been working to improve our schools for 7 years now. We have pursued this strategy relentlessly, under the leadership of Secretary Riley, and we have pursued investments which will support that strategy. Every year we've had to fight for them, but every year we've been successful in the end in getting enough bipartisan support to prevail.

Unfortunately, this year education seems to be almost the only thing on Capitol Hill where they don't want to spend a lot of extra money. As all of you know, lots of extra money has been added to many appropriations bills; billions of dollars has been spent on special projects and other things that cannot possibly be characterized as the Nation's highest priorities, over and above what were the budget limits back at the beginning of the year when we didn't know that the budget would be in as good a shape as it's in.

We have worked over the last several years to restore billions of dollars in educational funding, and we are prepared to fight for it again. I'd like to explain why and talk about the latest evidence we have that our strategy is working.

For 7 years we've had a straightforward approach. We've worked to increase standards, raise accountability, and make critical investments in education. We promoted standards in every State, required States to identify failing schools and make efforts to turn them around. We've increased Head Start dramatically and begun to provide funding for after-school and summer school programs. We have worked to connect 95 percent of our schools to the Internet, and we provided more choice through charter schools. We've hired more teachers and improved teacher quality. We're gaining ground.

For example, in 1993 only 14 States had real standards and a core curriculum. Today, 49 States do. In 1993 only 14 percent of our schools and 3 percent of our classrooms were connected to the Internet. Today, 95 percent of the schools and 65 percent of the classrooms are connected. In 1993 there was only one charter school in the entire country. Today, there are 1,700. In 1993 there was no Federal funding for after-school and summer school programs. Today, there are 600,000 children in such programs instead of on the streets. In 1993 there were no nationally certified master teachers. Today, there are almost 5,000, and by the end of the year, there will be well over 10,000.

All over the country States are turning around troubled schools. And I might say, this is due in no small measure to the leadership of the Secretary of Education, who will be talking later to the press about the report I'm going to discuss. But since 1993, he has reduced, by two-thirds, regulations imposed on States and local school districts under the previous administrations. And a new GAO report just came out showing that 99 percent of the funds appropriated by the Congress for the 10 largest Federal education programs actually are received by the local school districts for the purpose for which they were intended.

Math and reading scores are now rising across America. Some of the greatest gains are in the most disadvantaged schools. The number of students taking advance placement tests has increased by two-thirds in 8 years, the increase among Latino students, 300 percent; among African-American students, 500 percent. College exam scores are rising—entrance exam scores—even though more students from more disadvantaged backgrounds are taking the tests. The high

school dropout rate is down, the college-going rate at an all-time high.

But no one believes that we have finished the job of renewing American education, so that all students can get the world-class skills they need. The students who went back to school this fall are the biggest, most diverse group in our history. We owe it to them to make sure they're prepared to succeed in the high-tech information society in which they will live. That's what we have to do.

For example, we've been working for years to reduce class size, because study after study from Tennessee to Wisconsin to California has shown that smaller classes boost test scores and learning, especially among the most disadvantaged students who need the most personal attention. Two years ago we launched a class size reduction initiative to put more teachers in the classroom and train better those that are already there. It has allowed school districts across our country already to hire 29,000 new, well-trained teachers.

Today the Council of Great City Schools issued its second annual report on the results of the class size initiative. Last year alone, according to the report, 25 of our biggest city school systems used Federal funds to hire more than 2,700 teachers and to train 25,000 more. In Philadelphia, the teacher-student ratio in kindergarten and first grade has been cut to 15 to 1. San Francisco used the funds to get eighth grade math and language-arts classes down to 20 to 1, from a high of 33 to 1.

Just as all previous academic studies have shown, urban schools across the country report that test scores are up in smaller classes. Student confidence and teacher morale are higher; disciplinary problems are down. Michael Casserly, who runs the Council of Great City Schools, is with us today. I want to thank him for his commitment to our schools, and I want to thank him for this report, which he just gave me. And as I said, he and Secretary Riley will be discussing it later out in front of the White House.

I have been fortunate to visit schools like the ones documented in this report. From small-town Kentucky to inner-city New York, around the country, what you see clearly, based on the evidence, is an education revival, not an education recession. The report is more unequivocal proof that cutting class size and investing in teacher quality does produce results, whether the schools are urban or rural, large or small. But every year we have to fight the majority in Congress for funding the class size initiative. The budget proposed by the Republican leadership does nothing to meet our goal of hiring 100,000 new teachers to reduce class size in the early grades.

Our budget would help build or dramatically remodel 6,000 schools and repair another 5,000 a year for 5 years. Their budget fails to guarantee investment in building or modernizing classrooms, although our school construction deficit is now $127 billion. And I do believe that we have a bipartisan majority in both Houses for this initiative if we could just get it to a vote.

The budget also shortchanges funding for after-school programs and for teacher quality. We have a proposal that could allow us to put over 2 million kids in after-school programs. It underfunds our GEAR UP program, denying as many as 600,000 children help in preparing for college. And perhaps worst of all over the long run, it walks away from our $250 million commitment not only to identify failing schools but to help them turn around, or to shut them down and reopen them under new management.

It fails to give middle class families a $10,000 tax deduction for college or to provide a tax credit to help local school districts build new schools. And it fails to fund our billion-dollar initiative for teacher quality.

We get returns on every cent we spend for teacher quality. We should be using some of it to reduce the number of uncertified teachers in our classrooms. In the schools with the highest minority enrollment in this country, students have less than a 50 percent chance of having a math or a science teacher with a license and degree in the field. There is no excuse for this. We have the money to address it. We can do better, and we must.

We have lots of evidence now if you invest more in schools and teachers, if you demand more of them, you can turn schools around and change young people's lives for the better.

Now, as I said, this is not a strategy for micromanaging our schools. We've reduced regulations on them by two-thirds. It is a strategy for making national priorities out of what educators have told us and proved time and time again will work to give all our kids a world-class education.

Everyone here is committed to staying at the negotiating table until we have an education budget worthy of America's children in the 21st century. We're going to keep fighting to strengthen accountability, to hire 100,000 new teachers, to help communities build or modernize schools, to expand after-school programs and college opportunities, to put a qualified teacher in every classroom in America. That is our commitment. We owe it to our children to keep it.

Now I'd like to call on Senator Robb, who has been a real leader in this effort, to speak.

[*At this point, Senator Charles S. Robb and Representative Shelley Berkley made brief remarks.*]

The President. Let me just say in closing, obviously we wanted Representative Berkley to speak because she's been a leader in this whole effort for smaller classes, more teachers, and modernized schools and because she represents a district which is exhibit A of the problem. But it is a national problem.

We wanted Senator Robb to speak because he has been a leader in the school construction and class size initiative but also because he's a former Governor who, while he served, clearly had one of the finest records in America in education. And I say that because one of the things that we keep being told by the leadership is that somehow we're, again I'll say, "trying to tell the States what to do." We have three people here who were Governors for a total of 20 years, and we know we have not designed programs to micromanage education. What we have done is listened to educators, looked at the results, and we understand there's a national priority here.

Look, when I became President, Federal spending as a portion of all the education spending had dropped below 6 percent. When President Johnson was here, it was 9 percent. And we, first of all, had to turn it around when we got the budget under control. We've got the budget under control; we've got it back up to 7 percent. It's still just 7 cents on the dollar.

We have got to spend this money where it will have the biggest impact on learning for children. That's what this is about. And so I just wanted to make that clear. I thank them for what they've said, and I thank all the others who have taken the trouble to come here today and stand here, because we feel very, very strongly about this.

Now, I've said before, I'm a little concerned about some of the money that is being spent in these appropriations bills, but I've always been willing to work with Congress. I know there are always some special projects, but surely to goodness, if we're going to have however many billion dollars there are in special projects that don't reflect national priorities, we could come up with the modest amount more necessary to fund a truly aggressive education budget that would get the job done.

Thank you.

Situation in Yugoslavia

Q. Mr. President, the situation in Belgrade appears very critical. Citizens have stormed the Parliament building. What message today, sir, do you have both to those folks who have stormed the Parliament and to President Milosevic himself?

The President. The United States stands with people everywhere who are fighting for their freedom. We believe in democracy. I have said before, the opposition candidate who, according to all unbiased reports, clearly won the election, obviously also has strong differences with us. This is not a question of whether he agrees with us. All we want for the Serbian people is what we want for people everywhere, the right to freely choose their own leaders.

And it's been a hardcore dictatorship. They had an election. The election results were then, apparently, altered and then—now the court has made this decision. I think the people are trying to get their country back. And we support—we support democracy and the will of the Serbian people.

Q. Sir, will the U.S. in any way intervene if force is used against the citizens in Belgrade or other parts of Serbia?

The President. I don't believe it's an appropriate case for military intervention, and I don't believe that the United States should say or do anything which would only strengthen Mr. Milosevic's hand. The people of Serbia have made their opinion clear. They did it when they voted peacefully and quietly, and now they're doing it in the streets because people tried to—there's been an attempt to rob them of their vote.

And I think if the world community will just stand with—stand for freedom, stand for democracy, stand for the will of the people, I think that will prevail. It did all over Eastern Europe. We've had a peaceful transition, democratic transition, with an election in Russia. The world is moving toward freedom and democracy, and the United States should support those forces, and we will do so strongly.

Yes.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, the latest crisis in the Middle East comes at a politically sensitive time in Israel and, actually, for this country, as well. Do you still hold out hope that before you leave office a comprehensive peace agreement can be reached, or is there a point where you just say it has to wait for the next President, the next Congress, and the next Israeli leader?

The President. Well, first of all, the timetable has to be dictated by the leaders in the Middle East. But the answer to your question is, we know what the issues are; we know what the differences are. And what my obligation will be, and what the next President's obligation will be, is to do whatever we can to either help make the peace agreement or make sure it takes hold.

But our timing should be completely irrelevant to this. I should be available around the clock, every day, as long as I'm here, and we should try to do it as soon as we can because it will keep more people alive and give a much brighter future to the people in the Middle East. So our timing here should be completely irrelevant to that. But let's get back to basics here. The first thing we've got to do is to stop this violence and to get beyond it.

Now, yesterday Prime Minister Arafat—I mean, Chairman Arafat and Prime Minister Barak—excuse me—and Secretary Albright had what I think was a very productive meeting. They made clear commitments which they communicated from Paris to their people to take steps to shut this violence down. They're trying to work out a process, in which we've offered to be involved, that would evaluate what happened and why, and what went wrong.

But the most important thing is to stop people dying and then to get back to the negotiating table. So the commitments that were made yesterday and communicated by the leaders back to the Middle East now have to be implemented on the ground. That's the most important thing. There will be ample time for reassessments. There will be ample time for evaluation. But the most important thing is to stop the killing and the dying and the violence.

Now, the next most important thing is to get on with the peace process. That's, by far, the next most important thing, because it's obvious that on both sides, there's still underlying anxiety and fear and misunderstanding. And we've just got to get beyond all this. We've come too far in the last 7 years, 7½ years now, to turn back. We've just come too far. We've got to stay after this.

Oil Supply

Q. Mr. President, the United States has taken steps to increase the oil supply. Do you feel the United States Government can still do more? Is there anything else your Government can do in the United States or abroad to increase the oil supply?

The President. Well, I'm going to watch it every day. We've been fortunate that the price has dropped several dollars a barrel, after the last step we made. But there are still significant questions about how soon the product will be—can go to the refinery and whether we not only can get fuel but fuel oil out of the refinery and into the supply chain in time to make sure there's no adverse price impact for the winter. I do think we're going to have enough supplies to get through the winter. And I'm just going to watch it every day and do what seems indicated.

I would just say this, since you raised that question—and then I have to let these Members of Congress go, and Mr. Casserly and Secretary Riley will go out and talk more about the education report—but what I would hope is that what we're going through here would prompt the majority in Congress to work with us on some longer term strategies on which we ought to be able to agree.

We are very close to the development of very high mileage vehicles with fuel cells, alternative fuels, blended fuels. We are within sight of cracking the chemical mystery of the conversion of biomass to fuels at a ratio that would make it—change the whole future of this issue. Right now it takes 7 gallons of gasoline to make 8 gallons of ethanol or any other biomass fuel, but the chemists believe they can get the conversion down to one gallon of gasoline for 8 gallons of fuel. When that happens, then all of you will drive to work every day with the equivalent of 500 miles a gallon. And this will be a very different world. We will be living in a different world when that happens.

And we ought to be investing money in that. There are technologies available today off the shelf that pay out in 2 years or less that would permit us to dramatically reduce energy consumption in homes, offices, and factories all over America. We ought to give people a tax break to buy them, and we ought to do it now. We ought to create a market that will move quickly to a very different energy future that will actually grow the economy faster.

So you know where—we differ over—and there are some production incentives we could adopt now that we agree on. The most significant difference we have I think is over whether there should be drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. And that's an issue that's being debated in the election; the American people can draw their own conclusions. I think we're right. They think they're right. They can hear the debate. But that should not be an excuse to walk away from the long-term elements of an energy strategy that I've been trying to pass for more than 2 years, that we can do today, at very modest cost and enormous return.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:27 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Michael D. Casserly, executive Director, Council of Great City Schools; President Slobodan Milosevic of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro); Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; and Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel.

Remarks to the Conference on the Progressive Tradition in Princeton, New Jersey

October 5, 2000

Thank you very much. Thank you for the wonderful welcome. Thank you, President Shapiro, for your distinguished leadership here and the vital work you did during the course of our common Presidencies. It occurred to me that this might be the only place in America where people thought Woodrow Wilson got a demotion when he was elected President of the United States. [*Laughter*]

Thank you, Dean Rothschild. And thank you, Ruth Miller, for putting off your retirement so I could come here today. I want to thank Professor Sean Wilentz for putting on this conference and for his many acts of generosity and kindness and support for our efforts over the last 8 years.

I'd like to thank the Congressman from Princeton, Representative Rush Holt, for coming here. Thank you. I know this is not really a political event, but I can't help noting that Rush Holt is the only bona fide scientist in the Congress, and Lord knows, we need at least one.

Another Member of Congress wanted to come here today, Senator John Edwards from North Carolina, a good friend of mine, whose daughter Katherine is in the freshman class. And I promised to give his excuses to his daughter and the rest of you, but they are voting in the Senate today. And part of the Progressives' tradition is showing up. [*Laughter*] And so he's showing up down in Washington.

And I thank you, Katharine Strong Gilbert, for giving me this Whig-Clio Award.

You know, James Madison is a very important figure to every American and every President who cares, in particular, about the framework and history of the Constitution.

But it's interesting to me that he actually participated in debates here in the 18th century, including one with Aaron Burr, where Madison was the Whig and Burr was the Clio. It was that debate that produced a memorable line that is too often attributed to me: The era of Whig Government is over. [*Laughter*]

I must say, when I first saw the program for this conference I felt some ambivalence. The student in me wanted to come here and stay for the whole thing. But the politician in me wondered what in the living daylights I was doing here. I'm supposed to lead off a group of people whose books I have read, who know more about the subject I'm supposed to address than I ever will.

I can say that I had some unique experience in carrying on the Progressive tradition. I always felt that the work we did the last 8 years made us the heir of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson—Al Gore and me, our entire administration. And I have a fascination with that period of history.

I own a lot of Theodore Roosevelt's books in the first edition, including a fascinating account of how he organized the Rough Riders. I've also got a wonderful book that Owen Wister, the writer of westerns, wrote about his friendship with Theodore Roosevelt, when, like many of you, they were undergraduates together at Harvard. The other day I acquired Joseph Tumulty's book—he was Woodrow Wilson's private secretary—about his relationship with President Wilson, both as Governor and as President. It's a fascinating account of the time, by someone who was admittedly biased, but still had a unique perspective.

So I've thought a lot about this period. And I suppose as a politician, I should give myself the leeway of quoting Theodore Roosevelt, who said in his speech on the new nationalism, "I do not speak merely from a historical standpoint. It is of little use for us to pay lip service to the mighty men of the past, unless we sincerely endeavor to apply those qualities to the problems of the present."

It is in that spirit that I would like to say a few words today, about the Progressive tradition, about what it means for today and how it is part, I believe, of a larger ongoing debate in American history about the whole idea of America. What does the Nation mean? What does it mean to be an American?

The Progressives thought we could only keep faith with the past by keeping faith with the future. Their time had much in common with ours, and therefore, our responsibilities have much in common with theirs, to preserve what is enduring but to adapt our Nation time and again to what is new.

Woodrow Wilson said, "It behooves us once again to stand face to face with our ideals, to renew our enthusiasm, to reckon again our duties, to take fresh views of our aims, and fresh courage for their pursuit." These words ring with relevance for your time. Not simply because we stand at the dawn of a new century, as Wilson and Roosevelt did, but because this time, like theirs, is characterized by swift and stunning change.

Like the industrial revolution, this information revolution is a true seismic shift. It alters forever the way we work, live, relate to each other and those beyond our borders. The consequences of the digital chip, nanotechnology, the Internet, and the sequencing of the human genome will be every bit as profound, if not more profound, than those of the telephone, the assembly line, and the vast migration of Americans to the cities and the opening of America to its first great wave of immigrants.

But these are only the most obvious parallels between the Progressive Era and what I call this time, the last time I came to Princeton, a new Progressive era. I also believe in a larger sense the Progressive Era and this time represent two of the five pivotal points in American history, when we have been called upon to reaffirm and to redefine not just the role of Government for new times but the very idea of the American Nation. That debate has gone on from the beginning.

First there was the debate which George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and John Marshall won over Thomas Jefferson and his friends, about whether we were preeminently going to be one Nation, or a just a little bit stronger confederation of States. I have to say out of deference to Mr. Jefferson that after he became President, I suspect he was glad he lost the argument,

as he sent out Lewis and Clark, imposed the infamous embargo, and bought Louisiana, which at the time cost the equivalent of one full year's budget of the Federal Government.

Can you imagine what would happen if I came to the Congress and said—[*laughter*]—"Have I got a deal for you." [*Laughter*] "Just $1.9 trillion. What difference does it make?" [*Laughter*]

The second great debate we had about the idea of the Nation occurred obviously in the days leading up to and during and immediately after the Civil War, when Abraham Lincoln saved the Union by moving it closer to the true ideals of the Declaration of Independence and, as Gary Wills has so brilliantly argued, literally redefining the Constitution closer toward those ideals in the Gettysburg Address.

The third great point was in the Progressive Era, when Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt presided over an America fully entering the industrial revolution.

Then the fourth time was during the New Deal, the Second World War, and its immediate aftermath with the dawn of the cold war, when Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman gave us our first comprehensive social safety net and an institutionalized commitment to American leadership for peace and freedom in the world.

Now, at the dawn of this global information age, Al Gore and I have been working to adapt all of the domestic and foreign policies of the United States to these sweeping changes in science and technology, in social diversity and pluralism, and in increasing global interdependence.

History has taught Americans not to stand passively in the face of change. What the Progressive Presidents understood so clearly, from Teddy Roosevelt to Wilson to FDR and Truman to Kennedy and Johnson, is the understanding that America either will shape change or be shaped by it. As I've already said, I believe the time in which we live bears the most resemblance to the Progressive Era. But there are also elements of those other great hingepoints in American history in this time, too.

You can see it in the fight we had with the Republican Congress that led to the shutdown of the Government. You can see it in our efforts to build one America across all the lines that divide us. You can see it in our struggle to end genocide and ethnic cleansing in the Balkans and to build binding ties to Africa, Latin American and Asian nations with whom we have not been closely aligned in the past.

The central lesson of the Progressive is that you either have to shape change consistent with your values, or you will be shaped by it in ways that make it more difficult for you to live by your values. To retreat from responsibility is to invite instability. To embrace the obligation of leadership has consistently under Progressive times led to better lives for all Americans.

Wilson and Roosevelt made an enemy of outdated orthodoxy, replacing them with what Teddy's famous cousin Franklin Roosevelt called "bold, persistent experimentation." As many of the scholars here have argued, and doubtless will argue with greater clarity than I can, the Progressive legacy is not primarily a set of programs that no longer have great relevance to us but a vital set of principles: the idea that new conditions demand a new approach to Government.

When Teddy Roosevelt became President, few Americans looked to him, to his office, or even to their Government to solve their problems. At the end of the 19th century, the White House was weak; the Congress was at the mercy of special interests. Roosevelt's genius was to redefine the role of Government and the role of the President, to protect the public interest and to act as an accountable agent of change. This is an ideal as old as Madison, but Roosevelt and Wilson gave it new meaning for a new era. What is its meaning today?

When I ran for President in 1992, our Government was discredited. In fact, you could hardly run for President unless you had something bad to say about the Government. Indeed, part of the political genius of the ascendency of President Reagan and his associates was to attain power by discrediting the very idea of Government. They basically were able to say things like, "Government couldn't run a bake sale. The Government would mess up a two-car parade." And they

found huge majorities of Americans sort of nodding their heads.

Those in the Progressive tradition, I believe, have given them some ammunition by clinging to old programs, bureaucracies, and approaches that no longer worked. Then the conservatives used the failures as an excuse to do nothing on the domestic front. Some of our leaders literally made a virtue of their endless capacity to tell the American people how bad the Government was. And then when those who were reacting against the Progressive tradition took power, they seemed determined to prove it by digging us a huge budgetary hole, quadrupling the Nation's debt in 12 years. So our economy sank; our society became considerably more divided; and predictably, public confidence in our democratic Government collapsed.

That's why, when I ran in 1992, I said that it would be necessary to change our party, change our national leadership, and change our Nation. Al Gore and I believed that we had to find a new way, something now popularly called around the world, "a third way," a way back to enduring values, a way beyond a Government profoundly indifferent to people's problems, a way forward to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow.

We committed to reinvent Government so it could function as it does best in an information society, as a catalyst, a partner to the private sector in creating opportunity, jobs, and hope and providing our citizens with the tools they need to make the most of their own lives. That, too, of course, is a principle as old as our Republic, opportunity for all.

And whether we're talking about the information age, the industrial age, or the turn from the 18th to the 19th century, economic growth and opportunity have always gone hand in hand. That's why we set out to build an economic strategy that would work for this time, rooted in fiscal discipline, investment in our people and our future, and expanding our economic ties with the rest of the world. Well, lucky for us, or I wouldn't be here talking today, it's worked out pretty well.

We've gone from record deficits to record surpluses. Our economy has created 22 million jobs. We're in the midst of the longest economic expansion in history. But in the Progressive tradition, to use President Kennedy's words, the rising economy is lifting all boats. The Census Bureau reports that in the last year, typical household income rose to the highest level ever recorded, breaking $40,000 for the first time—up since 1993 by $6,300, after inflation. The poverty rate has fallen to 11.8 percent, the lowest in 20 years. Senior poverty is below 10 percent for the first time ever. Child poverty dropped by the largest amount since 1966. Hispanic and African-American poverty are the lowest since separate statistics have been kept. Since 1993, 7 million Americans have moved out of poverty, over 2 million last year alone.

Now, a century ago, economic growth was generated by large industrial organizations, popularly called the trust then. Today, economic growth is largely generated by big ideas, which is why there are so many young people like you making a fortune in dot-com companies.

The antitrust provisions and worker provisions that were developed in the Progressive Era to make the economy work and to give more people a chance to share in it still matters today. And they have been built on, modified, and changed, but they still matter today. But today we need even more focus on boosting ideas and innovation, creating the conditions for prosperity, and again, giving everybody the tools they need to succeed in a very different and, in some ways, much less organized world.

You can see our efforts there, just for example in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, where the Vice President and I fought for the E-rate so that the poorest schools and hospitals and libraries could all afford to be hooked into the Internet, and where we fought for a framework that favored competition from new companies, over giving all the business of the new information economy to existing big enterprises. Again, it's worked reasonably well. There are hundreds of thousands of new jobs, thousands of new companies out there, and it's an example of how we tried to change the laws and the framework to meet what was best for opportunity for the largest number of Americans, and to give all of our people, especially our young people, the tools they need to take advantage of the age in which we live.

So, in that sense, the nature of opportunity, a constant value, is changing. At the time our Nation was founded, opportunity most of all meant the freedom to carve a farm and an existence out of the forest frontier. In the industrial age, the Progressives saw that it meant something different. It meant a high school education, a vocational training, preserving competition, protecting American workers from abuses, and keeping children out of the workplace when appropriate.

Today it means mastering new tools and technologies, being able to think broadly, adjust quickly, and being able to keep learning for a lifetime. This morning, for example, at the White House, I met with House and Senate Democrats to push the Congress again to adopt our educational proposals, because I think they are more than ever before at the core of the concept of opportunity and at the core of our ability to keep changing and building an ever more progressive society.

Even though we balanced the budget these last 8 years and run a surplus and we've eliminated hundreds of programs, we've also doubled investment in education and training. More than 10 million Americans this year will take advantage of the HOPE scholarship and lifelong-learning tax credit. We reorganized the student loan program to save students $8 billion in student loan repayments since 1993. We raised the minimum wage, an old tool that I think is still very important in new times, and I hope we can raise it again before the Congress goes home.

But we took a new tool, the earned-income tax credit, and doubled it so that it's helping this year alone 15 million families to work their way into the middle class. We adopted an empowerment zone program that the Vice President ran so ably, which has enabled thousands of jobs to be created in communities that otherwise would have been totally left behind in this economic recovery because they were remote or poor, because they didn't have people with a lot of skills that were well-suited to the trends of the times.

We created community development financial institutions to get capital to people who couldn't go into a normal bank and produce a record that would generate a loan. We also did as much as we could to try to help people move from welfare to work and to take maximum advantage of the new economy by investing in education, child care, and transportation, recognizing that we live in a place where very often the pool of available workers is here, usually in a city, and the pool of available jobs at their skill level is here, usually in the suburbs, usually with no public transport in between.

To try to help people balance work and family, the United States began to join what most other industrial nations have been doing for years, by adopting the family and medical leave law, which now over 20 million Americans have used to take some time off when a baby is born or when a family member is sick without losing their job.

And I just predict to you, all of you young people out here, this will be one of the big debates over the next decade, because we're the best country in the world at keeping the hassles of starting a business down, providing capital to start businesses, providing an environment in which people can flourish, but we lag way behind a lot of other nations in the Progressive tradition in simply saying that the most important work of any society is raising children and that work will be more productive if people who are working who have kids don't have to worry about the welfare of their children.

That's why we have to do more for child care. That's why we should expand family leave. That's why we should work more on flexible leave. When I became President, only 3 million people were making a living primarily in their own home. When I ran for reelection, 20 million people were making a living primarily in their own home. By the time you vote in November for the first President of the 21st century, we may be up to 30 million people. I don't have the latest figures, but it's stunning.

Part of the reason is technology makes it possible; the Internet makes it possible. But part of the reason is we haven't done as much as we should have to help people succeed at society's enduring work, raising children, and all the new work we're doing and the fact that more people than ever want to work or have to work and ought to be able to do so.

I am very glad that more and more Americans are sharing in our prosperity. But the other thing I want to say is that still a lot of folks have been left behind. Most of them live in inner cities or small rural towns or on or around Native American reservations. And one of the big challenges now to sort of perfect this Progressive movement is to figure out how to bring those people into the circle of opportunity.

I hope very much that, before I leave office, the Congress will pass the new markets initiative that I worked on with the Speaker of the House in a bipartisan fashion. I won't go through all the details, but essentially what it says is we ought to give wealthy Americans with money the same incentives to invest in poor areas in America we provide to invest in poor areas around the world, because we believe that we can do this. And we ought to put the infrastructure there.

For those of you who have never been on an American Indian reservation, let me tell you, just for example, at the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, one of the most historic parts of American history, the home of the Lakota Sioux, who were the tribe led by an Indian chief named Crazy Horse that dispatched General Custer in the late 19th century—the unemployment rate is 73 percent.

I was at Shiprock in northern New Mexico, one of the most beautiful places in our country, the other day at the Navaho Reservation, where the unemployment rate is over 50 percent; 70 percent of the people don't have homes—telephones in their homes. I was introduced by a young woman who won a contest, an academic contest at her school, the prize was a computer, and she couldn't log onto the Internet because there was not a phone line in her home. In our country, at our level of wealth, that is unconscionable. And this cannot rightly be called a full Progressive Era until we have addressed these challenges.

We still have to be constantly, restlessly searching for ways to expand the circle of opportunity. This, too, is a principle rooted firmly in the Progressive Era but also in our Nation's founding. Remember what the Framers said: They were committed to forming "a more perfect Union." They never said the Union would be perfect, that we would ever reach complete harmony in our living with our ideals, but that we had a constant, endless lifetime obligation to perfect the Union.

And if I could leave any of you with a thought that I hope you will have in your mind as you, as citizens, go to the polls, and then as you, as citizens, build your own lives, it is that we get a chance like we've got today maybe once every 50 years, maybe even more seldom, where we have both prosperity, social progress, coupled with national self-confidence and the absence of serious crisis at home or threat abroad, to really imagine the future we would like to build and then go about building it. And in my view, one of the most important things we have achieved is not any of these specific things people always talk about but just giving you the chance to build the future of your dreams. And I hope that decision will be made consistent with the values, the vision, and the record of the Progressive Era in America.

Theodore Roosevelt said, "The people have emphatically expressed their desire that our principles be kept substantially unchanged, although, of course, applied in a Progressive spirit to meet changing conditions." That's what you have to do.

I just want to make one other point that I think is of equal importance. I believe that in order to preserve a new Progressive Era, we must go much further than we have in our own national consciousness in understanding that our continued prosperity, as well as our security, requires us to continue to be involved in the world, to lead in the world, and to cooperate in the world.

Almost a century ago, Woodrow Wilson described the vision of collective peacekeeping, global security, the rights of nations against the backdrop of the looming threat, and then the fact, of a brutal modern, all-consuming war, a war that is difficult for young people to imagine. In one European battle in World War I, 900,000 people were lost, because they had modern technology and they were stuck in old patterns of fighting—digging trenches and shooting each other and moving up, line after line after line, that might have worked fine if they'd had

bows and arrows or even Civil War era rifles and cannons but was an absolute disaster when modern technology was married to old ideas—both geopolitical ideas, which led to the war, and the ideas of military strategy with which it was carried out. You should remember that today and try to make sure that the ideas you have are equal to the technology and the realities of modern life.

When Woodrow Wilson painted this idealistic vision few of his fellow countrymen and women listened. A lot of people thought he was an idealist who'd passed his prime. And after he was no longer on the scene and the reaction prevailed, as it always does after periods of progressivism, Professor Schlesinger has told us in his writings on the cycles of history, we had to learn in a very hard way that America could not safely or responsibly withdraw from the world.

Now we've had two cold wars and a long and bitter—two World Wars—excuse me—and a long and bitter cold war. We live in a time when new democracies are emerging around the world. When you walk out of here, if you turn on CNN, you'll see the emergence—I hope—in Serbia, with a lot of young people like you fighting for the future you take for granted. More people live under free governments of their own choosing today than ever before. For the first time in history, more than half of the people on this planet live under governments of their own choosing, throwing off the yoke of oppression. Many of them, but not all, are also enjoying newfound prosperity.

We are closer than ever to redeeming the vision of Woodrow Wilson, of reaching his dream of a world full of free markets, free elections, and free peoples working together. But we're still not there. And there are a lot of obstacles in the way, not least of which is the continuing bedrock of reluctance in our own society to pay our fair share and do our fair part, on the part of some conservatives, and on the part of some progressives who embrace the change that is the global economy and shape it, instead of denying it and pretending that as if we were Luddites that we can make it go away.

And you have to think about that. What does it mean to you what Wilson said and what Roosevelt said. They understood at the start of what has been called the American Century, Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman understood when they created the U.N. and NATO and the Breton Woods institutions, that the United States simply cannot be partly in the world, dipping in when it suits our purpose, hunkering down when it doesn't—that we can't relate to our friends in fits and starts; we can't lead just when it suits us and then tell people we're too busy when it doesn't.

We have not made that decision yet. You can see it in the ambivalence the Congress has felt when they supported me on NAFTA and the World Trade Organization and bringing China into the WTO and when they wouldn't go along with giving me the same trade authority that Presidents have had for nearly 30 years now, to negotiate comprehensive trade agreements with other countries, and have them voted up or down. You can see it in the fact that a strong conservative bloc in the Senate and in the House have actually spent 8 years demanding—8 years—the most prosperous years in our country's history, saying that the most important thing to do at the U.N. is to lower America's share of peacekeeping and lower our percentage of the total dues of the United Nations. You can see it in the breathtaking, and I think horribly shortsighted defeat in the U.S. Senate of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the first major treaty to be defeated since the Senate defeated Woodrow Wilson with the League of Nations Treaty. I must say, for my country's sake, I certainly hope it doesn't have a life-risk consequence, and I don't think it will, if the American people decide that these matters are important.

We live in a time when people have lots of opinions on lots of things. They're absolutely flooded with information. So if you took a survey in America and you said, "Should America pay its fair share to the U.N.; should America responsibly participate in peacekeeping, because other people share the load; should we have the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and have a cooperative approach to reducing the nuclear threats and other threats of weapons of mass destruction in the future?" you'd get big majorities that would say yes. But most Americans don't understand how important this is and what a

significant piece it is of building a new era of progress. So it doesn't tend to be a voting issue.

And whenever important new things are not voting issues in a free society, then entrenched, old interests tend to prevail, and we get in trouble. So I ask you all to think about that. The challenges of this new century are far more diverse than our predecessors could have foreseen. But all the good things that we have don't make all the bad problems go away.

Information technology will not resolve all conflicts between nations. Indeed, it creates some new challenges. It enables, for example, networks of terrorists, narcotraffickers, international criminals to communicate with each other with greater speed, clarity, and often with less chance of being caught.

New technology allows people to imagine weapons of mass destruction that are made smaller, just like computers, encased in small plastic containers that don't show up on airport metal detectors, that present new threats in the ongoing historical battle between the organized forces of destruction and the organized, and sometimes not so well-organized, forces of civilization.

So, for all the good things that are happening, we can't make all the problems go away. Therefore, the expansion of global commerce, the growth of democracy, the rise of other centers of economic activity does not diminish our responsibility to lead. It heightens it, and it requires that we do so in a more cooperative fashion.

As American interests evolve, I believe we can stay rooted to the principles of Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt. I think we stay true to those principles when we change. For example, I think we're being true to the principles of the Progressive Era when we provide debt relief to the world's poorest countries. It's unconscionable that these countries are making interest payments that are often half or more of their annual Government budget, instead of spending the money on education and health care and the development of their nation. And they can't pay the money back to us anyway. Why are we doing this? It doesn't make any sense.

So we have a new idea. Don't just give uncritical debt relief. Give debt relief to countries that can demonstrate they're not putting the money in Swiss bank accounts or building military or other instruments of oppression, but only putting the money into education, health care, and responsible development. That is, in my judgment, a critical component of progressivism in a global age, just as I think it's important to fight maladies like AIDS, TB, and malaria. Those three things claim one fourth of the lives that are lost in the world every year today. One quarter of all the people who will die in the year 2000 will die of AIDS, TB, or malaria. And we have it within our power to do something about it and also to lead the world toward the development of an AIDS vaccine and to make the drugs more widely available and to do more about TB and malaria. We ought to do that.

In an interdependent world, we'll be better off if people who are plagued have their plagues alleviated. We ought to do more, in my judgment, to support poor villagers in remote countries by giving them loans so they can start businesses and build a self-sustaining life, to reinforce democracy, and to build from the grassroots up, countries that can be good partners with us in the future. We ought to do more to insist that a more open economy also be a more fair one or, in the common parlance, to put a human face on the global economy.

We also stay true to the vision of Wilson and Roosevelt when we do our part to keep the peace and to support brave people struggling for the quiet miracle of a normal life, whether they're in the Middle East, Northern Ireland, in a small place like East Timor, a long way from here, in a poor country like Haiti or a country plagued by narcotraffickers and civil war like Colombia, and especially in the Balkans, where the First World War began. There especially, the fight for freedom should still be our own.

Freedom has made steady advances in Bosnia and Croatia and Romania and Bulgaria and, today, as I said earlier, in Serbia, where a decade ago the forces of destruction began their march across the Balkans. Now the march of freedom is gaining new ground. Yesterday, the Serbian police went into the coal mines and refused to fire on the coal miners. Today, in the Parliament building,

there are, as I said, thousands of young people, like you, and not so young people, like me, standing up there, saying they want their country back. They want to be free. They voted, and they want their vote respected.

The people of Serbia have spoken with their ballot; they have spoken on the street. I hope the hour is near when their voices will be heard and we can welcome them to democracy, to Europe, to the world's communities. When they do, we will move as quickly as possible to lift the sanctions and build the kind of responsible partnership that the people there deserve.

We have made the world, I believe, more safe against force and selfish aggression. But we know, like Roosevelt and Wilson before us, that no peace is lasting unless it is backed by the consistent, dedicated leadership of nations that have the wealth, size, and power to do the right thing. Here in America and in more and more nations around the world, Progressive parties are in power. Every now and then, we all get together and have dinner and try to help each other. And we try to figure out how to keep this going, how to keep up the fight for reform, for justice, for opportunity for all, for freedom.

I believe that the continuation of this legacy in our time depends as much as anything else on whether we actually believe in our common humanity and the primary importance of acting on our increasing interdependence.

There's a fascinating book that's been published sometime in the last year, I think, by Robert Wright, called "Non Zero." Some of you have perhaps read it. The title refers to game theory. A zero-sum game is one that in order for me to win, you have to lose. A game like the Presidential election. A non-zero-sum game is one where in order for me to win, you have to win, too. And Wright attempts to make a historical argument through all the tragedies, travesties, brutalities of human history, including the gross abuses of science and medicine under the Nazis and the gross abuses of organization under totalitarian regimes of the 20th century—attempts to prove Martin Luther King's moral assertion that the arc of history is long, but it bends towards justice, by arguing that, we are consistently growing more interdependent; and that the more interdependent we become, the more we are forced to look for solutions in which in order for me to win, you have to win, too—non-zero-sum solutions.

The whole idea of the Progressive Era was that everybody should be treated with dignity; everybody deserves certain minimal things in life; that the power of government should be arrayed against private power, so that individual people who are equal under the law, all had at least a fair chance at life. In this era, I often say, in my sort of Arkansas way, that everybody counts; everybody ought to have a chance; and we all do better when we work together. That's what I believe.

That, I think, is an enduring truth of the American dream, going back to the Founders, going back to all the voluntary societies that de Toqueville chronicled so eloquently, almost 200 years ago. In this time, we can have a Progressive Era that outlasts the one you came here to study, if we are faithful to its values, if we understand we have to change even more rapidly and perhaps even more profoundly than they did, and if we acknowledge that a precondition of true independence, in the old-fashioned American way in this very new age, is having some humility and compassion and understanding of our interdependence, which is founded on an acknowledgement, an acceptance, a celebration of our common humanity.

That, after all, is what led to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. It's what led Abraham Lincoln to lay down his life to hold the country together. And it's what gave us the Progressive Era, the sense that we all matter, that we were all connected, and that we were all entitled, each in our own way, to have a chance to play a part in the endless effort to create "a more perfect Union."

The Progressives have been important to America. They have redefined the idea of a nation in ways that were sorely needed. But you are in the middle of what could be the longest and most significant Progressive Era in American history. I ask you to study the one that happened before but to fully live the one that is unfolding before your eyes.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:23 p.m. in Richardson Auditorium at Princeton University. In his remarks, he referred to Harold Shapiro, president, Princeton University; Michael Rothschild, dean, and Ruth Miller, assistant dean, Woodrow Wilson School; Sean Wilentz, director, Program in American Studies, and Katharine Strong Gilbert, president, American Whig-Cliosophic Society, who presented the President with the James Madison Award for Distinguished Public Service; and historian Arthur Schlesinger. The conference was entitled "The Progressive Tradition: Politics, Culture, and History."

Statement Urging Action On Tobacco

October 5, 2000

Today the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, and the American Lung Association issued a report showing that while some States have devoted a substantial portion of their tobacco settlement to reduce youth smoking, most have committed only modest or minimal funds. Tobacco companies are spending 10 times more to market their product than all 50 States combined are spending on tobacco prevention and cessation. I encourage all States to commit a significant part of their settlement to address the harm that tobacco companies have caused through decades of deceptive marketing, especially to youth.

With a clear ruling last week by a U.S. District Court allowing the case to proceed to trial, the Attorney General today reaffirmed her intention to hold tobacco companies accountable for their actions. Tobacco companies have saddled generations of Americans with unnecessary health costs and premature death by fraudulently marketing their products to youth and deceiving the American public about the dangers of tobacco use. More than 400,000 Americans die each year from smoking-related diseases, and 80 percent of them started smoking as children. Today I renew my call to Congress to reject special protections for big tobacco and provide the funds necessary to allow this case to be decided in the courtroom, not the back room. Together with our partners in the States, we can and must make the health of our children a priority. The American people deserve their day in court.

Statement on Hate Crimes Legislation

October 5, 2000

Today the Republican leadership made a serious mistake by stripping the hate crimes legislation from the Department of Defense Authorization bill, despite strong bipartisan support in both the House and Senate. The Republican leaders have turned their backs on legislation designed to send the message that all persons should be treated the same under the law—no matter what their race, color, religion, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability.

This legislation would enhance the Federal Government's ability to prosecute violent crimes motivated by race, color, religion, or national origin and would authorize Federal prosecution of crimes motivated by sexual orientation, gender, or disability. This legislation also recognizes that State and local law enforcement still have primary responsibility for investigating and prosecuting hate crimes.

It has been over 2 years since the brutal dragging death of James Byrd, Jr., and about 2 years since the heinous death of young Matthew Shepard. We owe their families—and all the families of hate crimes victims across this country—no less than to pass this legislation this year. Working with the bipartisan coalition that supports hate crimes legislation, I will continue to fight the Republican leadership in Congress to make sure this important work gets done this year.

Proclamation 7352—German-American Day, 2000

October 5, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As we celebrate German-American Day and the many contributions that German Americans have made to our national community, we also mark the 10th anniversary

of German unification. The historic achievements of the last 10 years are all the more remarkable when we remember the dark days of the Cold War, a time when many citizens in Eastern Europe and around the globe lived under governments of oppression and tyranny. Nowhere was the threat more real than in West Berlin, where Americans and Germans stood together in defense of democracy and commitment to freedom. Ultimately, after almost three decades of division, the Berlin Wall came down and the people of Germany were reunited. Today, Americans and Germans are working together to ensure that democracy will be an abiding legacy for future generations throughout Europe.

Our present efforts are only the latest chapter of our shared history. In 1683, German Mennonites seeking religious tolerance landed near Philadelphia. Their arrival marked the beginning of waves of German immigration that would ebb and flow with the tides of history, ultimately bringing more than 7 million people to our shores. Today, nearly a quarter of all Americans can trace their ancestry back to their Germanic roots, and they continue to enrich our Nation with a proud heritage marked by a strong commitment to family, work, duty, and country.

Many prominent German Americans have strengthened our society through the years. Publisher Johann Peter Zenger championed freedom of the press in the early 18th century, and Thomas Nast's powerful cartoons increased public awareness of corruption within Tammany Hall in 19th-century New York. During the American Revolution, Baron de Kalb and Friedrich von Steuben fought valiantly for our freedom, just as Dwight Eisenhower and Chester Nimitz did in World War II. German Americans who have enriched America's cultural, scientific, and economic life include writers John Steinbeck and Erich Maria Remarque; physicists Albert Einstein and Maria Goeppert-Mayer; philosophers Hannah Arendt and Paul Tillich; and industrialists and business leaders John D. Rockefeller and John Wanamaker.

Behind the many well-known individuals who have played a prominent part in our history are millions of German immigrants whose names are not widely recognized, yet who profoundly shaped the America we know today. Industrious German Americans helped settle our cities and frontiers; defend democracy during times of conflict; promote our prosperity in times of peace; and preserve the bonds of family and heritage that our Nation shares with the people of Germany. As we celebrate German-American Day and the 10th anniversary of German unification and look ahead to the promise of a new century, America recognizes with pride and gratitude the important role that German Americans continue to play in the life of our Nation and celebrates the strength of our friendship with Germany.

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 the laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim Friday, October 6, 2000, as German-American Day. I encourage all Americans to remember and celebrate the important contributions made to our country by our millions of citizens of German descent and to celebrate our close ties to the people of Germany.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., October 10, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 11.

Remarks at a National Leadership PAC Reception in New York City

October 5, 2000

The President. Thank you for the standing ovation. [*Laughter*] Thank you for being here to——

Audience member. New York loves you!

The President. You guys calm down. This is a rowdy crowd here. Look, I'm not as young as I used to be. I don't know if I can quiet this crowd. I'm tired. Go easy on me

tonight. It's almost the end of the week. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Charles Rangel for giving me a chance to be here tonight with Alma and Alicia. I want to thank the other Members of Congress who are here. I've got them somewhere. [*Laughter*] Congressmen Crowley, Nadler, and Lowey of New York are all here. Thank you for being here. I want to thank the New York Democratic Chair; Judith Hope is here. I want to thank Jane Rosenthal for being our host and for gathering up all of you tonight.

I have a lot of friends here. I want to say a special word of appreciation to one person who is or just was in the audience, Chevy Chase, who was with me when I was nominated for President, when I won the California primary in June of '92. And I was running third in the polls, and no one wanted to come to my victory party, and Chevy Chase showed up. So thanks for being here again tonight.

I want to thank Ron Silver for being here and for being my friend and for representing the entertainers of this country so well. And I want to say a special word of thanks to Kevin Spacey. You know, getting to be friends with Kevin has been one of the best perks of being President. [*Laughter*] Franklin Roosevelt used to say that the President had to be America's best actor. Well, I'm the second-best actor in America. Kevin Spacey is the best actor in America, and I'm glad to be here with him.

Now, look, why are we here? Why are we here? I mean, Charlie Rangel couldn't get beat. If he expired before the election—which he's not about to do. He's been waiting a long time to be chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and after November 7th, he will be.

I just want to say one thing to you seriously. For whatever success we have had these last 8 years—whether it was in turning the country around, or in giving poor people more opportunity in the empowerment zones, or providing more affordable housing for people who desperately need it, or reaching out to Africa the first time the American Government ever had a serious outreach to our friends in Africa, or fighting against cuts in education and fighting to improve it—none of it would have been possible for me to do if it hadn't been for Charles Rangel, and I'm very, very grateful to him.

Don't you think Al Gore did a good job in the debate? [*Applause*] I do, too. And Hillary was no slouch in her debate. You know, this is an interesting time for me. My party has a new leader. My house has a new candidate. [*Laughter*] It's the first time in 26 years I haven't been on the ballot, and most days I'm just fine about it. [*Laughter*] I'm having a good time getting out here campaigning for everybody else.

For those of you from New York who have been helping my wife, I want to thank you. She will be a magnificent Senator. She will do you proud, and you'll be glad.

I just want to say one thing quite seriously, though, because I know that the Democratic ticket is well ahead in New York. But a lot of you have friends all across this country. And a lot of you have friends that you see at work, that you see when you go out, that you see with your kids, who will never come to an event like this. But they will vote, because they want to feel that they're good citizens, so they'll show up and vote. But they never come to anything like this. And I was wondering, what were these folks thinking when they were watching the debate? What did they get out of it, and what did they not get out of it?

I wondered what they were thinking in '92, right before they gave me and Al Gore a chance to change the country. You know, they were told that, after all, I was just the Governor of a small southern State. Remember when President Bush used to say that? [*Laughter*] And I was so naive, I thought it was a compliment. [*Laughter*] And I still do. They said, "This guy is only 46 years old. He doesn't look that old"—you took care of that. [*Laughter*] "The Republicans say he's terrible. Why should I take a chance on this guy?" But I mean, come on, it wasn't that big a chance. The country was in the ditch. We had to turn it around.

But now things are good, and we have to decide what to do with good times. And anybody in this audience who's over 30 years old can remember at least once in your life when you made a doozy of a mistake, not because times were so bad but because they

were so good you thought you did not have to concentrate. Isn't that right? Everybody over 30 has made a mistake like that.

So what I want to ask you to do—I thank you for your money; Charlie thanks you for your money; Jane thanks you for making her look good; Kevin and I thank you because we hate to play to an empty house. [*Laughter*] We're all real happy. But what are you going to do between now and election? You need to take this seriously. If somebody asks you tomorrow morning, if somebody called you on the phone from a State that's really tight—if somebody called you from Michigan, Ohio, tomorrow and you said, "What're you doing?" And you said, "I went to this deal last night with the President and Kevin Spacey and Charlie Rangel, and we had a pretty good time." And they said, "Why?" What would your answer be?

I'm telling you, we're still around here as a country after over 225 years because—or 224 years—even I can still add—[*laughter*]—because most of the time the American people get it right if they have enough information and enough time. So having a clear idea in the minds of every voter, an accurate idea of what the choices are in this election is very important. We have profound differences.

I went today over to Princeton University, where they're having this big conference on the last Progressive Era, when Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson remade America for the industrial age, when New York City was full of factories and full of the first great wave of immigrants. And they basically preserved America by changing it.

That's what we're trying to do, to preserve the fundamental values and ideas of America by changing it for this new time in which we're living. And there are huge differences here between the two candidates for President and Vice President but also between the parties in the House and Senate. And I'm telling you, I know every Senate seat, every House seat really matters.

If somebody asks you, you've got to be able to tell them, "We've got a different economic policy. We've got a different education policy. We've got a different health care policy. We've got a different environmental policy. We've got a different crime policy. We've got a different foreign policy. And we have got a very different policy on how we're going to build one America that brings us together across all the lines that divide us."

Compared to their leadership, we're for a hate crimes bill, and they're not. We're for employment nondiscrimination legislation; they're not. We're for stronger equal pay laws for women, and they're not. There are big differences about how we're going to pull this country together. We support a woman's right to choose, and they don't. And the next President gets a bunch of appointments to the Supreme Court.

You know, people ask me all the time—I see all these articles—every day the paper is full of articles about who's right on the economic plan, the taxes, the spending, and all that. I think that I have—at least, let me say this, I hope I've earned the right to make a comment or two about the economy. So people ask me all the time, "What great new, brilliant idea did you and Bob Rubin bring to Washington on economic policy?" You know what I always tell them? Arithmetic. [*Laughter*] We brought arithmetic back to Washington. And we got rid of that deficit. We got the biggest surplus in history. We're paying the debt down. We've got low interest rates and the economy. You have taken care of the rest.

Now, you've got to decide. If you like the way it's going, you've got to decide. They want a bigger tax cut than we do, and a lot of you in this room would get more money under their deal. A lot of you in this room would do better under our deal. Why would people who are really wealthy still come here and support us when they could get a whole lot of money out of their tax cut? Because they understand arithmetic.

If you spend a trillion and a half dollars on a tax cut and you spend another trillion dollars to shore up Social Security after you partially privatize it and then you keep all your spending commitments, we're back in deficits; we're back in higher interest rates; we're back in a slower economy; we're back in fewer jobs.

Look, just last week we learned that poverty last year dropped to a 20-year low. We learned that for the first time in 12 years we had fewer people without health insurance. We learned that child poverty had its biggest

drop in 34 years. Why? Because—partly because of arithmetic. Now, this is serious business.

You cannot go out here and promise to spend all this money and then keep your commitment when you get there, knowing it's going to produce a deficit, and expect anything other than what you're going to get, which is higher interest rates. The Council of Economic Advisers told me that the Democratic plan would keep interest rates about a percent lower than the Republican plan a year, for a decade. Do you know what that's worth in tax cuts? That's worth $390 billion in lower home mortgages, $30 billion in lower car payments, $15 billion in lower college loan payments, Lord only knows how much money in lower credit card payments, plus it's cheaper to start a business and hire new help.

This is not rocket science. He's right, Charlie Rangel is, on economic policy, and they're wrong. And you need to be able to explain that to people and tell them that's why you showed up here tonight.

On health care policy, they're not for the Patients' Bill of Rights, and we are. We're for a Medicare drug program that all the seniors can get, and they aren't. And we're right, and they're wrong, and you need to be able to explain that to people. And I could just go on and on, but you get the picture.

I'm telling you, you cannot assume that the outcome of this election—in Hillary's race, for who controls the House, for who wins the White House—is not in doubt. The people are in control, and until they show up and vote, it's in doubt. And you need to be able to say, you need to be able to tell people why you came here tonight, beyond the fact that you like Charlie or you wanted to see Kevin or you wanted to see if I'm still standing on two legs with 4 months to go. I'm telling you, you've got to be able to say that.

Now, when Al Gore stands up before audiences and he says, "You ain't seen nothing yet," that sounds like a campaign slogan, I know. But I'm not running, and I believe that. I've spent as much time as I could, I worked as hard as I could to turn this country around, to pull us together, and to get us moving forward. But it's almost like setting a banquet table, but the feast hasn't been served.

We're going to have young women having babies within 5 to 10 years with a life expectancy of 90 years, thanks to the human genome project. We are going to see economic explosions in places that we never thought we could bring economic opportunity to, in the inner cities and the rural areas and Native American reservations, if we make the right decision.

We're going to be able not just to bring the crime rate down to a 27-year low, we could make America the safest big country in the world, if we make the right decisions. We put 100,000 police on the street and did more to take guns out of the hands of criminals and children. They're not only against the commonsense gun safety measures that we've been for—we're now putting another 50,000 police on the street—they want to abolish the program.

You've got to admire that about the Republicans; evidence never fazes them. [*Laughter*] I mean, they know what they're for, and they don't want you to bother them with the facts or the results or anything else. You've got to kind of admire it, but you'll also have to live with the consequences.

So if you want to keep the crime rate coming down, if you believe you can clean up the environment and grow the economy, if you want to keep this prosperity going and spread it to other people, and maybe most important of all, you look at all the troubles around the world today where people still can't get along because of their religious, their racial, their ethnic differences—the most important thing is we're all in this together, and we better get along together. And we've worked hard to say that.

We've worked hard to say whether you're—whatever your race is, whatever your religion is, whether you're straight or gay, whether you're old or young, if you show up, play by the rules, and you try to do your part as an American, you're part of our America, and we're going forward together. That's a big deal. That's a big deal.

So I know we all want to have a good time. We're in this festive atmosphere, and I thank our hosts for letting me come. I believe I've been here three or four times since I've been

President. But I just want you to be serious enough. This deal is not over yet. Charlie is not the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee yet. He ought to be, and I think he will be, but it depends on what you do.

So you've got to promise yourself, every day between now and the end of the election, you find somebody that will never show up at one of these deals and you say, "Let me tell you why I'm for Al Gore and Joe Lieberman; let me tell you why I'm for Hillary and Charlie Rangel; let me tell you why you ought to support the Democrats." And tell them what the difference is on the economy, on the environment, on health care, on education; run it right down so they understand.

Don't let this be one of the times when we made a mistake because times were so good we didn't think we had to think. We do have to think. You may not get another chance like this in your lifetime, and if I had anything to do with it, I am grateful you gave me the chance to serve.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:10 p.m. at the Supper Club. In his remarks, he referred to Representative Rangel's wife, Alma, and his daughter, Alicia; actors Chevy Chase, Ron Silver, and Kevin Spacey; and former Secretary of the Treasury Robert E. Rubin.

Remarks at a Reception for Governor Tom Carper in New York City

October 5, 2000

Thank you very much. First, I will try to be brief tonight, because most of you have heard what I have to say. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Mark Fox for sticking with his friend, Tom Carper, and for helping again, and for being so kind and generous to me over these last couple years. I want to thank Denise Rich for letting me come back into her home again. I don't think that Hillary and I have had a better friend anywhere in America than she's been to us for the whole time I've been President. Denise, you've been wonderful, and I'm grateful to you. Thank you very much. Yes, give them a hand. [*Applause*]

I want to thank Brian Kennedy and Sarah Clancy for singing. Some of you know this, but I'm half Irish. And Brian Kennedy sang for me on November 30, 1995, in Belfast—he's from Belfast—with another Irish singer you might know, by the name of Van Morrison. [*Laughter*] Van and Brian sang to a crowd of about 50,000 people in the streets of Belfast, who came there to see Hillary and me, when I turned on the Christmas lights. They came because we had turned on the lights of peace in Northern Ireland. I loved hearing him sing again.

But the Irish have meant a great deal to me. James Galway, the great Irish flutist, probably the greatest living flutist in the world, has played at the White House. And Bono, the lead singer of U2, has been a great friend of mine—now better known as the leading advocate for debt relief in poor countries in the entire world. He has that great sense of humor. When I left Brian, and I went to Dublin, we had a big rally in the square there. There were over 100,000 people. And after—Bono was there, and he had brought me a signed copy of W.B. Yeats' plays, and had William Butler Yeats in his little-bitty handwriting. And underneath, there was Bono's handwriting. It said, "Bill, this guy wrote some good lines, too." [*Laughter*]

So the Irish have their way, you know, and they worked their way with us tonight. They were wonderful. I want to thank Tom Carper for running for the Senate. When I met Tom years ago, I was a Governor, and he was a Congressman. And we worked together in writing the first major overhaul of the welfare laws, back in 1988. I liked him then; I like him more now. He's been a remarkable Governor. He told you a little bit about his record.

I think that of all the Governors in the country, I can honestly say in during his period of service, no one was more innovative or made more progress on a wider range of social problems. And he's got that sort of disarming "Aw, shucks, I'm from the 49th biggest State; you better watch your billfold when I talk to you for 5 minutes"—[*laughter*]—way about him, which allows him to be very effective.

But it takes a lot of guts to make the decision, especially when he made it, to run against the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. I told Tom, I said, "Two years ago we were outspent by $100 million in the congressional races. This year you may be outspent by $100 million." [*Laughter*] So you're helping make sure that doesn't happen.

I'd just like to make a couple of general points. First, I thought Al Gore did a really good job in those debates, and I was proud of him. Second, I'm sorry I'm making you miss Joe Lieberman's debate, and I'm going to shut up so you can watch it. Third, a lot of you here have helped Hillary, and I want you to know how grateful I am for that. I'm very proud of her, and she was no slouch in her debate, either. I thought she was very good. I was really proud of her.

She's going home tonight, and we're going to get ready for another one on Sunday. But when I was watching that debate, what I was thinking is that all you should really hope for, in a great free society like ours, is that somehow people will understand the nature of the choices before them. Because we wouldn't be around here, after 224 years, if people didn't nearly always get it right. The American people nearly always get it right, if they have enough time and enough information. There's some mysterious center that anchors us in our freedom and our sort of forward progress.

And the only thing I've ever really worried about this election is that I've lived long enough now to know that anybody over 30 can look back on at least one occasion in his or her life when you made a colossal mistake, either a personal mistake or a business mistake, not because times were tough but because things were going so well you thought you no longer had to concentrate on life. If you live long enough, you'll make one of those mistakes. And countries are no different than people. They're just a collection of people, even a great country like ours.

So here we are with the best economy and the longest expansion we've ever had, welfare rolls down, crime rates down, all the social indicators going in the right direction. We learned last week we had a 20-year low on poverty; biggest drop in child poverty in 34 years; first time senior poverty ever went below 10 percent. We've got, for the first time in 12 years, even the number of people without health insurance is now going down again, because of our Children's Health Insurance Program.

So you wonder whether people will say what I'll hope they'll say, which is, holy goodness, you have a chance like this about once every 50 years, to build the future of your dreams for your kids, to sort of let all your hangups go and do what Tom said, just get together, identify the problems, identify the opportunities, paint your dream picture, and go out and do it. Or will they say, "Well, what difference does it make whether I vote now? Things are going along all right. Maybe there's no real differences." And they just sort of, kind of stumble through the election. Countries, like people, pay a price when they think they don't have to concentrate.

If the American people understand clearly the choice before them and the consequences for our kids, Al Gore and Joe Lieberman are going to do just fine. Tom Carper is going to win. Hillary is going to win. And we'll keep moving forward. But it's very important that you understand—a lot of you have been so generous to us, but I'd just like to ask you, just imagine how many people you will come in contact with from States beyond New York, between now—some of you aren't even from New York. Jeff lives in Atlanta; Georgia's a close State. We might win it; we might lose it. You think about all the States that you know people in, all the people you'll come in contact with between now and the election. If they ask you why you were here tonight, what answer would you give?

Listen, I think this is really important. I think a lot of—if you look at the undecided voters, a lot of them are going to be persuaded by conversations they had with their friends. And if you just look around this table tonight, literally more than 10,000, maybe more than 20,000 conversations will occur—maybe 100,000 conversations will occur between all of you collectively and the people with whom you come in contact between now and election day.

So if they said, "Tell me three good reasons I should vote for Gore instead of Bush;

now tell me why you want me to support Tom Carper or Hillary or someone else that's running," could you do it? And that's very important, because what I'd like to ask you to do is to take every chance you can to do that. Because I really do believe that a lot of these decisions are going to be made by people who never get a chance to come to dinners like this. Even if they could afford to come, they wouldn't do it, because it's just not their thing. But they will vote, because they're patriotic citizens; they love our country. They want to make a good decision, but they've never had an encounter like this and probably never will.

And all I can tell you is—just a couple of things—this economic issue is big. I read all the newspaper articles on all this. I think I've earned some credibility on the economy. People ask me all the time, "What great new innovation did you and Bob Rubin bring to Washington?" And I always tell them, arithmetic. We brought arithmetic. [*Laughter*] I tell everybody I had a fairly basic upbringing, and I thought 2 and 2 had to add up to 4. So we got rid of the deficit and started running balanced budgets and surpluses, and interest rates came down. The economy went up. You did the rest.

Then we opened markets abroad, and we had the right kind of telecommunications bill, so we opened markets at home. We were pro-competition. And we invested in the American people, in their education, in their future, and tried to find ways to solve the big problems people face so that they could grow the economy. And that is pretty much what has happened.

Now, I'm just telling you, you cannot cut taxes—I don't care—and most of you would be better off under the Republican plan than under the Democratic plan in the short run. But you've got a bigger stake in the long-term health and welfare of the American society, and the economy. You cannot cut taxes a trillion and a half dollars, spend another trillion dollars on a partial privatization of Social Security—it costs you a trillion dollars, because if those of you that are under 45 take your money out, somebody has got to put it back in, because you're going to guarantee all the old geezers like me, who are 55 and over, and I'll be next year, that we get to keep what we've got. So you've got to fill it up. So then you've spent 2½ trillion dollars.

Then whatever they tell you about the surplus, take my word for it—I know something about arithmetic—the surplus is at least $500 billion less than they tell you it is, because Government spending has grown at inflation plus population for 50 years—that's $300 billion, because they only measure it as inflation; and because all these middle class people are going to start paying the alternative minimum tax just because their incomes will grow, unless we change it, and that costs 220 to change—or 200 and change. So believe me, it's at least 500 billion less.

So that's one and a half trillion in taxes, a trillion in privatizing Social Security, a half a trillion because the deficit's not that big, and that's before you spend any money that the Republicans have promised to spend.

Now, our tax cut is about a third the size of theirs, because we think we've got to save some money for education and health care and the environment and our responsibilities around the world, defense and other responsibilities, and because we think we ought to keep paying down the public debt. It turns out, did you ever think you'd see the Democrats to the right of the Republicans on the question of fiscal responsibility, even in rhetoric?

The reason—there's a progressive reason for that. You keep interest rates down, you have more people working; you have more capital available. It's the best social policy in the world. Jonathan Tisch and I were talking on the way over here. He's a member and now the leader of our welfare to work partnership. He got 12,000 companies committed to hire people off welfare and put them to work. It's the best social policy there is. And they've hired—these 12,000 companies have hired hundreds of thousands of people off the welfare rolls. And if we keep interest rates down, the economy going, they'll hire more.

So I can just tell you, I think it is a mistake for us to return to deficit spending, to start to erode the Social Security taxes for other things, to let interest rates get higher. Most people estimate, that I've talked to, estimate

that the plan that the Vice President has advocated, that Carper would vote for, because he'll be at least as conservative as the administration on fiscal matters, will keep interest rates one percent lower for a decade. Now, that's worth $390 billion in lower home mortgages, $30 billion in lower car payments, and $15 billion in lower college loan payments. That's a $430 billion tax cut in lower interest rates. And I didn't even count credit card payments and business loans and all the things that will follow from that. You need to tell people that.

We cannot afford this. It is not the responsible thing to do. We quadrupled the debt from 1980 to 1992. When I leave office, we'll have paid off $360 billion of it. I'm telling you, we need to keep paying it down, keep the interest rates down, keep the economy going, and the rest of it will take care of itself. I hope you can tell people that.

Let me just give you one other issue, because I think it's important, because there's lots of advertising on this both ways, and there was a lot of yapping about it in the debate. I don't mean that in a pejorative way. They argued about their positions on health care. I would hope—because these things affect so many million people, I'll just deal with this. We're for this Patients' Bill of Rights that covers all Americans and all managed care plans, that says simply if your doctor tells you you ought to see a specialist, you can, and nobody in the HMO can tell you you can't. If you change jobs and change providers, but you're taking chemotherapy for cancer treatment, or you're pregnant and you've got one ob-gyn, you don't have to change them during the treatment, even if you change plans. If you get hit by a car, walking across the street in Manhattan, you can go to the nearest emergency room; you don't have to pass three before you get to one covered by your plan. And if you get hurt, you can sue, because if you can't do that, it's a bill of suggestions, not a bill of rights, unless there's some other mechanism that's binding on this.

So they say, to be fair to them, "Look, this is going to be burdensome." The Republican leadership that are against this, they say, "This is going to be burdensome to small businesses and to insurance companies, and it's going to raise the cost of health care. And we don't want to do that, particularly to people who self-insure. So it's too bad that we can't do it, but we can't afford to do it. So we'll give you a much weaker bill."

Now, here's what it costs. I covered all the Federal employees, everybody that's covered by Federal health payments, Medicare, Medicaid, they're already covered by this. I did it by Executive order. You know what it cost us? A buck a month a premium. You know what the Republican Congressional Budget Office says it would cost to cover everybody else? Less than $2 a month. I would pay $1.80 a month to make sure that the people that serve this dinner here tonight, if they walk out from here and they get hit in an accident, can go to the nearest emergency room. I would do that. I think most Americans would, of all incomes. It's a big issue. Somebody needs to lay it out like that.

All this fight they're having over Medicare drugs, they never did get down to what the real issue was. Here's the deal. If we were starting Medicare today, if you were designing a program for Medicare today, could you even think about not providing prescription drug coverage? Of course not. If you live to be 65, your life expectancy is 82, and pretty soon it will be a lot higher. And the older you get, the more medicine you take. And if you take the right medicine in the right way, and you halfway take care of yourself, it can dramatically increase not only the length but the quality of your life. It's a big deal. You would never think of doing this if we were starting all over.

Medicare was created in '65, when medical care was about doctors and hospitals and surgery and there was no—and our life expectancy was a lot less than 82, so you wouldn't do it. So we say, "Look, let's use Medicare; it's got one percent administrative cost. And we'll let people buy into Medicare. If you're poor, we'll give you the premiums; or if you have huge drug costs every month, catastrophic costs, we'll cover those. Otherwise you've got to pay, pay your fair share, and we'll give you a good drug plan. And if you're eligible for Medicare, no matter what your income, and you need this, you can buy in, but it's totally voluntary."

They say, "We don't want to do it that way. We're not sure it won't cost too much, and we don't want the Government regulating the drug market." We don't propose to regulate the drug market. We're selling insurance here: go out and buy the drugs, and people will pay the premiums. There's no price controls here. But they say, "No, the Government shouldn't do that, but we will pay the premiums for people up to 150 percent of the poverty line, which is about $15,000 for a couple"—not a lot of money, $16,000—"and everybody over that can buy insurance, we'll make insurance policies available."

Now, here's the problem with that. Half of all the seniors in America that need that medicine, they're above 150 percent of the poverty line. Second problem, and I've got to give it—I've had a lot of fights with the health insurance companies for 8 years, but I have to tell you, I have really been impressed by the way they've handled this, because they've been very close to the Republicans in Congress, but they have refused to take a dive on this. They have told the truth. They have said over and over and over again, you cannot have a private insurance policy that is worth having that is affordable. We cannot make a private insurance policy market for seniors to have prescription drugs.

Now, Nevada passed the Republican plan over a year ago. You know how many insurance companies have offered these people coverage? Over a year ago they passed it. Zero; not one. Now, I kind of admire that about our Republican friends. Evidence has no impact on them at all. [*Laughter*] You know, it's basically—I mean, you've got to admire that. "I know what I believe, and don't tell me the facts. I don't want to be confused; I know what I'm for." [*Laughter*]

Now what's really going on here? You see all these ads that are confusing; you hear all these arguments. Here's what you need to know. There is a real issue here. The pharmaceutical companies don't want this bill. And I am not demonizing them. I want to explain why they don't want it. And the Republicans in Congress and the Bush campaign, they're close to them, and they get a lot of support from them.

Now, I am delighted that we have these companies headquartered in America. They develop all these miracle drugs. They've changed lives for nearly—most everybody in this room has taken some medicine that's been developed in the last 10 years, if for nothing more than allergies, and you're better off for it. And we are very fortunate that these companies are in our country. They provide tens of thousands of wonderful jobs. They do a terrific job.

They've just got one problem. It costs them a fortune to develop the drugs, and then it costs them a lot of money to advertise. And every other rich country in the world, including Europe, Japan, and Canada, is under price controls. So they have to recover 100 percent of all their development and advertising costs from you and me and the rest of America, whether they're poor, rich, or middle class. And if they don't do that, their profit margins will get cut so much they fear they won't be able to develop new medicine.

Once they do that, it becomes very economical for them to sell the rest of the medicine anywhere in the world, which is why you see all these people going to Canada buying their medicine. You've seen all these stories; people in upstate New York, they go over to Canada. The reason this happens is, the rest of America's consumers have covered the cost of developing the drugs and advertising them. And once you get those costs covered, it costs minuscule just to make another pill or two. And that's why you can go to Canada and get it cheaper.

Now, what they're worried about is, if Medicare becomes the biggest drug buyer in America, that we'll use market power to get the prices down so that American seniors will buy drugs made in America almost as cheap as Canadian seniors can. See, this is a real issue. These people have a real problem. And we want them to succeed; we want them to keep doing it. But here's our position. This is the Gore-Lieberman position and the Democratic position.

It cannot be that the way to solve this problem the drug companies have is to keep medicine away from American senior citizens that they need. That can't be the only way to solve this problem. Those people have got plenty of money, plenty of power. We need to solve the problem that the seniors have,

and then we need to go solve the drug company problem that will be created when we solve this. But let's take care of America's health first, and then let's go try to figure out how to solve their problem. But we've got the cart before the horse here. I think we're right and they're wrong.

Now those are just three issues. But you need to know the answer to the difference in their education plans, the environment, crime, the whole nine yards, and you need to be able to answer. Because I'm telling you, we need to elect Tom Carper. And we've got a chance to win the Senate, a chance to win the House; I believe we're going to win the White House. And then when we get there, we have to be faithful to the positive change of the last 8 years.

That's the last thing I'll say. When Al Gore says, "You ain't seen nothing yet," it may sound like a campaign slogan when a candidate says it. But I'm not running for anything, and I believe that too. Because it takes a long time to turn a country around. It's like a big ocean liner. That's what happened to the *Titanic.* The crew saw the iceberg; they just didn't see it quick enough. And you can't turn it on a dime. A country is like that. So it takes time to turn it around. I've done everything I know to do to turn the country around, to pull us together, to move us forward. But all the best stuff is still out there.

I mean, young women in this country, within 10 years, I think they'll be having babies with life expectancies of 90 years, because of the human genome project. I think we'll be curing Alzheimer's. I think we'll be able to take women within, I don't know how many years, but some period of years, women in their thirties that have the gene predictors for breast cancer, and correcting it so they never develop it in the first place. I think these things—unbelievable stuff is going to happen. You're going to find out what's in the black holes of the universe, and what may even surprise you more, what's in the deepest depths of the ocean. It's going to be an amazing time.

But we've got to also get rid of child poverty. We could bring free enterprise to Indian reservations and inner-city neighborhoods and poor little country towns that never had it. We can provide health insurance to working families that have never been able to get it. We could dramatically cut AIDS, TB, and malaria deaths around the world that kill one in four people every year that die. We can do anything you ever dreamed of, if we make the right decisions. But if we get careless and we don't understand what the choice is and what the consequences are, we'll pay for that as a Nation, just like all of us who are of any age have paid for it in our personal lives in the past.

So in my lifetime we never had a chance like this. So thank you for helping Tom. Thank you, those of you who have helped Hillary, for doing that. It means more than I can say. But just do it for yourselves and your kids and your grandkids and your future. Every chance you get between now and November 7th, you tell somebody, "Let me tell you why I hope you'll vote, and what I think the choice is, and what the consequences are." Because if everybody knows, we're going to have a great celebration.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:43 p.m. at a private residence. In his remarks, he referred to event cohosts Mark Fox and Denise Rich. Governor Carper of Delaware is a candidate for U.S. Senate from Delaware. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the National Economy

October 6, 2000

Today, thanks to our economic strategy and the hard work of the American people, we reached another dramatic milestone in our unprecedented economic expansion—the unemployment rate has fallen to 3.9 percent, matching the lowest level in 30 years. Unemployment for African-Americans fell to the lowest level ever recorded, and for Hispanics it remains at historic lows. This is more good news for the American people and another reminder that those who advocate irresponsible tax plans that would jeopardize our fiscal progress are taking America down the wrong economic path.

Message on the Observance of Yom Kippur, 2000

October 6, 2000

Warm greetings to all those observing Yom Kippur.

This Day of Atonement, the most solemn of all the days of the Jewish calendar, is a time for intense prayer, fasting, and reflection. For the duration of Yom Kippur, Jews across America and around the world separate themselves from the comforts and distractions of everyday life to focus on repairing their relationship with God. It is a time to look back on the failures and transgressions of the past year, to make amends, and to seek God's forgiveness.

In neighborhoods across our nation, as Jewish families gather for Yom Kippur services, they offer people of all faiths an extraordinary witness. They remind us of the power of faith that changes lives, the love of family that strengthens spirits, and the blessing of God's forgiveness that allows us to repent of our sins and begin anew.

At this difficult time for all of us who have worked for peace, let us pray for an end to the violence and for a new beginning in the Middle East. Hillary joins me in extending best wishes to all for a meaningful Yom Kippur.

Bill Clinton

Digest of Other White House Announcements

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

September 30

The President had separate telephone conversations with Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority and Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel concerning the recent outbreak of violence between Jews and Palestinians in the Middle East.

The President had a telephone conversation with President Vladimir Putin of Russia concerning the elections in Yugoslavia.

October 2

The President had a telephone conversation with President Ahmet Necdet Sezer of Turkey concerning a congressional resolution to recognize accusations of Turkish genocide against Armenians in 1915.

The President announced his intention to nominate Philip N. Bredesen to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The President announced his intention to nominate Reginald Earl Jones to be Commissioner of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The President announced his intention to nominate Randolph J. Agley to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

The President announced his intention to nominate Mark A. Weinberger to be a member of the Social Security Advisory Board.

The President announced his intention to nominate Hsin-Ming Fung to be a member of the National Council on the Arts.

The President announced his intention to nominate Edward F. Reilly, Jr., to be a member of the U.S. Parole Commission.

The White House announced that the President will meet with Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina of Bangladesh in Washington on October 17.

October 3

In the morning, the President traveled to Miami, FL, where he attended a New York Senate 2000 reception in the afternoon at a private residence.

In the evening, the President watched the Presidential candidates debate at a private residence. Afterwards, he had a telephone conversation with Vice President Gore to congratulate him on his performance. Later, the President traveled to Coral Gables, FL.

The President announced his intention to appoint Kate Fitz Gibbon as a member of the Cultural Property Advisory Committee.

The President announced his intention to reappoint Gary J. Lavine as a member of the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad.

The President declared a major disaster in Florida and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by Tropical Storm Helene beginning on September 21 and continuing.

October 4

In the morning, the President met with His Holiness Guru Pujya Swami Maharaj at the Biltmore Hotel in Coral Gables, FL. Later, he attended a New York Senate 2000 breakfast at the hotel. In the afternoon, the President traveled to Jacksonville, FL, and later returned to Washington, DC.

The President declared a major disaster in Florida and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms and flooding beginning on October 3 and continuing.

October 5

In the afternoon, the President traveled to Princeton, NJ, and later to New York City. In the evening, he returned to Washington, DC, arriving after midnight.

The President announced his intention to nominate Anita Perez Ferguson to be Chair of the Inter-American Foundation.

The President announced his intention to nominate John M. Reich to be a member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

October 6

In the evening, the President attended an AFL–CIO reception at a private residence. He then attended a reception for Representative Tom Udall at the Washington Court Hotel.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

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

Submitted October 2

Randolph J. Agley,
of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term of one year (new position).

Reginald Earl Jones,
of Maryland, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2005 (reappointment).

Hsin-Ming Fung,
of California, to be a member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2006, vice Speight Jenkins, term expired.

Edward F. Reilly, Jr.,
of Kansas, to be a Commissioner of the U.S. Parole Commission for a term of 6 years, vice John R. Simpson, term expired.

Mark A. Weinberger,
of Maryland, to be a member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2006, vice Harlan Mathews, resigned.

Submitted October 3

Philip N. Bredesen,
of Tennessee, to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 2005, vice Walter Anderson, term expired.

Melvin C. Hall,
of Oklahoma, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, vice Ralph G. Thompson, retired.

Richard A. Meserve,
of Virginia, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the 44th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Submitted October 6

Andre M. Davis,
of Maryland, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, vice Francis D. Murnaghan, Jr., deceased.

Sophia H. Hall,
of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2003 (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 October 1

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's discussions with Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority

Released October 2

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Jake Siewert

Statement by the Press Secretary on the upcoming visit of Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina of Bangladesh

Released October 3

Statement by the Press Secretary on pipeline safety legislation

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

Released October 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Jake Siewert

Announcement of nomination for U.S. Court of Appeals Judge for the Fourth Circuit

Acts Approved by the President

Approved October 2

S. 1638 / Public Law 106–276
To amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the retroactive eligibility dates for financial assistance for higher education for spouses and dependent children of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty

S. 2460 / Public Law 106–277
To authorize the payment of rewards to individuals furnishing information relating to persons subject to indictment for serious violations of international humanitarian law in Rwanda, and for other purposes

Approved October 6

H.R. 940 / Public Law 106–278
To designate the Lackawanna Valley and the Schuylkill River National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes

H.R. 2909 / Public Law 106–279
Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000

H.R. 4919 / Public Law 106–280
Security Assistance Act of 2000

H.R. 5193 / Public Law 106–281
FHA Downpayment Simplification Extension Act of 2000

H.J. Res. 110 / Public Law 106–282
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes

S. 430 / Public Law 106–283
Kake Tribal Corporation Land Transfer Act