Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, November 20, 2000
Volume 36—Number 46
Pages 2819–2898

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Brunei, APEC Business Advisory Committee in Bandar Seri Begawan—2869
Internet address—2857
Radio address—2858
Vietnam
American Embassy community in Hanoi—2892
State dinner in Hanoi—2894
Vietnam National University in Hanoi—2887
Virginia, Veterans Day ceremony in Arlington—2859
White House bicentennial dinner—2852
World War II Memorial, groundbreaking ceremony—2862

Bill Signings

Coastal Barrier Resources Reauthorization Act of 2000, statement—2867
Energy Act of 2000, statements—2832, 2833
Export Administration Act of 1979, statement on reauthorization—2865
Frederick Douglass memorial and gardens, statement on legislation to establish—2892
FSC Repeal and Extraterritorial Income Exclusion Act of 2000, statement—2885
National Birmingham Pledge Week, statement on establishment—2891
National Marine Sanctuaries Amendments Act of 2000, statements—2866, 2867

Bill Signings—Continued

Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000, statement—2864
Veterans Claims Assistance Act of 2000, statement—2834

Communications to Congress

Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, letter on application to join the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe—2855
Iran, letters on national emergency—2841
Weapons of mass destruction, letter reporting on proliferation—2842

Communications to Federal Agencies

Japanese-American internment sites, memorandum on preservation—2840

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters in Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei—2874, 2875, 2884
Interviews
Jose Diaz-Balart of Telemundo—2827
Maria Salinas of Univision—2819
Terence Hunt and Walter M. Mears of the Associated Press—2876

Joint Statements

United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement—2885

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

Editor's Note: The President was in Hanoi, Vietnam, on November 17, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

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.*

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Brunei, Prince Qawi—2869
China, President Jiang—2884
Japan, Prime Minister Mori—2884
Russia, President Putin—2874
Singapore, Prime Minister Goh—2885
South Korea, President Kim—2875
Vietnam, President Luong—2894

Notices

Continuation of Emergency Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction—2842
Continuation of Iran Emergency—2841

Proclamations

America Recycles Day—2883
Boundary Enlargement of the Craters of the Moon National Monument—2835
International Education Week—2868
National Great American Smokeout Day—2886
Vermilion Cliffs National Monument—2838
Veterans Day—2856

Statements by the President

See also Bill Signings
Convention To Combat Desertification—2875
Craters of the Moon National Monument, enlargement—2835
Deaths
Hosea Williams—2892
Leah Rabin—2864
National Japanese-American Memorial, dedication—2834
Vermilion Cliffs National Monument, establishment—2835

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—2896
Checklist of White House press releases—2896
Digest of other White House announcements—2895
Nominations submitted to the Senate—2895

Interview With Maria Salinas of Univision

October 30, 2000

Budget Negotiations

Ms. Salinas. Okay, let's start talking exactly about what's happening now on Capitol Hill. Of course, you're in the middle of a very bitter battle with Congress on the remaining legislation that you want passed, but Republicans are blaming you and accusing you of not wanting to negotiate. Are you willing to compromise with them on certain issues?

The President. Of course, but let's look at the facts here. We signed—I have signed all but two of the appropriations bills they have passed. There's only two appropriations bills left and one bill dealing with taxes and restoring funds to the health care system.

Now, in every case where we have negotiated in good faith, we have reached compromise, and I have signed a bill. I signed a bill the other day which had the biggest increase in the history of the country for land preservation; another bill which provided almost 80,000 vouchers for people to move from welfare to work and have housing vouchers; another bill which provided real improvements in veterans' health care programs.

So we've had lots and lots of bills that resolved longstanding differences in a principled, compromised way. The only difference is that the ones that are outstanding that they're blaming me for, instead of negotiating, they basically walked out of the room, left the Democrats in the White House there. They came up with their own bill. They said, "This is the best we can do. Take it or leave it." Now, that's not a negotiation. And that's a matter of fact. No one disputes that.

So I'm prepared to negotiate with them but not to let them run over me. That's one of the big things the voters have to think about in this election year, is whether they really want the Republican leadership in control of Congress and then someone in the White House of the same party that allows them to do this sort of thing without any kind of restraint, because they would—the leadership is to the right of their own constituency.

We were just talking before the interview started that at 2:30 in the morning, this morning, we had reached an agreement on an education bill that also involves the Labor Department, that would constitute the biggest increase in education in history. We'd double the number of kids in after-school programs. We would have a lot more teachers to make classes small in the early grades. We put a lot more money into teacher quality. We'd do more for repairing schools that are overcrowded or crumbling. We would provide more funds to identify and then turn around failing schools. It's a hugely important bill.

And it contains some important compromises between labor and business on labor issues, including a bill to protect workers who suffer from stress-related injuries on the job—physical stress, I mean. So the Republicans shook hands on it, and then they went back to their leaders, and they said, "No, our lobbyists won't like this," so they wrecked the deal. Now, that's not a failure of bipartisanship; that's a failure of leadership on their side.

Every bill where we've negotiated, we've gotten an agreement. The only bills where we're at loggerheads now are this one, where the leaders overrule their own negotiators, and the other two, where they won't negotiate with us. And there's a lot in there: immigrant fairness, minimum wage increase, the new markets legislation to give people incentives to invest in the poor areas of America that have been left behind. There's a lot of important work still to be done.

"Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act"

Ms. Salinas. I want to talk about that one bill—the Latino immigration, and it's the "Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act." It's definitely one of the major barriers in getting the budget bill passed. How far are you willing to go to get this legislation passed?

The President. Quite far. We've made some headway. They have allowed, for example, the relatives of people who are already in this country legally to come to this country after a certain amount of time if their naturalization process has not been completed. I think that's quite good.

But so far, the Congress has not been willing to treat immigrants from Honduras or Guatemala or El Salvador the same way they treated immigrants from Nicaragua and Cuba. And I just don't think there's any difference there. I think if you fled a violent political atmosphere in your home country, it shouldn't matter what the nature of the regime was, as long as it was a regime that violated the rule of law and human rights and put people in danger.

So I feel very strongly that they should all be treated the same. And that also affects people from Haiti, people from Liberia, as well as the Latinos from Central America. I think it's very important that we treat them fairly, and I'll keep working at it until—we'll make as much progress as we can. I feel very, very strongly about this. I can't imagine why—how the Republicans could justify treating the Cubans and the Nicaraguans different from the Hondurans and the Guatemalans and the Salvadorans.

Ms. Salinas. What part of the immigration bill are you willing to compromise on if you're faced with a Government shutdown?

The President. Well, I don't think they'll ever shut the Government down again. And I think the real issue is whether we can get this whole bill in return for other compromises in this appropriations bill. It's called the Commerce/State/Justice appropriations bill. The negotiations are complicated. They cover a lot of different factors, and all I can tell you is, I'm going to drive the hardest bargain I can on this, because I just feel very strongly about it.

Now, we may or may not be able to get it all, but I am certainly prepared to fight very hard. I just don't think you can justify treating one group of immigrants that have been here legally—they're working; they're paying taxes; they're making a contribution to our country; no one questions that they came here legally. How in the world we could disrupt families and send some of them home or not legalize their position here, when we've done exactly the same thing for people from other countries, is just beyond me. I just don't think it can be justified.

Ms. Salinas. Do you support amnesty, in theory?

The President. Well, that's what—of course, the Republicans are saying this is an amnesty bill, but what we're saying is, at least we want fairness. We want all groups of immigrants treated fairly. Then we can see if there are others who are here that aren't covered by the statute. But we had a general amnesty when the immigration act was passed before. And I think what's important is—look, I don't have any problem with it. I believe we should——

Ms. Salinas. But there hasn't been amnesty since 1986.

The President. That was a long time ago. What I think we should do is to treat all the people who are—who came here legally, and who have been here fairly since then—that's what I think we should do. Amnesty implies that this is about people who didn't come here legally. We're talking about people who came here lawfully, that now are being treated differently in terms of whether they can stay. There are people who are working, paying taxes; they have children. It's not right. It's just not right.

You cannot justify the position that the majority party in Congress is taking on this. At least I don't think you can, and I'm trying to get it straightened out.

Illegal Immigration

Ms. Salinas. What do you think we should do with the 6 million undocumented workers that live in the United States?

The President. Well, we've always had some illegal immigration, and I guess we always will. But that's a different subject. I don't know—there are lots of options there. I think my successor will probably have to figure out what to be done about that.

Ms. Salinas. Any suggestions to them?

The President. What?

Ms. Salinas. Any suggestions to your successor? Both Al Gore and Mr. Bush say they do not support an amnesty.

The President. I think it's difficult to justify a general amnesty for people who did not come here lawfully, because if you do that, then you are really burning the people who have been waiting in line patiently to come here legally. And you don't want to discriminate against them. On the other hand, I don't think you can justify not allowing legal immigrants to stay in this country, when they came here because of troubles in their own country, clearly lawfully under the American law, and now we're saying, "Okay, some can stay, but some have to go." And that's what I think. Let's deal with the biggest and most immediate problem first, and that's what it is. We've got to have fairness for these immigrants. They're legal. They ought to be able to stay here.

2000 Campaign

Ms. Salinas. You're going out on the campaign trail in the next week. Do you miss campaigning for yourself?

The President. No. I thought I would, actually. I thought I'd miss it more than I have, but this year, I think I've worked harder this year than I did when I was running. I've done about, oh, almost 200 events for people running for the House of Representatives and the United States Senate and then for the Vice President and Senator Lieberman on behalf of the Democratic Party, and I've done what I could to help my wife in New York. That's been a joy for me.

So I've enjoyed that. I think there is—you know, I love the campaign, and I'm interested in it. But I've had my time, and I've been very fortunate, and I've enjoyed it immensely. And I only hope that I can be helpful in these closing days of the election, just to clarify the choices before the American people.

I have absolutely no doubt the decisions they'll make if they understand the choices, the differences, and the consequences. So if I can help in that regard, I'll be glad to do what I can.

Ms. Salinas. The media is reporting that the Democratic leadership has asked you to come out and campaign in key States with key constituencies. Do you think they waited too long to ask you?

The President. No. First of all, I have been out there quite a lot. I haven't been out there on these kind of election-style rallies. But I don't think that was appropriate. I think that our candidates—this election, fundamentally, is about—in a Presidential election, about Senator Lieberman and Mr. Cheney and, more importantly, about Vice President Gore and Mr. Bush. That's what the election is about.

What I can do is to try to help clarify the choices, say what I believe. Everybody knows who I'm for. That's not the issue. The issue——

Ms. Salinas. Who are you for?

The President. I've even been wearing my pins every day, as you see.

Ms. Salinas. Hillary?

The President. I'm for Hillary, Gore, and Lieberman.

But I think, to go back to your question, it would have been not appropriate for me to be out there much before now because of the work I have to do here and because of the crisis we've been having in the Middle East. But I think in the last week of the campaign, people sort of expect, you know, that it's okay for the President to go out and try to rally the troops and make the last-minute arguments.

There are a lot of votes, I think, that could go either way now. And all I hope to do for the American people, at least, is to clarify their choices, because they have—there are huge differences between these two candidates and these two parties. And if people understand those differences and make their choices, then that's how democracy is supposed to work.

I mean, the country is in great shape. We're moving in the right direction, and this should be a happy election for the American people. They should be able to dream about where they want us to go and then make a judgment about who is most likely to lead us there.

Ms. Salinas. The New York Times reported earlier this month that you were personally hurt because Vice President Gore has not asked you to go out and campaign for him and he has not sought your advice. Is that, in fact, true?

The President. No, it is not true. I don't know where they got the story. I've already told them—I told them back in August; Bill Daley and I were talking about it the other day—that I thought it would not be wise for me to go out too soon, except to continue to do what I was doing. I would help them raise funds; I would do what I could. But I needed to be doing the job the American people hired me to do, and the American people needed to have an opportunity to look at the candidates and make their own judgments. I said then and I'll say now, I don't think people would object to my going out at the end of the campaign to try to make some of the last-minute arguments and rev up our forces.

But that is simply not true, and where we are heavily——

Ms. Salinas. Well, what part——

The President. ——we talk to the Gore campaign several times a day. So I don't know where the story came from, but it's not accurate.

Ms. Salinas. But what part of it isn't true, though? The fact that you are not hurt or the fact that the Vice President has asked you to go out and campaign for him and has sought your advice?

The President. Both those things are true. It is also true that I agree with them. We both believe that I should not be out before this time. And it is not true that we have not been heavily involved in talking to them about the campaign. But me, personally, I needed to be President, and he needed to establish his own identity and to show, as he said at the convention, that he was his own man and he was out there running his own campaign.

And I think that what has been done to date is appropriate. So the article was not right about that.

Ms. Salinas. Mr. President, you know that there has been a lot of talk about the so-called Clinton factor. Do you believe that you are an asset or a liability to this campaign?

The President. Neither. But I think that the record—because I think it's not about me. I'm not on the ballot. Anybody that is still angry at me because of the personal mistakes I made is—the American people are fairminded. They don't hold one person responsible for another person's mistakes. So that's not an issue.

I think what is a factor in the campaign is what we did here the last 8 years that the Vice President was an integral part of. This is a different country than it was 8 years ago. And the American people need to remember that.

Eight years ago we had an economy in trouble, a society that was divided, and a political system that was paralyzed. Eight years later we've got the longest economic expansion in history; we've turned the biggest deficits into the biggest surpluses; we've got 22 million new jobs; crime is at a 26-year low; welfare is at a 32-year low. We've got a reduction in the number of people without health insurance for the first time in a dozen years. We've got cleaner air, cleaner water, safer drinking water, more land set aside than any administration in 100 years, and our schools are getting better. Test scores are up; the dropout rate is down; and college-going is at an all-time high.

And in each of these areas, we had policies that are working. So in each of these areas, Al Gore does not seek the status quo. He wants to change. But he wants to change to build on the progress we've done, to keep the prosperity going. And his opponent has very different ideas on economic policy, crime policy, environmental policy, education policy, health care policy. And the American people, if they know that, can make their own judgment about which one's right. But at least there is a test run here. We do have evidence that our way works pretty well.

Ms. Salinas. Given that you have such a solid record, you and Vice President Gore, why do you think this race is so close? Shouldn't Al Gore be far ahead?

The President. Well, I think that part of it is, when times are good, sometimes people may not pay as much attention in the beginning to the differences between the candidates. And I think, you know, Governor

Bush is a gifted campaigner, and he has made his case, and I think that the Republicans have tried with some success to blur the issues at critical points.

But the things that—as President, I've paid a lot of attention to the economy. And one of the things that I think is very important here is that Al Gore's philosophy about this projected surplus is just, first, keep paying down the debt. That keeps interest rates down. That's a tax cut for everybody. His plan will keep interest rates a percent lower for a decade. That's $390 billion in lower home mortgages alone, $30 billion in lower car payments, $15 billion in lower college loan payments, and more business loans, more jobs, a stronger stock market.

So I think—so he says, "Pay the debt down first, then take what you've got left and invest it in education, health care, the environment, national security, and a tax cut." And the opposition says, "Well, we've got this money. Let's give it back to the people." If the surplus is $2 trillion, they propose to spend, what, about $1.5 trillion on a tax cut, plus interest, and then $1 trillion to partially privatize Social Security, and a $.5 trillion—those are big numbers. But if you think the surplus is $2 billion and you spend $1.5 billion on taxes, $1 billion on privatizing Social Security, and $.5 billion on spending, you're in deficit. That means higher interest rates.

Now, so the people have to decide: Do I want this big tax cut now and this privatization now, and do I think it will be so good that it's worth going back into deficits and having higher interest rates?

I think from my point of view, the arithmetic here is very important, and it's really pretty simple. You can forget about all the zeroes, and you just think that if you drop all the zeroes, whatever you spend and whatever you cut taxes can't add up to more than two. If it does, you're not paying down the debt as you should. And the other thing that bothers me is, you see in these controversies we're having now, even when we have enough Republicans here to have bipartisan support for bills, the leadership is well to the right of them. And if you have the President of the same party and these leaders in Congress, I don't know who would restrain them when it comes to what they would do in so many areas of our national life, and that bothers me.

If you think about the last 6 years, all the times when we've gotten great bipartisan cooperation, but only after I have first restrained them from doing what they initially wanted to do—so I'm worried about that.

Bipartisanship

Ms. Salinas. Mr. Bush said that if he was in office, if he was the President, we wouldn't have that kind of problem, that he could work well with both Democrats and Republicans. Is that realistic?

The President. It's realistic, but look at the scorecard here. Now, when we got—when they won the Congress, they said, "We don't want to work with you. We're going to do it our way." And they had the biggest education and environmental cuts in history, the biggest Medicare premium increases in history, and so I vetoed them. They didn't negotiate with us. They just said, "Take it or leave it," and they shut the Government down. And the public made it clear they didn't like that.

So look what's happened since then, until right now. We had a bipartisan balanced budget agreement, a bipartisan welfare reform bill. We now have the biggest surpluses in history. We have the lowest welfare rolls in 32 years, cut in half. We had a bipartisan telecommunications bill, which has created thousands of businesses and hundreds of thousands of jobs. And this year, as I just said, we just had a bipartisan bill to increase the spending on land preservation, the biggest in history; a bipartisan bill to continue welfare reform; a bipartisan bill to relieve the debt of the poorest nations in the world; a bipartisan bill to reach out in trade to our friends in the Caribbean and in Africa.

We've had huge bipartisan cooperation. But the pattern is that the leadership of the Republican Party, at various points, will say, "Take it or leave it," and then we'll say no, and then we'll have a bipartisan cooperation. And in the nature of things, the conflict gets more coverage than the cooperation.

But we've had wonderful bipartisan success here when they've been willing to work with us. You know, I hope and believe that

we still can get that done on the remaining business of this legislature.

2000 Campaign

Ms. Salinas. Let me go back to my question again. If the record is so good and the country is so strong, has there been a mistake? Has there been something lost in the message for Al Gore? What's his biggest mistake in this campaign?

The President. I don't know that it's—I think first of all, he's acquitted himself very well. I think the public knows that he knows more, that he's more experienced, that he's better qualified. But I think that in the public presentation of the other campaign, they've done a very good job in kind of blurring some of these differences.

So I think that what I'd like to see is what I always tell all of our Democratic friends, that clarity is our friend, if we can just make the differences clear and the consequences clear. For example, you can decide, if you believe in our program to put 100,000 police on the street and you want to continue it, you have one choice. If you want to get rid of it, you have another choice. If you believe in our program to put 100,000 teachers in the classrooms for smaller classes in the early grades, you can have one choice. If you don't believe it, you can have another one. If you believe that we ought to extend the background checks of the Brady law to people at gun shows, you have one choice. If you don't think they should apply to handguns bought at gun shows, you have another one. If you believe that we should keep trying to improve the environment, you have one choice. If you believe that we should relax some of our clean air standards and get rid of the order I issued to protect roadless areas in our national forests, you have another one.

So it's like people can really decide what they want as long as they know what the choices are. I always thought it would be a very close race, and I always thought that Governor Bush was a formidable opponent. They don't disagree on everything, but on the really important, big, economic, educational, health care, tax policy issues, there are these—Social Security—big, big, differences. And I think—you know, I just believe the Vice President is going to win in the end. I've always thought he would win.

Hispanic Vote

Ms. Salinas. You know that Republicans, particularly Mr. Bush, have been very active in seeking out the minority votes, especially the Hispanic vote. And they have made some inroads with Hispanics. Give me three reasons why Hispanics should vote for Al Gore.

The President. First, because he will keep the prosperity going and extend it to people and places that have been left behind. He will pay down the debt, keep interest rates low, and invest much, much more money in education, health care, and the environment, as opposed to the other approach, which will take us back to deficits and won't leave enough money to invest in our people and our future. So the economy is very important.

Secondly, he will push for things like immigrant fairness, an end to racial profiling, the Hispanic Education Action Plan that we created together. He ran the empowerment zone program, which included Hispanic communities around America, which has already helped a lot of economic revitalization. So he's right on the economics; he's right on the social issues.

Third, he believes that it's really important that we work hard to build one America and to reach out to the rest of the world. He'll be a good partner to Latin America. He'll be a good partner to Central America. He will be—he has the experience necessary to handle the crises of the world and to be a strong leader.

I don't have any question that he will be a very, very fine President. He makes good decisions, and he's ready for the job. And I think, to me, maybe those are arguments I could make to all Americans. But if you look at the issues that are really important to Hispanics—just take the minimum wage for example. Look at the difference in the two candidates on the minimum wage. One supported our first increase in the minimum wage and is fighting for the present one; the other was opposed to raising the minimum wage in Texas, which is only $3.35 an hour. That's just one example.

So I believe—the only thing I would say to Latino Americans is, look at the issues;

look at the differences. Make up your own mind. But the differences are quite vast. You have two perfectly nice people. Both of them speak Spanish, and I think that's great. I hope I'll be the last non-Spanish-speaking President.

Ms. Salinas. Nada?

The President. Yes, just a little. I speak a little but very little, and I hope I'll be the last one. But beyond that, I think we ought to say you have two good people; they love their country; they love their families; they'll do what they think is right. They really see the world in very different ways. And I think if we can clarify that, I think the Vice President will win and win by more than people think he will today.

Mexico

Ms. Salinas. Let's talk about Latin America for a moment. You have always been a very strong supporter of Mexico. Now that there is a new President—he's an outsider, the same as you were an outsider when you came into office. What do you think Mr. Vicente Fox needs to do to be successful in a country that was governed by the same party, the PRI, for decades?

The President. Well, first, he's a very impressive man. He came up here to see me, and I followed his campaign. And I think, just as a person, he's quite an impressive person. He took on decades of tradition. He imagined how he could make it come out differently, and he did. So—and I identify with him. He lives on a ranch, and I came from a rural area, and I think he's a very impressive fellow.

I think what he has to do is to put together a good team, establish a reputation for real competence, and then develop a certain gift for getting the support of the other two main parties or their representatives in the Mexican national legislature wherever he can, and maintaining the support of the people. It's not going to be easy for him, because he knows he has to make some difficult decisions.

All reforms are always——

[*At this point, a portion of the President's remarks were missing from the transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary.*]

Colombia

Ms. Salinas. ——more involved in their fight against the guerrillas. People are dying every single day.

The President. No. I think what we want to do is to increase the capacity of the Colombian Government to enforce the law. We want to also increase the capacity of the Colombian Government to have a justice system that works and to offer the farmers and the poor people in the rural areas an alternative lifestyle so they don't have to have that drug money to make a decent living. I think that's very important.

And I think we should support the frontline states, the countries that border Colombia, that are also worried that if Colombia succeeds, they'll have even more problems. So we have some money in our Plan Colombia for the other states as well, states like Bolivia, the poorest country in the Andes, which has had, ironically, the greatest success in dealing with the drug issue.

Now, on the guerrilla problem, which is tied to the narcotrafficking problem, we still believe that over the long run, there will have to be some sort of negotiated peace settlement. And I wish—you know, the President, President Pastrana, has gone out of his way to try to seek a peace. And I don't think he's gotten an appropriate response from the rebels.

As I said, the money from the narcotrafficking may have something to do with that, but in the end, it's not good for Colombia to have as much of the land in turmoil and as many people killed every year as possible. But I think if they can get a handle on the narcotrafficking, it will increase their capacity to negotiate a peace on the political issues.

President's Legacy

Ms. Salinas. Let's talk a little bit about your legacy, Mr. President. What do you feel has been your greatest accomplishment and your biggest failures?

The President. I don't know. I think the historians will probably have to make a judgment about that. I think that the main thing is, we've turned the country around. We gave people a sense of hope and possibility. It's not just the economy. But the country is

working better now. It's not just the economy. The crime rate is down. All the indicators—that drug abuse among young people is down. Teen pregnancy is down at historically low levels.

As I said, the environment is stronger; the school systems are better; and the health care system is getting better. So I feel good about that. Are there things that I wish I could have done? Sure. I wish we could have completed the reform of Social Security. I wish we had found a way for all Americans to have health insurance.

But because we've got a strong economy, because I'm leaving a balanced budget and a surplus, the next administration, if Vice President Gore is elected, if people like my wife are elected to the Senate, we'll have the ability to extend health care coverage to working families, for example.

So I wish I could have done that, but you never get to do everything you want to do, and I've worked about as hard as I could for 8 years.

Ms. Salinas. Any regrets? Any personal regrets?

The President. Oh, of course I have some. But if I had to do it all over again, I would still want to be President. I would still want to have the chance to serve, and it's been a joy and an honor. I've loved it. I just—the work—having the chance every day to get up and work as hard as you can to fulfill the dreams of the people of this country is a great honor, especially to be here at the turn of the century, with the explosion of this new economy, with the end of the cold war and a whole new different set of affairs in the world, and with American society growing ever more diverse. I think it's so exciting.

This country is more exciting to live in than ever before in human history—in our history, in our 224-year history, and one of the most interesting societies, I think, in history just because it's so diverse. And yet we're still kind of making our democracy work. That's one of the reasons that it's so important for new immigrants to get out and vote, to prove that they believe in the system, and to reaffirm the fact that they have as much influence as anybody else does. On election day, my vote counts no more than someone who just registered.

First Family

Ms. Salinas. There's a recent poll that says that you and Mrs. Clinton are the most admired people in the country. But people want to know, do you feel that you have a solid marriage that will be able to outlive everything that you've been through?

The President. Well, I certainly hope so. I told Hillary when we got married—something I've repeated several times over the last 25 years, and we just celebrated our 25th anniversary—that one of my goals—this literally, when we were in our late twenties, one of my goals was to be an old man in my seventies, sitting on a park bench with her and seeing young people go by just in the beginning of their lives and have no regrets. And I still hope that will happen.

You know, we've got a home in New York now. I'm going to build a library in Arkansas, in my home, and I'm looking forward to this next chapter in my life. And I'm very proud of my wife, for the campaign she's run for the Senate. I'm very proud of our daughter, and I'm glad that Chelsea took this time off away from school to be with us in our last months in the White House and at her mother's campaign. So it's been a happy time for us, and I'm looking forward to the future.

Ms. Salinas. What will you be doing after you leave the White House, and what will you miss most about the White House and being President?

The President. I don't know what I'm going to do for sure. I'll try to be a useful citizen. I'll miss the work most and the daily contact with all different kinds of people. But I love the job. So it's the work I'll miss the most.

NOTE: The interview was taped at 5:27 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House for later broadcast, and the transcript was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 9. In his remarks, the President referred to Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush and Vice Presidential candidate Dick Cheney; President Vicente Fox of Mexico; and President Andres Pastrana of Colombia. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Interview With José Diaz-Balart of Telemundo

November 4, 2000

Mr. Diaz-Balart. Mr. President, thank you very much for being with us on "Esta Manana." It's a pleasure having you.

The President. Glad to do it.

Hispanic Vote and the 2000 Election

Mr. Diaz-Balart. Let's talk about the importance of November 7th, specifically towards the Latino population of the United States. Why should people who, many times, don't feel part of this country, and yet are citizens, why should they vote?

The President. Because there are issues at stake that will directly affect themselves, their families, their communities, and our country. There are huge differences in the economic policies of the two candidates.

Obviously, I favor the ones that Vice President Gore and my wife and others have articulated, but there's the question of whether you think it's better to pay down the debt, have a smaller tax cut focused on the middle class, and invest more in education, or whether it's better to have a bigger tax cut, partially privatized Social Security, and have spending that will take us back in debt but give some people more money right now. That will affect everybody. How do you build on the prosperity of the new—of the last 8 years?

Then, there are differences of opinion on crime, on the environment, on health care, on education, and on fairness toward immigrants, which should be a big issue to the Latino population. I and virtually everyone in my party are fighting for the fairness to immigrants act, and the leadership of the Republican Party is opposing us. And so we're—and we have a simple position, which is that it was right to let people from Cuba and Nicaragua come into this country if they were fleeing dictatorial or violent environments, but we owe the same thing to the people from El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Haiti, and other places. So I think that's a big issue.

Then there are issues revolving around whether we should have hate crimes legislation. Should we have stronger laws guaranteeing equal pay for women? All these things will drastically affect, one way or the other, what life is like for ordinary Americans.

Voter Apathy

Mr. Diaz-Balart. Why do you think, sir, that the polls show that candidates really haven't gotten through to all of the voters, that there's some apathy, and there's some feeling that, "You know what, I don't even want to get involved with this?"

The President. I think the main—anybody that doesn't want to get involved, I think, it's because the issues aren't as clear as they should be. But I also think, in a funny way, the general prosperity and sense of well-being of the country could be working against us a little bit. Because people may think, well, you know—younger voters, a lot of them can't even remember what it was like 8 years ago.

And I think sometimes when times are good, you tend to be more casual about voting and about studying the differences. And then, maybe they—people, I think, do have a negative reaction sometimes to all this—the air wars—not just the Presidential race, but all these ads where they're attacking each other and all that. That sometimes tends to depress turnout.

But I would hope the American people would actually be in a very good humor. I mean, this has been an essentially positive election. The candidates have been sharply critical of each other on the issues, but there has been surprisingly little personal attack. Governor Bush has, I think, wrongly questioned Vice President Gore's character a couple of times, but by and large, both of them have run clean, positive campaigns in which they have strongly disagreed with each other on the issues. But that's what democracy is about. I would think—I think the American people ought to be happy. I mean, the economy is growing; all sectors of the society are benefiting. Crime is down. The environment is cleaner. There are fewer people without health insurance. The schools are getting better.

I think that people should think, "Wow, we've got a chance now to really dream big dreams about what we want America to look like over the next 10 years. What should

America's role in the world be over the next 10 years? What is exactly the right thing to do with our projected surplus? And how should we handle all this?" This is, for a citizen who loves democracy, a dream election. We may never have another election like this in our lifetime, where we've got prosperity, social progress, and the absence of crisis at home and threat abroad.

I would just say to the American people, you make a lot of mistakes in life. Sometimes when things are so good, you think it doesn't matter if you concentrate or act. It does matter.

President's Role in 2000 Campaign

Mr. Diaz-Balart. You know, what does surprise me, sir, is that a President with a huge popularity as you do, whose numbers continue to be record-setting as far as anybody is concerned, and yet we don't see you in the battleground States. I don't see you in Michigan. I haven't seen you in Florida. I haven't seen you in Tennessee and even in your home State that much. It surprises me as a journalist. Does it surprise you? Why aren't you there?

The President. Not exactly. I think, first of all, there is a limit to what the President can do in another person's race. I have been out a lot this year. I couldn't go out—I think it would have been actually a negative factor if I had gone out before the Congress went home, because people would think, "What's President Clinton doing trying to tell me how to vote for the next President when he's got a job to do back in Washington?"

Now, when they did go home, I went to California. I spent the day in New York trying to help my wife and our candidates here, and I'm going to spend a day in Arkansas tomorrow, which is a State where I think we're a little bit behind but not too badly. And maybe I can have an impact there.

But I also have done, over the course of this last year, I've been in all those battleground States. I've done 150-plus events for our Congressmen and Senators, every one of them also making the argument for the Vice President. And I cut a lot of radio spots and done some other communications, phone messages, and other things to try to reach swing voters and try to affect the turnout.

But I'm not so sure, if I had been to more places, it would have made a difference in the vote, because I actually have experienced it from the other end. When President Reagan was wildly popular in 1984, he came to Arkansas and campaigned for my opponent. It had no effect on my vote, not at all.

So I've done everything I could do to help the Vice President and Senator Lieberman, and I think that there was a decision made that the best I could do would be to try to articulate a national message, which I can do anywhere—yesterday my speech in California was played live on CNN, for example—and keep the schedule I had set, because I have a unique relationship with Arkansas, and then try to do direct voter contact.

But I want the focus to be on Vice President Gore and Governor Bush. I think the people have to make that decision. All I can do is to help clarify what I think the choice is. You know, the American people have been very good to me, and I've tried to tell them in the last 2 weeks what I think the choice is, and I hope I've had a positive impact.

Perspective on the Presidency

Mr. Diaz-Balart. What would you tell them about these last 8 years for you as a—less as President Clinton and more as Bill Clinton, the man whose dreams, in many ways, came true, and who has had ups and downs?

The President. Well, first of all, I feel an enormous sense of gratitude to the American people. I mean, they gave me a chance to serve, and they sort of took a chance on me at first, because I was the Governor of a small State. I was quite young. I had never served an elected office in Washington. But I had some clear ideas about what I thought we should do. So I feel gratitude.

Secondly, I feel gratitude because they've worked out pretty well. And one of the lessons that I have learned from all this is that it really matters—if you want to run for President, you should have reasons for running that are bigger than yourself, bigger than your desire to do it, because that will sustain you in the tough times. It gives you a game plan. It gives you a way of organizing a team and marshaling the energy of the country.

And of course, the people stayed with me in the tough times, too.

So when I leave office, I will leave grateful for the progress America has made, grateful for the generosity and support of the American people, but I'll also be more idealistic than I was the day I took the oath of office. In spite of all the battles I've been through, I'm more idealistic about the potential of America within our country and the potential of America to have a positive impact around the world than I was when I took office.

Post-Presidential Plans

Mr. Diaz-Balart. How do you plan to channel that optimism and continue trying to make a difference?

The President. I hope that what I can do is to try to trade my job in, which now has an enormous amount of power and authority, but requires me to be involved in literally hundreds of things, and identify four or five big areas that I care passionately about and concentrate my energies there, so that whatever influence I have as a former President, being able to concentrate in fewer areas, I'll still have a positive impact.

I'm still working on the details of how to do that, but I really hope I can do that. I think that I have an obligation to my country and to the people who have been my friends and allies around the world to try to use whatever time and energy I have left in this astonishing, unique experience I've had to make the world a better place, and I'll keep trying.

Mr. Diaz-Balart. Give me an idea, something that may or may not work out, but something that we could be seeing you at.

The President. Well, I'm very interested in the economic empowerment of poor people. That's something I've worked on here at home with our empowerment zone programs, with our community development institutions, making loans to people who couldn't get them otherwise, and something that my wife and I have worked on around the world.

Last year, through our AID programs, we made 2 million small microenterprise loans in Latin America and Africa and in poorer countries in Asia. I think one of the problems with democracy is, it's hard for it to take root if people don't feel any tangible benefits.

In Latin America today, we have some countries where democracy is more fragile partly because they haven't felt the benefits. One of the problems we have in the Middle East today, with all the tension in the West Bank and Gaza, is that many Palestinians are not better off today economically than they were when we signed the peace agreement way back in 1993. And we have to do a better job in the world of merging politics and economics. So that's one area that I'm very interested in.

Middle East Peace Process

Mr. Diaz-Balart. We'll talk about the Middle East real quick before we go to Latin America, which is a subject dear to our viewers' hearts. Some critics have said that the United States, your administration, has been so keen on pushing for some kind of concessions on both sides, that maybe it's become an American agenda in the Middle East, versus the Americans acting as brokers and as objective people who can help the system.

The President. I don't think that's a fair criticism. Here's why. We, all along, have basically facilitated what the parties wanted to do. Now, when we met at Camp David, we met knowing that there might not be an agreement. But we did it because both parties were afraid that they were coming up on the September deadline for the declaration of a Palestinian state without an agreement, and that without further progress on these tough issues, we might have a real mess there, even worse than what we've been through.

So what I tried to do was to explore—when they reach an impasse, I did what President Carter did, way back at Camp David I, between Israel and Egypt. If they reach an impasse, then you can offer an idea to see if both sides will take it. But it can never be America's agenda. All we can ever do is try to be an honest and fair broker, because we don't have to live with the consequences. The people that have to live with the consequences are the Israelis and the Palestinians. So for us to try to force something on them is a grave mistake.

On the other hand, the consequences of not making peace have been evident these last 3 or 4 weeks over there. And they are just horrible. So we should nudge them when we can, and as long as both sides trust us, we can nudge them without them thinking it's our agenda, because they know when they have to get off—they know when they can't do something.

Cuba

Mr. Diaz-Balart. This January will mark the 42d anniversary of Castro in power, the longest lasting dictator. Why haven't you helped the internal dissident movement in Cuba like, let's say, Reagan did for Poland?

The President. Well, I don't know what else we could have done. I believe I could have done a lot more if the Cuban Democracy Act had been left intact. And the Cuban community in Florida, for example, and in New Jersey, strongly supported the Cuban Democracy Act. I think we could have done a lot more for the dissident movement in Cuba because we would have been in a position to have carrots and sticks in return for openness and change, and we could have supported them.

But when Castro's air force murdered those Brothers to the Rescue people in the two airplanes, shot them down completely illegally, we had to have some sort of response. The Congress passed the Helms-Burton bill. I signed it, but it tied the hands of the executives so much that it's hard for us to use the full panoply of pressures we had.

For example, let's just take Kosovo—I mean Serbia. We just had an election in Serbia, Mr. Kostunica. We could put a lot of money into a democratic election there, but we also had something to offer them if they won. I had the power to immediately suspend the embargo, to do other things. We had an embargo on them that was very tough, but I always had the flexibility to use carrots and sticks.

I think it's a great mistake, and I hope the next Congress will correct it, to put the President in a position where he can promote positive change in Cuba, because the Congress believes the only way it can show it's anti-Castro is to make sure that the President has no leverage. The Congress just adopted another bill that I think was a mistake. They put it in the Agriculture bill, and I had no choice but to sign it. The bill purported to sell—allow more food sales to Cuba, but because it doesn't have any financing mechanism, there won't be any food sales. The real purpose of the bill was to further restrict the ability of Americans to travel to Cuba and have person-to-person contact. I think that's a mistake, because I think it again—we have no plans to invade Cuba. If there's not going to be a military invasion of Cuba, then what you need is a balance of carrots and sticks.

I am disappointed that Castro is still in power. I am disappointed that democracy has not been restored to Cuba. I am glad that we have had a very tough line these last 8 years. I wish we could have done better. But I think that it is a mistake—I think the Cuban Democracy Act was right. That was the right concept—more sticks and more carrots, more flexibility. Get in there and find the people in Cuba that are promoting democracy, that are promoting free markets, that are promoting freedom of speech, that are politically opposed to the communist regime, and find ways to support them. And find ways to give power to just ordinary people doing all kinds of things that are inconsistent with a total communist dictatorship.

And I hope that we'll—he can't last forever. Nobody lives forever, for one thing. And I don't think that the system is sustainable without him, but I would like to see change before then. I know even in Miami and in New Jersey, I hear more and more discussion among my friends in the Cuban communities about what else we could do. I wish we could have done better. I do think the next President should be given more tools. If we want to try to move toward freedom quicker, we've got to give the President more tools to deal with.

Mexico

Mr. Diaz-Balart. One of the good stories coming out of Latin America is this election in Mexico with Vicente Fox winning the PRI after 70-something years.

The President. Great story.

Mr. Diaz-Balart. Tell me how that's—the influence you think or the impact of that story on—not only on the United States-

Mexico relations but also on Latin America in general.

The President. Well, first of all, I think it's a great credit to the people of Mexico that they had an honest election, that it was carried off in a forthright way. It is secondly a great credit to Ernesto Zedillo, because he, first of all, opened his own party's Presidential nomination up to a broader popular choice, and secondly, he basically assured an honest election to make politics competitive in Mexico.

So I think President Zedillo will go down in history for many things in a positive way. He had a very good economic policy, but he also had the courage to give up his own party's monopoly of power. And he knew what he was doing when he opened the system.

Then thirdly, I think it's a tribute to Mr. Fox. He's a very engaging, compelling man. He's an interesting man. He's a——

Mr. Diaz-Balart. Charismatic.

The President. Very charismatic. He lives on a ranch. He showed me the boots he was wearing he said were made in a boot factory on his own ranch. His children still, by and large, live on the ranch. I think one of them lives in Mexico City now. He's a very impressive man.

And what I hope will happen is that when he takes office, I hope that the PRI will try to cooperate with him, will try to work with him, will give him a chance to succeed, because one of the problems that a new President faces, if your party has never been in power, or if your party has been out of power a very long time—that even happens here sometimes; we faced some of those challenges when I came in—is, you have to put together a team that not only is smart and knowledgeable on policy but also can figure out how to work through the political culture of a country, in this case Mexico's political culture, which has never before had a President of another party.

So I would hope that since Mexico has one-term Presidencies, the PRI has nothing to lose by helping Mr. Fox succeed and giving him a chance to do good for Mexico. If he makes a mistake, he'll have to live with the consequences, like we all do. But I think that America has a big interest in the success of Mexico, and I think the PRI will rise in the esteem of the public if they are seen to be a constructive force there. So this will be an interesting test for them because they've never been like this before, either. I like Mexico's chances for the future. I think they're—I, personally, believe their biggest problem is the same thing Columbia is facing but on a smaller scale. The narcotraffickers have so much loose money to throw around in countries that are poor, and have so much power to throw around in communities and areas where the power structure is weak, that that's a real test for Mexico and its democracy.

But it's basically, I think, Mexico is moving in the right direction and deserves a lot of the world's applause for what's happened there.

Immigration

Mr. Diaz-Balart. In interviews with "Esta Manana," both Governor Bush and Vice President Gore have said that a lot needs to be done as far as how INS handles the Mexicans who try to reach this country for a better life for themselves and for their family. They both have said that they failed to—there's not enough, maybe, human respect towards families that are divided, people who are sent back without any kind of sensitivity towards their cases. Would you agree with that?

The President. Oh, yes. I think there are several problems with the INS. But I think, first, there's the whole issue of how we deal with controlling our borders and immigrants that come here without legal sanction. And then there's the question of how we handle those who are eligible for naturalization and how long they have to wait and how they're treated while they're waiting.

The Vice President headed up a task force for us back in '96 to try to dramatically speed the naturalization process, and we did—you remember we did a project in Miami and in several other cities. We got an enormous amount of criticism from the Congress, I think, because they thought that immigrants would be more likely to be Democratic voters, although one of the reasons we did it in Miami was because, as you know, Cuban-American voters normally tend to vote for Republicans for President. And we wanted to demonstrate that we weren't trying to be

partisan. What we wanted to do was to make the INS work better, for people who were eligible for naturalization.

Now, for people who are trying to get in the country, it's a genuine dilemma, because every nation has to have some control over its borders and some limits on immigration. And if you ignore those entirely, with regard to Mexico, because of our long history and the culture of the Rio Grande Valley and all of that you know very well, then you're sort of really hurting those people that wait their turn in line.

So I think what we need is a little better treatment. We need to review the quota. We need to make sure that people are treated right, and then we need to examine whether or not we need to do more on the family unification front. As you know, that's one of things we're fighting for in the Latino immigrant fairness legislation before Congress now, is trying to do a little more on family reunification, because it seems to me that America ought to be a pro-family country. We ought to let people be together, and that's another reason I'm fighting for the Liberians, too. You may be familiar with that case and the Liberian immigrants.

I will say this: I think, on balance, the Government works a lot better than it did when I got here, but I am disappointed that I have not made more improvements in the Immigration and Naturalization Service. So both Governor Bush and the Vice President are right, and I'm glad that they have both committed to focus on it.

Post-Presidential Plans

Mr. Diaz-Balart. My last question is, here's a kid who goes to the White House and meets President Kennedy, then later as a grown man is saying hello to kids on that same lawn. Here's a political animal who has studied all his life politics, history. I see you out there on the line, and you seem to be the last guy who wants to be there. The people who have shook your hand leave before you do, because you want to say hello and touch everybody out there. How in the heck are you going to do—what are you going to do after this? Here's a guy who—you're a young guy, and all your life you've done this, and I see you out there. Now what? What happens?

The President. I do love politics, and I also love public service. I will miss the job of being President even more than the political events, even more than living in the White House, which has been a profound honor. But you know, it is our system, and it's probably a pretty good system, that a person just gets to be President for 8 years, if you're lucky. So I have to do what I've done before at several points in my life. I have to start a new life and figure out how to use the life I've lived to good effect in building a new life.

And I won't have to stop being a citizen of America or a citizen of the world; I just won't be the candidate any more. I hope I'll be a member of the Senate spouses' club after Tuesday. I told Vice President Gore that if he got elected, I would do whatever he wanted me to do, anything from coming in to talk or going to funerals. I'd do whatever I was asked to do.

I've done this. I'm grateful. I'm not going to stop being an interested citizen, but I have to make a new life. I just hope it will be one that will be of some use to my country.

Mr. Diaz-Balart. Mr. President, thank you very much. I appreciate you being with us on "Esta Manana."

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview was taped at 5:10 p.m. at the African Square Plaza for later broadcast, and the transcript was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 9. In his remarks, the President referred to Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush; President Fidel Castro of Cuba; President Vojislav Kostunica of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro); and President Vicente Fox and former President Ernesto Zedillo of Mexico. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Statement on Signing the Energy Act of 2000

November 9, 2000

Today I have signed into law H.R. 2884, the "Energy Act of 2000." This Act extends

key authorities that aid management of energy emergencies, specifies the conditions under which the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve can be used, and updates the operating rules for the Weatherization Assistance Program.

The Act reauthorizes the operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, a critical line of defense against the threat of energy shortages that can cripple our economy. Extension of the direct authority for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve guarantees that the full range of means will be available to any Administration that may need to take actions necessary to secure our Nation's energy supplies.

The Act also restores the limited antitrust protection for U.S. oil companies assisting the Department of Energy and the International Energy Agency in planning for and responding to an oil emergency. With this protection, these companies can continue their vital participation in preparing and implementing a coordinated and effective response.

As I also requested, the Act provides authority to establish and use a Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve with a capacity of up to 2 million barrels. This Reserve will serve New England and the upper Mid-Atlantic States where consumers rely to a great extent on heating oil to heat their homes. Creation of the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve was a priority of my Administration, and I am pleased the Congress provided bi-partisan support for its inclusion in this Act.

The Act also amends the Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program, a program that reduces heating and cooling costs for low-income Americans by improving the energy efficiency of their homes. These changes will make it easier for States to provide timely energy weatherization services and include a repeal of a financially burdensome cost-sharing requirement for the States.

Unfortunately, this Act also contains an objectionable provision that transfers licensing authority for small hydroelectric projects in Alaska from Federal jurisdiction to the State of Alaska. I remain strongly opposed to this provision because it could erode the Federal Power Act's uniform system for licensing hydroelectric projects in the United States and impair the Federal Government's ability to protect Federally managed resources.

The Act also amends the President's existing authority, under section 161(h) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, to draw down the Strategic Petroleum Reserve by making exercise of the authority dependent upon a finding by the Secretary of Defense that the drawdown would not impair national security. This amendment is objectionable because, in effect, it conditions the exercise of judgmental authority by the President upon the agreement of one of his subordinates.

Despite these objectionable features, I believe that the Act demonstrates this Nation's and my own commitment to providing for a more secure energy future, and I am pleased to sign it today.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 9, 2000.

NOTE: H.R. 2884, approved November 9, was assigned Public Law No. 106–469. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement on Signing the Energy Act of 2000

November 9, 2000

Today I am pleased to sign the "Energy Act of 2000," which contains a number of measures to strengthen America's energy security that I have repeatedly urged Congress to act on this year. This legislation reauthorizes the operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, a critical line of defense against the threat of energy shortages, and guarantees that a full range of tools will be available to secure America's energy supplies. In addition, this legislation establishes an appropriate trigger for the use of the 2 million barrel Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve that I directed my administration to establish earlier this year. This will help provide an insurance policy against supply shortages and price spikes in winters and assist consumers who rely on heating oil to heat their homes.

The act also makes changes in the Weatherization Assistance Program to reduce State costs and better serve low-income Americans.

NOTE: H.R. 2884, approved November 9, was assigned Public Law No. 106–469. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement on the Dedication of the National Japanese-American Memorial

November 9, 2000

Earlier today America honored the patriotism of Japanese-Americans during World War II with the dedication of the National Japanese-American Memorial in the Nation's Capital. Attorney General Janet Reno and Commerce Secretary Norman Mineta joined distinguished members of the Japanese-American community and Americans of all ancestries in reminding us of a time when this county lost sight of the very foundations of democracy it was defending abroad.

This Nation must never forget the difficult lessons of the Japanese-American internment camps during World War II and the inspirational lessons of patriotism in the face of that injustice.

Today I have directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop recommendations to preserve existing internment sites and provide for their public interpretation. In addition, I am signing legislation designating the United States Federal Courthouse for the Western District of Washington in Seattle, Washington, as the William Kenzo Nakamura United States Courthouse. William Nakamura was a student at the University of Washington when he and 120,000 other Japanese-Americans were removed from their communities and forced into internment camps. Despite the injustice of his internment, William Kenzo Nakamura volunteered for the U.S. Army and died fighting for this country in Italy on July 4, 1944. In June of this year, I posthumously awarded him the Medal of Honor in recognition of his courage and heroism.

As the Nation prepares to honor its veterans, it is my hope that the unique contribution of Japanese-Americans to preserving this Nation's freedom and democracy remains a vital part of America's history.

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

Statement on Signing the Veterans Claims Assistance Act of 2000

November 9, 2000

Today I am pleased to sign into law H.R. 4864, the "Veterans Claims Assistance Act of 2000." The Act reaffirms and clarifies the duty of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to assist claimants in developing evidence pertinent to their claims for VA benefits. It eliminates the previous requirement that a claim be well-grounded before VA's duty to assist arises. The Act requires the Secretary to make reasonable efforts to assist a claimant in obtaining evidence to substantiate his or her claim unless it is clear that no reasonable possibility exists that the Secretary's assistance would aid in substantiating the claim. As under current law, the Secretary must consider the entire record of evidence, and when there is an approximate balance of positive and negative evidence regarding an issue material to the determination of a matter, the Secretary must give the benefit of the doubt to the claimant.

Veterans seeking benefits from this Government are deserving of all reasonable assistance that VA has to offer. The benefits administered by the Secretary are a means by which the Nation expresses its profound gratitude for the many sacrifices our veterans have made to protect and defend our freedom. Veterans Day, a day set aside to honor all veterans, is an especially appropriate time for us to ensure that we will continue to pay our debts to these men and women. This Act demonstrates to veterans and to all those currently serving in our military and to those who may serve in the future, that America honors its commitments to those who have served. I am very pleased to approve this new law.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 9, 2000.

NOTE: H.R. 4864, approved November 9, was assigned Public Law No. 106–475. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement on Signing Proclamations for the Vermilion Cliffs and the Craters of the Moon National Monuments

November 9, 2000

Today I am pleased to sign proclamations extending greater protection to two irreplaceable pieces of America's natural and cultural heritage, the Vermilion Cliffs in northern Arizona and the Craters of the Moon in central Idaho. With this action, nearly one million acres of unique natural and historic resources already in public ownership are fully protected.

The Vermilion Cliffs monument covers 293,000 acres of Federal land on the Colorado Plateau in northern Arizona. Humans have explored and lived on this geologic treasure since the earliest known hunters and gatherers crossed the area 12,000 or more years ago. California condors, desert bighorn sheep, pronghorn antelope, mountain lion, and other mammals roam the canyons and plateaus.

The expansion of the Craters of the Moon monument, originally created by President Coolidge in 1924, adds 661,000 acres of volcanic craters, cones, lava flows, caves, and fissures of the 65-mile-long Great Rift, a geological feature that is comparable to the great rift zones of Iceland and Hawaii.

With these proclamations, this administration continues its commitment to preserving and restoring America's natural treasures, from the Florida Everglades to the California redwoods, for this and future generations.

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

Proclamation 7373—Boundary Enlargement of the Craters of the Moon National Monument

November 9, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The Craters of the Moon National Monument was established on May 2, 1924 (Presidential Proclamation 1694), for the purpose of protecting the unusual landscape of the Craters of the Moon lava field. This "lunar" landscape was thought to resemble that of the Moon and was described in the Proclamation as "weird and scenic landscape peculiar to itself." The unusual scientific value of the expanded monument is the great diversity of exquisitely preserved volcanic features within a relatively small area. The expanded monument includes almost all the features of basaltic volcanism, including the craters, cones, lava flows, caves, and fissures of the 65-mile-long Great Rift, a geological feature that is comparable to the great rift zones of Iceland and Hawaii. It comprises the most diverse and geologically recent part of the lava terrain that covers the southern Snake River Plain, a broad lava plain made up of innumerable basalt lava flows that erupted during the past 5 million years.

Since 1924, the monument has been expanded and boundary adjustments made through four presidential proclamations issued pursuant to the Antiquities Act (34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S.C. 431). Presidential Proclamation 1843 of July 23, 1928, expanded the monument to include certain springs for water supply and additional features of scientific interest. Presidential Proclamation 1916 of July 9, 1930, Presidential Proclamation 2499 of July 18, 1941, and Presidential Proclamation 3506 of November 19, 1962, made further adjustments to the boundaries. In 1996, a minor boundary adjustment was made by section 205 of the Omnibus Parks

and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–333, 110 Stat. 4093, 4106).

This Proclamation enlarges the boundary to assure protection of the entire Great Rift volcanic zone and associated lava features, all objects of scientific interest. The Craters of the Moon, Open Crack, Kings Bowl, and Wapi crack sets and the associated Craters of the Moon, Kings Bowl, and Wapi lava fields constitute this volcanic rift zone system. Craters of the Moon is the largest basaltic volcanic field of dominantly Holocene age (less than 10,000 years old) in the conterminous United States. Each of the past eruptive episodes lasted up to several hundred years in duration and was separated from other eruptive episodes by quiet periods of several hundred years to about 3,000 years. The first eruptive episode began about 15,000 years ago and the latest ended about 2,100 years ago.

Craters of the Moon holds the most diverse and youngest part of the lava terrain that covers the southern Snake River Plain of Idaho, a broad plain made up of innumerable basalt lava flows during the past 5 million years. The most recent eruptions at the Craters of the Moon took place about 2,100 years ago and were likely witnessed by the Shoshone people, whose legend speaks of a serpent on a mountain who, angered by lightening, coiled around and squeezed the mountain until the rocks crumbled and melted, fire shot from cracks, and liquid rock flowed from the fissures as the mountain exploded. The volcanic field now lies dormant, in the latest of a series of quiet periods that separate the eight eruptive episodes during which the 60 lava flows and 25 cinder cones of this composite volcanic field were formed. Some of the lava flows traveled distances of as much as 43 miles from their vents, and some flows diverged around areas of higher ground and rejoined downstream to form isolated islands of older terrain surrounded by new lava. These areas are called "kipukas."

The kipukas provide a window on vegetative communities of the past that have been erased from most of the Snake River Plain. In many instances, the expanse of rugged lava surrounding the small pocket of soils has protected the kipukas from people, animals, and even exotic plants. As a result, these kipukas represent some of the last nearly pristine and undisturbed vegetation in the Snake River Plain, including 700-year-old juniper trees and relict stands of sagebrush that are essential habitat for sensitive sage grouse populations. These tracts of relict vegetation are remarkable benchmarks that aid in the scientific study of changes to vegetative communities from recent human activity as well as the role of natural fire in the sagebrush steppe ecosystem.

The Kings Bowl lava field and the Wapi lava field are included in the enlarged monument. The Kings Bowl field erupted during a single fissure eruption on the southern part of the Great Rift about 2,250 years ago. This eruption probably lasted only a few hours to a few days. The field preserves explosion pits, lava lakes, squeeze-ups, basalt mounds, and an ash blanket. The Wapi field probably formed from a fissure eruption simultaneously with the eruption of the Kings Bowl field. With more prolonged activity over a period of months to a few years, the Wapi field formed a low shield volcano. The Bear Trap lava tube, located between the Craters of the Moon and the Wapi lava fields, is a cave system more than 15 miles long. The lava tube is remarkable for its length and for the number of well preserved lava-cave features, such as lava stalactites and curbs, the latter marking high stands of the flowing lava forever frozen on the lava tube walls. The lava tubes and pit craters of the monument are known for their unusual preservation of winter ice and snow into the hot summer months, due to shielding from the sun and the insulating properties of the basalt.

Section 2 of the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S.C. 431), authorizes the President, in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments, and to reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

Whereas it appears that it would be in the public interest to reserve such lands as an addition to the Craters of the Moon National Monument:

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by section 2 of the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S.C. 431), do proclaim that there are hereby set apart and reserved as an addition to the Craters of the Moon National Monument, for the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, all lands and interests in lands owned or controlled by the United States within the boundaries of the area described on the map entitled "Craters of the Moon National Monument Boundary Enlargement" attached to and forming a part of this proclamation. The Federal land and interests in land reserved consist of approximately 661,287 acres, which is the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

All Federal lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of this monument are hereby appropriated and withdrawn from all forms of entry, location, selection, sale, or leasing or other disposition under the public land laws, including but not limited to withdrawal from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and from disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing, other than by exchange that furthers the protective purposes of the monument. For the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, the Secretary shall prohibit all motorized and mechanized vehicle use off road, except for emergency or authorized administrative purposes.

Lands and interests in lands within the proposed monument not owned by the United States shall be reserved as a part of the monument upon acquisition of title thereto by the United States.

The Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a transportation plan that addresses the actions, including road closures or travel restrictions, necessary to protect the objects identified in this proclamation.

The Secretary of the Interior shall manage the area being added to the monument through the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service, pursuant to legal authorities, to implement the purposes of this proclamation. The National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management shall manage the monument cooperatively and shall prepare an agreement to share, consistent with applicable laws, whatever resources are necessary to manage properly the monument; however, the National Park Service shall have primary management authority over the portion of the monument that includes the exposed lava flows, and shall manage the area under the same laws and regulations that apply to the current monument. The Bureau of Land Management shall have primary management authority over the remaining portion of the monument, as indicated on the map entitled, "Craters of the Moon National Monument Boundary Enlargement."

Wilderness Study Areas included in the monument will continue to be managed under section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701–1782).

The establishment of this monument is subject to valid existing rights.

Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to enlarge or diminish the jurisdiction of the State of Idaho with respect to fish and wildlife management.

This proclamation does not reserve water as a matter of Federal law. Nothing in this reservation shall be construed as a relinquishment or reduction of any water use or rights reserved or appropriated by the United States on or before the date of this proclamation. The Secretary shall work with appropriate State authorities to ensure that water resources needed for monument purposes are available.

Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to enlarge or diminish the rights of any Indian tribe.

Laws, regulations, and policies followed by the Bureau of Land Management in issuing and administering grazing permits or leases on all lands under its jurisdiction shall continue to apply with regard to the lands in the monument administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to revoke any existing withdrawal, reservation, or appropriation; however, the

national monument shall be the dominant reservation.

Warning is hereby given to all unauthorized persons not to appropriate, injure, destroy, or remove any feature of this monument and not to locate or settle upon any of the lands thereof.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this ninth day of November, 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, 8:46 a.m., November 14, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on November 15. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Proclamation 7374—Vermilion Cliffs National Monument

November 9, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Amid the sandstone slickrock, brilliant cliffs, and rolling sandy plateaus of the Vermilion Cliffs National Monument lie outstanding objects of scientific and historic interest. Despite its arid climate and rugged isolation, the monument contains a wide variety of biological objects and has a long and rich human history. Full of natural splendor and a sense of solitude, this area remains remote and unspoiled, qualities that are essential to the protection of the scientific and historic objects it contains.

The monument is a geological treasure. Its centerpiece is the majestic Paria Plateau, a grand terrace lying between two great geologic structures, the East Kaibab and the Echo Cliffs monoclines. The Vermilion Cliffs, which lie along the southern edge of the Paria Plateau, rise 3,000 feet in a spectacular escarpment capped with sandstone underlain by multicolored, actively eroding, dissected layers of shale and sandstone. The stunning Paria River Canyon winds along the east side of the plateau to the Colorado River. Erosion of the sedimentary rocks in this 2,500 foot deep canyon has produced a variety of geologic objects and associated landscape features such as amphitheaters, arches, and massive sandstone walls.

In the northwest portion of the monument lies Coyote Buttes, a geologically spectacular area where crossbeds of the Navajo Sandstone exhibit colorful banding in surreal hues of yellow, orange, pink, and red caused by the precipitation of manganese, iron, and other oxides. Thin veins or fins of calcite cut across the sandstone, adding another dimension to the landscape. Humans have explored and lived on the plateau and surrounding canyons for thousands of years, since the earliest known hunters and gatherers crossed the area 12,000 or more years ago. Some of the earliest rock art in the Southwest can be found in the monument. High densities of Ancestral Puebloan sites can also be found, including remnants of large and small villages, some with intact standing walls, fieldhouses, trails, granaries, burials, and camps.

The monument was a crossroad for many historic expeditions. In 1776, the Dominguez-Escalante expedition of Spanish explorers traversed the monument in search of a safe crossing of the Colorado River. After a first attempt at crossing the Colorado near the mouth of the Paria River failed, the explorers traveled up the Paria Canyon in the monument until finding a steep hillside they could negotiate with horses. This took them out of the Paria Canyon to the east and up into the Ferry Swale area, after which they achieved their goal at the Crossing of the Fathers east of the monument. Antonio Armijo's 1829 Mexican trading expedition followed the Dominguez route on the way from Santa Fe to Los Angeles.

Later, Mormon exploring parties led by Jacob Hamblin crossed south of the Vermilion Cliffs on missionary expeditions to the Hopi villages. Mormon pioneer John D. Lee established Lee's Ferry on the Colorado River just south of the monument in 1871. This paved the way for homesteads in the monument, still visible in remnants of historic ranch structures and associated objects that tell the stories of early settlement. The

route taken by the Mormon explorers along the base of the Paria Plateau would later become known as the Old Arizona Road or Honeymoon Trail. After the temple in St. George, Utah was completed in 1877, the Honeymoon Trail was used by Mormon couples who had already been married by civil authorities in the Arizona settlements, but also made the arduous trip to St. George to have their marriages solemnized in the temple. The settlement of the monument area by Mormon pioneers overlapped with another historic exploration by John Wesley Powell, who passed through the monument during his scientific surveys of 1871.

The monument contains outstanding biological objects that have been preserved by remoteness and limited travel corridors. The monument's vegetation is a unique combination of cold desert flora and warm desert grassland, and includes one threatened species, Welsh's milkweed. This unusual plant, known only in Utah and Arizona, colonizes and stabilizes shifting sand dunes, but is crowded out once other vegetation encroaches.

Despite sporadic rainfall and widely scattered ephemeral water sources, the monument supports a variety of wildlife species. At least twenty species of raptors have been documented in the monument, as well as a variety of reptiles and amphibians. California condors have been reintroduced into the monument in an effort to establish another wild population of this highly endangered species. Desert bighorn sheep, pronghorn antelope, mountain lion, and other mammals roam the canyons and plateaus. The Paria River supports sensitive native fish, including the flannelmouth sucker and the speckled dace.

Section 2 of the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S.C. 431) authorizes the President, in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments, and to reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

Whereas it appears that it would be in the public interest to reserve such lands as a national monument to be known as the Vermilion Cliffs National Monument:

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by section 2 of the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S.C. 431), do proclaim that there are hereby set apart and reserved as the Vermilion Cliffs National Monument, for the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, all lands and interests in lands owned or controlled by the United States within the boundaries of the area described on the map entitled "Vermilion Cliffs National Monument" attached to and forming a part of this proclamation. The Federal land and interests in land reserved consist of approximately 293,000 acres, which is the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

All Federal lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of this monument are hereby appropriated and withdrawn from all forms of entry, location, selection, sale, or leasing or other disposition under the public land laws, including but not limited to withdrawal from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and from disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing, other than by exchange that furthers the protective purposes of the monument. For the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, the Secretary shall prohibit all motorized and mechanized vehicle use off road, except for emergency or authorized administrative purposes.

Lands and interests in lands within the proposed monument not owned by the United States shall be reserved as a part of the monument upon acquisition of title thereto by the United States.

The Secretary of the Interior shall manage the monument through the Bureau of Land Management, pursuant to applicable legal authorities, to implement the purposes of this proclamation.

The Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a transportation plan that addresses the actions, including road closures or travel restrictions, necessary to protect the objects identified in this proclamation.

The establishment of this monument is subject to valid existing rights.

Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to enlarge or diminish the jurisdiction of the State of Arizona with respect to fish and wildlife management.

This proclamation does not reserve water as a matter of Federal law. Nothing in this reservation shall be construed as a relinquishment or reduction of any water use or rights reserved or appropriated by the United States on or before the date of this proclamation. The Secretary shall work with appropriate State authorities to ensure that any water resources needed for monument purposes are available.

Laws, regulations, and policies followed by the Bureau of Land Management in issuing and administering grazing permits or leases on all lands under its jurisdiction shall continue to apply with regard to the lands in the monument.

Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to revoke any existing withdrawal, reservation, or appropriation; however, the national monument shall be the dominant reservation. Warning is hereby given to all unauthorized persons not to appropriate, injure, destroy, or remove any feature of this monument and not to locate or settle upon any of the lands thereof.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this ninth day of November, 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, 8:46 a.m., November 13, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on November 15. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Memorandum on Preservation of Japanese-American Internment Sites

November 9, 2000

Memorandum for the Secretary of the Interior

Subject: Preservation of Japanese American Internment Sites

The internment of Japanese Americans was a tragic episode in American history. The recent publication of the National Park Service report on the condition of the former internment camp sites, coupled with our Fiscal Year 2001 budget initiative, will help focus attention and resources on preserving the historical values of these sites.

The National Park Service report, entitled "Confinement and Ethnicity: an Overview of World War II Japanese American Relocation Sites," describes the current condition of the internment camps and other relocation sites. To follow up on this report, I direct you to develop recommendations to preserve the existing Japanese American internment sites and to provide more opportunities for the public to learn about the internment. These recommendations should be developed within the next 60 days in consultation with other Federal agencies, as appropriate.

I also direct you to consult with Members of Congress, States, tribes, local officials, and other interested parties as you develop these recommendations. You should also consider expanding partnerships with private organizations and landowners and explore the creation of an interagency team to coordinate the work of Federal agencies. Your recommendations should include proposals for administrative and legislative action to help preserve these sites, within existing budget resources.

William J. Clinton

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

Notice—Continuation of Iran Emergency

November 9, 2000

On November 14, 1979, by Executive Order 12170, the President declared a national emergency to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States constituted by the situation in Iran. Since that time, notices of the continuation of this national emergency have been transmitted annually by the President to the Congress and published in the *Federal Register*. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on November 5, 1999. Because our relations with Iran have not yet returned to normal, and the process of implementing the January 19, 1981, agreements with Iran is still underway, the national emergency declared on November 14, 1979, must continue in effect beyond November 14, 2000. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency with respect to Iran for 1 year. This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 9, 2000

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:20 p.m., November 9, 2000]

NOTE: This notice was published in the *Federal Register* on November 13. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Continuation of the National Emergency With Respect to Iran

November 9, 2000

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency declared by Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2000, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

Because our relations with Iran have not yet returned to normal, and the process of implementing the January 19, 1981, agreements with Iran is still underway, the national emergency declared on November 14, 1979, and the measures adopted pursuant thereto to deal with that emergency, must continue in effect beyond November 14, 2000. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to Iran for 1 year.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on the National Emergency With Respect to Iran

November 9, 2000

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Notice—Continuation of Emergency Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction

November 9, 2000

On November 14, 1994, by Executive Order 12938, I declared a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons (weapons of mass destruction) and the means of delivering such weapons. Because the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, the national emergency first declared on November 14, 1994, and extended on November 14, 1995, November 12, 1996, November 13, 1997, November 12, 1998, and November 10, 1999, must continue in effect beyond November 14, 2000. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12938.

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

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 9, 2000

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:20 p.m., November 9, 2000]

NOTE: This notice was published in the *Federal Register* on November 13. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction

November 9, 2000

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

On November 14, 1994, in light of the dangers of the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons ("weapons of mass destruction"—WMD) and of the means of delivering such weapons, I issued Executive Order 12938, declaring a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*). Under section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), the national emergency terminates on the anniversary date of its declaration unless, within the 90-day period prior to each anniversary date, I publish in the *Federal Register* and transmit to the Congress a notice stating that such emergency is to continue in effect. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. I am, therefore, advising the Congress that the national emergency declared on November 14, 1994, and extended on November 14, 1995; November 12, 1996; November 13, 1997; November 12, 1998; and November 10, 1999, must continue in effect beyond November 14, 2000. Accordingly, I have extended the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12938, as amended.

The following report is made pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)). It reports actions taken and expenditures incurred pursuant to the emergency declaration during the period May 2000 through October 2000. Additional information on nuclear, missile, and/or chemical and biological weapons (CBW) nonproliferation efforts is contained in the most recent annual Report on the Proliferation of Missiles and Essential Components of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Weapons, provided to the Congress pursuant to section 1097 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190), also known as the "Nonproliferation Report," and the most recent annual report provided to the Congress pursuant to section 308 of the Chemical and Biological Weapons Control and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–182), also known as the "CBW Report."

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

Nuclear Weapons

In May 1998, India and Pakistan each conducted a series of nuclear tests that brought their nuclear weapon programs out in the open, in defiance of decades of international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Since that time, they have continued production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and have flight-tested ballistic nuclear-capable missiles. World reaction to these developments included nearly universal condemnation across a broad range of international fora. The United States and a number of other countries respectively imposed sanctions and other unilateral measures. The G–8 agreed to new restrictions on lending by international financial institutions.

Since the mandatory imposition of U.S. statutory sanctions, we have worked unilaterally, with other P–5 and G–8 members, with the South Asia Task Force, and through the United Nations to urge India and Pakistan to move toward the international nonproliferation mainstream.

We have supported calls by the P–5, G–8, and U.N. Security Council on India and Pakistan to take a broad range of concrete actions designed to prevent a costly and destabilizing nuclear arms and missile race, with possible implications beyond the region. The United States has focused most intensely on several objectives that can be met over the short and medium term: an end to nuclear testing and prompt, unconditional adherence by India and Pakistan to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT); constructive engagement in negotiations on a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT) and, pending its conclusion, a moratorium on production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices; restraint in the development of nuclear-capable missiles, as well as their nondeployment; and adoption of controls meeting international standards on exports of sensitive materials and technology.

Against a backdrop of international pressure on India and Pakistan, intensive high-level U.S. dialogues with Indian and Pakistani officials have yielded only modest progress, principally on export controls. In September 1998, Indian and Pakistani leaders, noting that their countries had already declared testing moratoria, expressed to the U.N. General Assembly a willingness to sign the CTBT by September 1999 under certain conditions. Subsequent developments including the Indian election, the Kargil conflict, the October coup in Pakistan, and the U.S. Senate's vote against providing its advice and consent to CTBT ratification further complicated the issue during 1999, although neither country renounced its commitment. Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee announced during his visit to Washington in September 2000 that India would maintain its moratorium until CTBT entered into force. Both governments have said they would work to build domestic consensus for CTBT signature, without which they could not sign. Such

consensus has not been achieved and, consequently, neither country has signed the CTBT thus far.

India and Pakistan both withdrew their opposition to negotiations on an FMCT in Geneva at the end of the 1998 Conference on Disarmament session, and negotiations got underway for a brief time. However, these negotiations were unable to resume in 1999 or 2000 due to a deadlock over the negotiating mandate.

Some progress was achieved in bringing Indian and Pakistani export controls into closer conformity with international standards. India recently instituted new, more specific regulations on many categories of sensitive nonnuclear equipment and technology and has said that nuclear-related regulations will be forthcoming. Pakistan has publicly announced regulations restricting nuclear exports and has indicated that further measures are being prepared. However, both countries' steps still fall well short of international standards. We have begun with India a program of technical cooperation designed to improve the effectiveness of its already extensive export controls, and encourage further steps to bring India's controls in line with international standards. Similar assistance to Pakistan is prohibited by coup-related sanctions.

The summer 1999 Kargil conflict and the October 1999 military takeover in Pakistan resulted in the suspension of the Indo-Pakistani bilateral dialogue begun at Lahore. Tensions remain high, particularly over insurgent attacks in Kashmir, and there are no encouraging signs that talks will resume soon.

We have agreed to continue regular discussions with India at the senior and expert levels, and will also remain engaged with Pakistan, as appropriate. Our diplomatic efforts, in concert with the P–5, G–8, and in international fora, will also continue.

I discussed these issues with the Governments of India and Pakistan during my trip there in March 2000 and with Prime Minister Vajpayee when he came to Washington this September. With India, we have stressed that our relationship will not be able to reach its full potential without progress on our nonproliferation and regional security concerns. With Pakistan, we also emphasized the importance of progress on regional security and nonproliferation, among other pressing issues.

In October 1994, the United States and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK or North Korea) signed an Agreed Framework which, if fully implemented, will ultimately result in the complete cessation of the DPRK's nuclear weapon-related program and its full compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). As a first step, North Korea froze construction and operations at its Yongbyon and Taechon nuclear facilities. The freeze remains in place, and to monitor the freeze, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has maintained a continuous presence at the Yongbyon site since 1994. The U.S. spent fuel team completed canning of the accessible spent fuel rods and rod fragments from the North's 5-megawatt nuclear reactor in April 2000. The IAEA has confirmed that the remaining few rod fragments that are currently inaccessible do not represent a proliferation concern, and the Agency continues to monitor the canned fuel. The U.S. spent-fuel team returned to the DPRK in October 2000 to continue clean-up and canning at Yongbyon, and to begin looking at long-term maintenance.

Serious U.S. suspicions about an underground facility at Kumchang-ni led the United States to raise its concerns directly with Pyongyang and to negotiate access to the site as long as U.S. concerns remain. In May 1999, a Department of State-led team of experts visited the site and judged it, as then configured, not suited to house plutonium production reactors or reprocessing operations. Based on the data gathered by the U.S. team and the subsequent technical review, the United States concluded that the activities were not a violation of the Agreed Framework. A second Department of State-led team conducted a visit in May 2000 and found no evidence to contradict the 1999 assessment. In light of a final review of these results, the joint communique issued following the visit of DPRK Special Envoy Jo Myong Rok to Washington stated that "U.S. concerns" about the underground site at Kumchang-ni had been "removed."

While the Kumchang-ni visit addressed some of our nonproliferation concerns, future negotiations with the North will seek to discuss ways to allay all of them—in the context of assuring full implementation of the Agreed Framework and improving overall relations. In May and July 2000, the United States and DPRK held rounds of talks concerning Agreed Framework implementation and the DPRK's missile program, respectively. Another round of talks, which included discussion on terrorism issues, was held in New York from September 27 to October 2 of this year. During the talks, the DPRK informed us that DPRK Special Envoy Marshal Jo Myong Rok would visit Washington from October 9 to 12, 2000. The joint communique released at the end of that historic visit noted that both countries "are prepared to undertake a new direction in their relations." Toward that end, the two stated that "neither government would have hostile intent toward the other." Both sides pledged to "redouble their commitment and their efforts to fulfill their respective obligations in their entirety under the Agreed Framework." The DPRK also reaffirmed its ballistic missile flight test moratorium, and agreed that "there are a variety of available means, including the Four Party talks, to reduce tension on the Korean Peninsula and formally end the Korean War by replacing the 1953 Armistice Agreement with permanent peace arrangements."

The NPT is the cornerstone of the global nuclear nonproliferation regime. In May 2000, NPT Parties met in New York for the 2000 NPT Review Conference (REVCON). Despite predictions to the contrary, the 158 participating nations adopted by consensus a Final Document that reviews NPT implementation over the past 5 years and establishes a program of action for the future. This is the first NPT Review Conference to achieve such a Final Document since 1985. The Conference met or exceeded all U.S. objectives. It provided an important boost to the NPT and to nuclear nonproliferation goals in general.

The IAEA verifies states' compliance with their NPT obligations by means of its safeguards system. The discovery at the time of the Gulf War of Iraq's extensive covert nuclear activities led to an international consensus in favor of strengthening the IAEA safeguards system's ability to detect undeclared nuclear material and activities. The United States and a large number of like-minded states negotiated in the mid-1990s substantial safeguards strengthening measures, including the use of environmental sampling techniques, expansion of the classes of nuclear activities states are required to declare, and expansion of IAEA access rights. Measures requiring additional legal authority are embodied in a Model Additional Protocol approved in 1997. This Protocol has now been signed by 54 states and has entered into force for 14. Provided the IAEA is given the resources and political support it needs to implement its new safeguards measures effectively, proliferators will now find it much harder to evade the system.

The United States signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty on September 24, 1996. As of early October 2000, 160 countries have signed and 65 have ratified the CTBT, including 30 of the 44 countries required by the Treaty for its entry into force. During 2000, CTBT signatories conducted numerous meetings of the Preparatory Commission (PrepCom) and its subsidiary bodies in Vienna, seeking to promote rapid completion of the International Monitoring System (IMS) established by the Treaty.

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

The purpose of the 35-nation Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Exporters (Zangger) Committee is to harmonize implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty's requirement to apply International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards to nuclear exports. Article III.2 of the Treaty requires parties to ensure that IAEA safeguards are applied to exports to nonnuclear weapon states of (a) source or special fissionable material, or (b) equipment or material especially designed or prepared for the processing, use or production of special fissionable material. The Committee maintains and updates a list (the "Trigger List") of equipment that may only be exported if safeguards are applied to the recipient facility. The relative informality of the Zangger Committee has enabled it to take the lead on certain nonproliferation issues that would be more difficult to resolve in the Nuclear Suppliers Group.

At its March 2000 meeting, the Committee approved the Chairman's report of Committee activities to the 2000 NPT REVCON. The Committee also agreed to continue consideration of possible future adoption of the full-scope safeguards (FSS) policy. The Committee also agreed to an informal meeting with IAEA staff to discuss procedures for keeping the Agency informed on Trigger List changes and the rationale for such changes, since the Agency uses the Zangger Trigger List as a reference document. A separate working group, chaired by Sweden, is considering the addition of plutonium enrichment equipment to the Trigger List.

During the past year, two new members have joined the Zangger Committee—Turkey in October 1999 and Slovenia in March 2000.

All of the nuclear weapon states, including China, are members of the Zangger Committee. However, unlike all of the other nuclear weapon states members of the Zangger Committee, China is not a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), which requires its members to adhere to a FSS policy of requiring nonnuclear weapon states to accept IAEA safeguards on all of its nuclear facilities as a condition of supply to those states. China has been reluctant to agree to this policy.

With 38 member states, the NSG is a widely accepted and effective export-control arrangement, which contributes to the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons through implementation of guidelines for control of nuclear and nuclear-related exports. Members pursue the aims of the NSG through adherence to the Guidelines, which are adopted by consensus, and through exchanges of information on developments of nuclear proliferation concern.

Turkey, Belarus, and Cyprus became the newest members of the NSG in May 19, 2000. Slovenia was invited to participate as an observer at the 2000 Paris Plenary and has applied for NSG membership this year. NSG members often agree to allow nonmember nations deemed eligible for NSG membership to participate in Plenary meetings as observers. While not an NSG member, China has taken a major step toward harmonization of its export control system with the NSG Part 2 Guidelines by the implementation of controls over nuclear-related dual-use equipment, material, and related technology.

In May 2000, the NSG Troika (composed of the past, present, and future NSG Chairs—in this case Britain, Italy and France) met with representatives of the Iranian Government to discuss Iranian criticism of the NSG. The meeting of the Troika followed up earlier meetings by the Italian Chair in Tehran and on the margins of the 1999 NSG Transparency Seminar in New York. The Troika urged Iran to sign the additional protocol with the IAEA that strengthens safeguards. Iranian officials offered to provide additional confidence-building measures to facilitate nuclear exports from NSG members. The United States, as the future plenary chair, intends to be an active participant in all NSG Troika activities in the coming years, though any involvement in Troika contacts with Iran will need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis prior to the meetings. The United States does not believe that the ongoing discussions with Iran can or should soften supplier attitudes.

During the Plenary meetings in Paris in June 2000, the Czech Republic presented information on its new legislation intended to halt all tangible and intangible supply to the

Bushehr Nuclear Power Plant in Iran. The Czech delegation stated that the new legislation covers direct transfers to Bushehr, as well as indirect support through a third party. The Italian NSG Chair presented a report of NSG activities at the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

Chemical and Biological Weapons

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

Chemical weapons (CW) continue to pose a very serious threat to our security and that of our allies. On April 29, 1997, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (the Chemical Weapons Convention or CWC) entered into force with 87 of the CWC's 165 States Signatories as original States Parties, including the United States, which ratified on April 25, 1997. Russia ratified the CWC on November 5, 1997, and became a State Party on December 8, 1997. As of October 30, 2000, 140 countries will have become States Parties.

The implementing body for the CWC—the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW)—was established on April 29, 1997. The OPCW, located in The Hague is comprised of States Parties and international civil servants that are responsible for implementing the CWC. It consists of the Conference of the States Parties, the Executive Council, and the Technical Secretariat (TS). The TS carries out the verification provisions of the CWC, and presently has a staff of approximately 500, including about 200 inspectors trained and equipped to inspect military and industrial facilities throughout the world. As of October 30, 2000, the OPCW has conducted over 790 routine inspections in some 37 countries. No challenge inspections have yet taken place. The OPCW maintains a permanent inspector presence at operational U.S. CW destruction facilities in Utah, on Johnston Island, and elsewhere. Accordingly, approximately 70 percent of the inspection days currently have been at U.S. declared facilities.

The United States is determined to seek full implementation of the concrete measures in the CWC designed to raise the costs and risks for states or other entities attempting to engage in chemical weapons-related activities. Receiving accurate and complete declarations from all States Parties will improve our knowledge of possible chemical weapons-related activities. Its inspection provisions provide for access by international inspectors to declared and potentially undeclared facilities and locations, thus making clandestine chemical weapons production and stockpiling more difficult, more risky, and more expensive.

The Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act of 1998 was enacted into U.S. law on October 21, 1998, as part of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–277). I issued Executive Order 13128 on June 25, 1999, to facilitate implementation of the Act and the Convention, and published regulations on December 30, 1999, regarding declarations and inspections of industrial facilities. The United States commenced its submission of industry declarations at the end of April 2000, and hosted its first industry inspection on May 8, 2000. Industry inspections are proceeding well. Our submission of the industry declarations to the OPCW and commencement of inspections, has strengthened U.S. leadership in the organization as well as our ability to encourage other States Parties to make complete, accurate, and timely declarations.

Countries that refuse to join the CWC have been isolated politically and denied access by the CWC to certain key chemicals from States Parties. The relevant treaty provisions are specifically designed to penalize countries that refuse to join the rest of the world in eliminating the threat of chemical weapons.

The United States also continues to play an active role in the international effort to reduce the threat from biological weapons (BW). We participate in the Ad Hoc Group (AHG) of States Parties of the Convention

on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (the Biological Weapons Convention or BWC). The AHG is striving to complete a legally binding protocol to strengthen the 1972 Convention to promote compliance and enhance transparency. This Ad Hoc Group was mandated by the September 1994 BWC Special Conference. The Fourth BWC Review Conference (November/December 1996) urged the AHG to complete the protocol as soon as possible before the next BWC Review Conference in 2001. Work is progressing on a draft text through discussion of national views and clarification of existing text. Differences in national views persist concerning such substantive areas as on-site activities, export controls, declarations, and technical assistance provisions. The United States remains strongly committed to the objective agreed to in the 1996 Review Conference, but will only accept a protocol that enhances U.S. security and strengthens national and international efforts to address the BW threat.

I announced in my 1998 State of the Union Address that the United States would take a leading role in the effort to erect stronger international barriers against the proliferation and use of BW by strengthening the BWC with a new international means to detect and deter cheating. We are working closely with industry representatives to obtain technical input relevant to the development of U.S. negotiating positions and then to reach international agreement on protocol provisions.

The United States continues to be a leading participant in the 32-member Australia Group (AG) chemical and biological weapons nonproliferation regime. The United States attended the most recent annual AG Plenary Session from October 2–5, 2000, during which the Group reaffirmed the members' continued collective belief in the AG's viability, importance, and compatibility with the CWC and BWC. Members continue to agree that full adherence to the CWC and BWC by all governments will be the only way to achieve a permanent global ban on chemical and biological weapons, and that all states adhering to these Conventions must take steps to ensure that their national activities support these goals. At the 2000 Plenary, the Group welcomed its newest members, Cyprus and Turkey. At this year's plenary, the regime continued to focus on strengthening and refining AG export controls and sharing information to address the CBW threat, especially from terrorism. The AG also reaffirmed its commitment to continue its active outreach program of briefings for non-AG countries, and to promote regional consultations on export controls and nonproliferation to further awareness and understanding of national policies in these areas. The AG discussed ways to be more proactive in stemming attacks on the AG in the CWC and BWC contexts.

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

Missiles for Delivery of Weapons of Mass Destruction

The United States continues carefully to control exports that could contribute to unmanned delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction, and closely to monitor activities of potential missile proliferation concern. We also continue to implement U.S. missile sanctions laws. In April 2000, we imposed sanctions against a North Korean entity and four Iranian entities for missile proliferation activities. These sanctions followed March 1999 missile sanctions against three Middle Eastern entities.

During this reporting period, the 32 Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) Partners (members) continued to share information about proliferation problems with each other and with other potential supplier, consumer, and transshipment states. Partners also emphasized the need for implementing effective export control systems.

This cooperation has resulted in the interdiction of missile-related materials intended for use in missile programs of concern.

In March and September 2000, the United States participated in two MTCR Reinforced Point of Contact Meetings (RPOC). At the RPOCs, MTCR Partners continued their discussions on new ways to better address the global missile proliferation threat. They also undertook to develop a new multilateral mechanism on missile nonproliferation. This mechanism is intended to complement the important work of the MTCR and eventually to include the participation of both MTCR and non-MTCR countries.

The MTCR Partners held their annual plenary meeting in Helsinki, on October 9–13, 2000. The Partners took decisions concerning the substance of a new multilateral mechanism on missile nonproliferation and ways to take it forward. They also discussed cooperation on halting shipments of missile proliferation concern and exchanged information about activities of missile proliferation concern worldwide, including in South Asia, Northeast Asia, and the Middle East.

During this reporting period, the United States continued to work unilaterally and in coordination with its MTCR Partners to combat missile proliferation and to encourage nonmembers to export responsibly and to adhere to the MTCR Guidelines. Since my last report, we continued our missile nonproliferation dialogues with China, India, the Republic of Korea, and North Korea, and have raised this issue with Pakistan at senior levels. Although regular discussions with Pakistan at the expert level have not proceeded since the fall 1999 coup, we remain engaged at the diplomatic level, and I addressed our nonproliferation concerns during my visit to Pakistan in March of this year. In the course of normal diplomatic relations we also have pursued such discussions with other countries in Central Europe, South Asia, and the Middle East.

In July 2000, the United States and the DPRK held a fifth round of missile talks in Kuala Lumpur. This was the first round of talks after a 16-month hiatus. It provided a useful opportunity to assess developments since the March 1999 talks in Pyongyang, including the DPRK's June 2000 reaffirmation of its moratorium on flight tests of long-range missiles of any kind. The United States discussed its continuing concerns about North Korea's missile activities and again pressed for tight constraints on DPRK missile development, testing, and exports. Both sides agreed to hold another round of talks as soon as possible, and a sixth round occurred September 28–29 in New York. The United States continued to urge the DPRK to take steps to address U.S. and international concerns about the DPRK's indigenous missile programs and its missile-related activities. The United States also discussed Chairman Kim Jong-Il's idea, suggested to Russian President Putin in mid-July, of trading missile restraints for launches of DPRK satellites on foreign launchers. During the October visit to Washington of DPRK Special Envoy Jo Myong Rok, the United States and DPRK agreed that "resolution of the missile issue would make an essential contribution to a fundamentally improved relationship between them and to peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region." The DPRK also reaffirmed its ballistic missile flight test moratorium "while talks on the missile issue continue."

Secretary Albright met with Chairman Kim Jong-Il in Pyongyang October 23–24. They had serious, constructive, and in-depth discussions on the full range of U.S. concerns on missiles, including both the DPRK's indigenous missile programs and exports. They also explored Chairman Kim's idea of restraining DPRK missile capabilities in exchange for launches of DPRK satellites on foreign boosters. U.S. and DPRK missile experts are scheduled to continue discussions in early November.

In response to reports of continuing Iranian efforts to acquire sensitive items from Russian entities for use in Iran's missile and nuclear development programs, the United States is pursuing a high-level dialogue with Russia aimed at finding ways to work together to cut off the flow of sensitive goods to Iran's ballistic missile development program and its nuclear weapon program. Russia's government has created institutional foundations to implement a newly enacted nonproliferation policy and passed laws to punish wrongdoers. It also has passed new

export control legislation to tighten government control over sensitive technologies and continued working with the United States to strengthen export control practices at Russian aerospace firms. However, despite the Russian government's nonproliferation and export control efforts, some Russian entities continued to cooperate with Iran's ballistic missile program and to engage in nuclear cooperation with Iran beyond the Bushehr Unit 1 nuclear power reactor project, which could further Iran's nuclear weapon aspirations.

Consistent with the Russian government's April 2000 announcement of administrative action against the Rector of the Baltic State Technical University (BSTU) for his involvement in training Iranian specialists at BSTU, and following our own assessment, the United States announced on April 24, 2000, plans to impose trade and administrative penalties on the Rector for his involvement with the Iranian missile program. At the same time, the United States also announced its intention to remove restrictions imposed in July 1998 on two Russian entities—INOR and Polyus—which have ceased the proliferation behavior that led to the imposition of penalties. However, penalties imposed in July 1998 against five other Russian entities and in January 1999 against three additional entities remain in effect.

Value of Nonproliferation Export Controls

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

Export controls are a critical part of nonproliferation because every emerging WMD/missile program seeks equipment and technology from other countries. Proliferators look to other sources because needed items are unavailable within their country, because indigenously produced items are of substandard quality or insufficient quantity, and/or because imported items can be obtained more quickly and cheaply than domestically produced ones. It is important to note that proliferators seek for their WMD and missile programs both items on multilateral lists (like gyroscopes controlled on the MTCR Annex and nerve gas precursors on the Australia Group list) and unlisted items (like lower-level machine tools and very basic chemicals). In addition, many of the items of interest to proliferators are inherently dual-use. For example, key precursors and technologies used in the production of fertilizers or pesticides also can be used to make chemical weapons; bio-production technology can be used to produce biological weapons.

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

The U.S. national export controls and those of our regime partners also have played an important role, increasing over time the critical mass of countries applying nonproliferation export controls. For example: the 7-member MTCR of 1987 has grown to

32 member countries; the NSG adopted full-scope safeguards as a condition of supply and extended new controls to nuclear-related dual-use items; several nonmember countries have committed unilaterally to apply export controls consistent with one or more of the regimes; and most of the members of the nonproliferation regimes have applied national "catch-all" controls similar to those under the U.S. Enhanced Proliferation Control Initiative. (Export controls normally are tied to a specific list of items, such as the MTCR Annex. "Catch-all" controls provide a legal basis to control exports of items not on a list, when those items are destined for WMD/missile programs.) The United States maintains a global program, funded by the Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Activities account, to assist other countries' efforts to strengthen their export control systems. A principal focus of this important effort is Russia and the Newly Independent States (NIS), where we also employ funds provided under the Freedom Support Act.

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

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

Threat Reduction

The potential for proliferation of WMD and delivery system expertise has increased in part as a consequence of the economic crisis in Russia and other Newly Independent States (NIS). My Administration gives high priority to controlling the human dimension of proliferation through programs that support the transition of former Soviet weapons scientists to civilian research and technology development activities. I have proposed an additional $4.5 billion for programs embodied in the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI) that would support activities in four areas over FYs 2000–2004: nuclear security; nonnuclear WMD; science and technology nonproliferation; and military relocation, stabilization and other security cooperation programs. Of the $1 billion Congressional ETRI request for FY 2000, an estimated $888 million is available: State ($182 million), Energy ($293 million), and Defense ($467 million). We are seeking $974 million in FY 2001.

Expenses

Pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I report that there were no specific expenses directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency in Executive Order 12938, as amended, during the period from May 16, 2000, through November 12, 2000.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at the White House Bicentennial Dinner

November 9, 2000

Good evening, Mrs. Johnson, President and Mrs. Ford, President and Mrs. Carter, President and Mrs. Bush, distinguished guests. It has been said that an invitation to the White House to dinner is one of the highest compliments a President can bestow on anyone. Tonight Hillary and I would amend that to say that an even higher compliment has been bestowed on us by your distinguished presence this evening. In the entire 200 years of the White House's history, never before have this many former Presidents and First Ladies gathered in this great room.

Hillary and I are grateful beyond words to have served as temporary stewards of the people's house these last 8 years, an honor exceeded only by the privilege of service that comes with the key to the front door.

In the short span of 200 years, those whom the wings of history have brought to this place have shaped not only their own times but have also left behind a living legacy for our own. In ways both large and small, each and every one of you has cast your light upon this house and left it and our country brighter for it. For that, Hillary and I and all Americans owe you a great debt of gratitude.

I salute you and all those yet to grace these halls with the words of the very first occupant of the White House, John Adams, who said, "I pray to heaven to bestow the best of blessings on this house and all that shall hereafter inhabit it. May none but the honest and wise rule under this roof."

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to join me in a toast to Mrs. Johnson, President and Mrs. Ford, President and Mrs. Carter, President and Mrs. Bush for their honest and wise service to the people while they inhabited this house.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:20 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. The dinner was hosted by the White House Historical Association. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at the White House Bicentennial Dinner

November 9, 2000

Well, Mr. Sidey, we just saw the first example of your comment about doing without Air Force One. President Bush is having airplane trouble and will stay with us for the remainder of the evening. [*Laughter*] Actually, I've commiserated with all these people about what our new life is about to be like. And I understand that the worst part of it is that I will be lost for the first 4 months because no one will be playing a song anymore. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Lady Bird Johnson and President and Mrs. Ford, President and Mrs. Carter, and President and Mrs. Bush, for being here.

I thought that joke about Harry Truman living with his mother-in-law was particularly apt, since my mother-in-law is upstairs at this very moment. And she has agreed to let me live with her for the next 2 years, when I'm in Arkansas trying to build my library.

I, like previous speakers, would like to acknowledge President and Mrs. Reagan and say that we miss them and wish them well. I'd also like to acknowledge a person who's been a particular friend of Hillary's and mine these last 8 years, who suffered two losses in her family recently and could not be here tonight, with whom we care very much about, Margaret Truman Daniel. And we're thinking of her and wish her well.

I would like to thank Senator and Mrs. Robb for being here and for their service to America. And I'd like to thank you, General Eisenhower. Thank you for coming. We're honored to have you here. And Ethel Kennedy, thank you for coming; and other members of Presidents' families.

One of the most interesting things, to me, about living here these last 8 years is watching the threads of American history weave their way through the families of Presidents. The other day we had an actual ceremony here commemorating the 200th anniversary of the opening of the White House. And someone played John Adams and came up with his one footman and the horses and the old 18th-century carriage and got out. And then we had a little reception for all the

Adams family members in the direct line of John and John Quincy Adams who were here.

And it turned out that one of them had two sons in the United States Navy today, one of whom serves on a destroyer that is the twin to the U.S.S. *Cole* and was there when Hillary and I spoke with the families and at the memorial service a few days ago. It made me, once again, very grateful to be an American, as well as to have the opportunity to live here.

I thank the members of the White House Historical Association, and especially Bob Breeden and Hugh Sidey. Hugh, I hope you won't mind—you've had fun at our expense—I was thinking, there are at least two of us up here at the table that you've said more nice things about tonight than you have in our entire career in public life. [*Laughter*] And we are immensely grateful. I was also thinking that between all of us, we've served so long, we've been here together about half as long as Helen Thomas has. And we're delighted to see you. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank the members of the Marine Band. You know, I was a band boy in high school, which, if you were from Arkansas and over 6 feet tall, was a bad thing to be. [*Laughter*] But I loved music from the time I was a child. And I think it would be fair to say that I doubt if any President has ever enjoyed the Marine Band as much as I have. I have loved every encounter I've ever had with them, and they are absolutely magnificent.

I know that all of you noticed that every President who has spoken here tonight thanked Gary Walters and the White House staff. They were not going through the motions. They were not saying that because that was something they had to say. Until you've lived here and you realize how totally bizarre your life can get from time to time, it's impossible to express how grateful you are to people who make it normal, no matter what; who are always there for you at all hours of the day or night. When you're up in the polls and down in the polls, when you're celebrating your greatest triumph or the wheel runs off, they still try to make it a home. And then, when you have to get out and make it a public place, simultaneously, they do that as well.

So Gary, from you to all the people that are down in the basement tonight keeping the lights on, making sure that the temperature works, all the people that you never to see, to all these wonderful people who served our dinner tonight, we thank you from the bottom of our hearts. Thank you.

History tells us that even as the city's planners debated the final design of this house, masons laid its stone foundations 4 feet thick. Like our Nation's Founders, these men were building a monument to freedom that they wanted to last. Over the course of two centuries, as all of you know—and we've seen some references tonight—this old house has withstood war and fire and bulldozers, just as its inhabitants have faced a stern test or two.

In this remarkable audience are former residents, historians, and others who have very little to learn about the White House. But I thought I would use, if I might, the story of the East Room, where we are now tonight, as just a metaphor. You've already heard that Dolly Madison cut down George Washington's picture here, and you may remember that it was said that the East Room began its existence as Abigail Adams' laundry room. But it was soon after that Thomas Jefferson, with Merriwether Lewis, unrolled maps on the floor amidst animal skins to plan what became known as the Lewis and Clark expedition, on this very floor. Whether you agree with all of Thomas Jefferson's policies or not, it's interesting; just in buying Louisiana and doing the Lewis and Clark expedition, he helped to make us the great continental nation that we are today.

Now, a few years after that, President Lincoln introduced Ulysses Grant to well-wishers. You may remember that a lot of people in Washington didn't like General Grant. He was 5'4", unimposing. He forgot to shave on some days when he was more interested in battle, and he was said to enjoy drink from time to time. And when some of the people in Washington were criticizing this rube from the hinterland because of his drinking habits, President Lincoln wryly suggested that he wished the person would find out what General Grant drank and give it to the other generals; it might end the war more quickly. [*Laughter*]

In fact, that was one of many things that were untrue. There's not a single documented reference of Ulysses Grant ever being drunk on the job. I thought I would use this historic moment to clean his slate a little bit. [*Laughter*]

But anyway, Grant was a little guy, and they were mobbing him here in this room, so he did something that I'm not sure I would have the courage to do. He jumped up on the sofa and stood there so that he would not be completely overrun by the crowd.

It was here, more tragically, that just a couple of years later, Abraham Lincoln lay in state; and here, quite fittingly, a century after that, President Lyndon Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act, one of the most important American acts of the last 50 years. Just 25 years ago, Gerald Ford took the oath of office and was sworn in as President here.

We have had so many happy nights here, but I think I'll just mention one because she is here in this room. Not so very long ago, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Association, the embodiment of our commitment in the cold war to stand against communism. And on that occasion, we had this marvelous dinner with this sort of arced head table with all the heads of state, the largest number of heads of state ever to visit Washington at one time. They were entertained here by Jessye Norman, standing and singing alone. And we welcome you here tonight, again. Thank you very much.

This place is a thrill to live in. You heard President Carter say that he told them he wanted to eat the things that the staff was eating, as it turned out. When I came here, we asked them to re-do the kitchen so we could have dinner in the kitchen at night. And just about every night for 8 years, Hillary and Chelsea and I have had dinner in the little kitchen upstairs—which is interesting how low standards have sunk. Until Jackie and John Kennedy moved here, the First Family came downstairs to dinner every night in a formal dining room for 160 years. Who knows? Maybe the next crowd will be eating on the roof. [*Laughter*]

We have enjoyed being in the Solarium, where President Reagan convalesced after he was shot. We have family and friends there. And I spend a lot of my evenings alone working in the Treaty Room, as you just heard from Hugh Sidey, on the great walnut table that President Grant used for a Cabinet table. Shortly thereafter, it was used in that same room, which was Abraham Lincoln's waiting room, as the table on which the treaty ending the Spanish-American War was signed in 1898. Thereafter, it became known as the Treaty Table, and every single treaty signed in the United States in 102 years has been signed on that table: President Carter's Camp David accords; the treaty signed by Yitzhak Rabin and King Hussein of Jordan, ending the war between their two nations. It always reminds me that I am a temporary resident.

Hillary and Chelsea and I will be forever grateful to the American people for letting us make the White House our home for what was, I find amazing now, 40 percent of my daughter's young life. From the day we moved in, Hillary devoted herself to preserving the White House, to the restoration of public rooms, to the selection of the bicentennial china we use tonight, to installing sculpture in the Jacqueline Kennedy Garden. I thank her for the work she has done to make this a more vibrant living museum than ever.

I thank Mrs. Carter and Mrs. Bush for the work they did, which Hillary was able to help complete, to adequately endow the White House Endowment Fund so that this house and its collections will be better preserved for all future visitors, and so that all people who come here will better understand our Nation's past.

Now soon, we, too, will be part of that past. When I leave here, as we all must, I will depart with a great sense of gratitude. I'm being helped along the way by all of my friends who are determined to keep me humble and grounded.

The other day, I went to a meeting of the bishops of the Church of God in Christ, and I thought I was being quite clever. I got up in front of these 400 bishops, and I said, "I wanted to come here today because I wanted to be among some leaders who aren't term-limited." And the head bishop got up and said, "Oh, Mr. President, we're all term-limited." [*Laughter*]

And so I say tonight, the White House has never belonged to any one of us. It will always belong to all of us. We do not yet know who the next occupant will be, but we can honor the service, the lives, and the families of the candidates who contested this election. We know how proud President and Mrs. Bush must be of their son, and rightly so. And we Americans should take great pride in the fact that this contest was fought to a close conclusion. It is not a symbol of the division of our Nation with the vitality of our debate, and it will be resolved in a way consistent with the vitality of our enduring Constitution and laws.

I think tonight of the words of an Englishman, Charles Dickens, who visited here in 1842. Listen to what he said right after he attended one of the functions that they then called levees. Where I come from, that holds in the Mississippi River. [*Laughter*] But for years in the 19th century, the receptions that Presidents regularly held were called levees. He walked through the White House, listening to the Marine Band play, marveling at the crowd assembled. And here is how he described the event in his American notes: "Every man, even among the miscellaneous crowd in the halls who were admitted without any orders or tickets to look on, appeared to feel that he was part of the institution." Well, that's still the way it ought to be.

Every one of you, from the wealthiest to those who could not be called wealthy, of whatever race or region, whatever your background, whether you're dining here or working here, you are a part of the institution. You are the center of the Nation. The most important title in this house has ever been "citizen." It is, after all, why we're still around here after 200 years.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:18 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Margaret Truman Daniel, daughter of President Harry S. Truman; former First Ladies Betty Ford, Rosalynn Carter, Barbara Bush, and Nancy Reagan; Lynda Robb, daughter of President Lyndon B. Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson; Gen. John Eisenhower, USA (Ret.), son of President Dwight D. Eisenhower; Ethel Kennedy, widow of Senator Robert F. Kennedy; Helen Thomas, former reporter, United Press International; soprano Jessye Norman; Robert L. Breeden, chairman and chief executive officer, White House Historical Association; Gary Walters, chief White House usher; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of President Gerald R. Ford, President Jimmy Carter, President George Bush, and Hugh Sidey, president, White House Historical Association. The dinner was hosted by the White House Historical Association. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on the Application of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia To Join the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe

November 9, 2000

Dear _____ *:*

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) has indicated its preparedness to join the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) as a participating state. Given the interest of the Congress in the question of FRY participation in international and regional organizations, as reflected, for example, in section 594(e) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2001, I want to inform you that the United States representative to the OSCE will support the FRY's application when the matter is considered before the OSCE Permanent Council on Friday, November 10. The decision is predicated on the FRY's recent actions, including those that indicate the FRY is approaching membership in regional and international organizations on the same basis as the other successor states, and is taking important steps towards resolving issues related to liabilities, assets, and property.

We have reviewed the FRY application and have concluded that the FRY has applied on the same basis that Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia applied to participate in the OSCE following

the dissolution of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). This mirrors the approach taken by the FRY last week in applying as a new member to the United Nations.

The FRY's application on the same basis as other successors demonstrates what President Kostunica has told United States officials: that he is abandoning Milosevic's claim that the FRY is the continuation of the former SFRY. As applied to succession talks, this change removes a major impediment to progress in negotiations among the successor states by establishing that all are operating from a principle of equality. In this regard, the fact that all other successors sponsored the FRY's entry to the United Nations and have signaled a willingness to support entry to the OSCE reflects the importance of the step the FRY has taken.

In addition, President Kostunica has taken other steps to expedite succession discussions. He has designated senior officials for the issue. These officials, in turn, have told United States Government officials that they intend to move quickly to reach an agreed solution. As a sign of the priority the new government attaches to this issue, during its first week in office, it received the designated international mediator, Sir Arthur Watts, to resume talks suspended under the previous regime. In their preliminary discussions with Watts this week, Yugoslav officials reviewed the prior negotiations and signaled their desire to make a fresh start and to seek rapid progress. These actions reflect a complete reversal of the previous government's position and represent reasonable and appropriate steps towards resolving successor state issues.

As succession discussions develop and the FRY applies to additional organizations, we will continue to work with FRY authorities, international mediators, and the other successor states to press for progress towards resolving these succession issues.

My Administration places great importance on the integration of the FRY into the international community through membership within regional and international organizations. Such integration will support President Kostunica's program on democratization and economic recovery, which, in turn, will help lead towards greater stability and support for democracy within Serbia, as well as increase cooperation with the FRY's neighbors and international community on meeting Belgrade's obligations under international law including cooperation with the International War Crimes Tribunal.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Ted Stevens, chairman, and Robert C. Byrd, ranking member, Senate Committee on Appropriations; and C.W. Bill Young, chairman, and David R. Obey, ranking member, House Committee on Appropriations. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 10.

Proclamation 7375—Veterans Day, 2000

November 10, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

On this day, in ceremonies across our Nation and around the world, Americans gather to pay tribute to our veterans. In community centers and church halls, at VFW posts and U.S. embassies, in quiet cemeteries and on battlefields fallen silent, we pause to honor the brave men and women of our Armed Forces whose devotion to duty and willingness to serve have sustained our country for more than two centuries.

Over the course of our history, some 41 million Americans have served—and more than a million have died—so that we might live in freedom. We are the beneficiaries of their courage, their sacrifice, and their vigilance; and so are countless freedom-loving people around the world.

In the past century alone, through two world wars and the long, tense struggle of the Cold War; on the front lines in Korea, Vietnam, Beirut, Grenada, Panama, Somalia, Haiti, the Persian Gulf, and the Balkans, our brave men and women in uniform have risked their lives to protect U.S. interests, assist our allies, promote peace, and advance our ideals. Thanks to their extraordinary record of service, more people now live under democratic rule than at any other time in history. And today, America is a stronger

Nation in a more secure world because of our veterans.

President Kennedy once said, ''Democracy is never a final achievement. It is a call to untiring effort, to continual sacrifice and to the willingness, if necessary, to die in its defense.'' Today we give thanks to the veterans of our Armed Forces for showing that willingness. Whether serving on bases and in ports at home or deployed across the globe, they have endured hardship and danger to protect our Nation and assist our allies. The story of America has been written, in large part, by the deeds of our veterans—deeds that bind us to our past, inspire us in the present, and strengthen us to meet the challenges of the future.

In honor of those who have served in our Armed Forces, the Congress has provided (5 U.S.C. 6103 (a)) that November 11 of each year shall be set aside as a legal public holiday to honor America's veterans. On Veterans Day, we pay tribute to all those who have served in our Armed Forces, and we remember with deep respect those who paid the ultimate price for our freedom. America's veterans have answered the highest calling of citizenship, and they continue to inspire us with the depth of their patriotism and the generosity of their service.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Saturday, November 11, 2000, as Veterans Day. I urge all Americans to acknowledge the courage and sacrifice of our veterans through appropriate public ceremonies and private prayers. I call upon Federal, State, and local officials to display the flag of the United States and to encourage and participate in patriotic activities in their communities. I invite civic and fraternal organizations, places of worship, schools, businesses, unions, and the media to support this national observance with suitable commemorative expressions and programs.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this tenth day of November, 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, 8:46 a.m., November 14, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on November 15.

The President's Internet Address

November 11, 2000

Next week representatives from around the world will gather to help shape an international response to one of the greatest challenges we face, the threat of global warming. Today I want to talk with you about what this challenge means for the United States and how we can meet it together. The scientific consensus is clear: The Earth is warming, and there is strong evidence that human activity is part of the reason why.

Today I received a report from some of our leading scientists that provides the most detailed assessment ever of the potential impacts of global warming across the United States. This landmark report, undertaken at the request of Congress, pulls together a great deal of scientific analysis and paints a sobering picture of the future.

Scientists project that continued growth in greenhouse gas emissions could raise temperatures across our country by 5 to 9 degrees over the next 100 years. To put that in perspective, the Earth has not seen a temperature change of that magnitude since the end of the last ice age, about 15,000 years ago. This new study makes clear that this projected warming threatens serious harm to our environment and to our economy. It could mean more flooding, more droughts, more extreme weather, and a serious disruption in water supplies.

It could mean rising sea levels, the loss of species, and the destruction of entire ecosystems such as the Alpine meadows of the Rocky Mountains. What's more, the scientists warn, there may be many other impacts that we simply cannot predict.

Fortunately, there are steps we can take now to help avert these threats to our future. That's why for the past 8 years Vice President Gore and I have pursued commonsense

strategies to reduce greenhouse gas pollution. We've expanded research and development of solar, wind, biofuels, and other renewable energy resources.

We've taken dramatic steps to reduce energy use by the Federal Government, the world's largest energy consumer. We've adopted stronger energy-efficient standards for appliances and forged new alliances with industry, including the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles. These are all steps that reduce greenhouse gas emissions while saving consumers money and strengthening our economy.

But we must do more. That is why today I'm calling for a dramatic new approach to reducing air pollution from America's powerplants, a comprehensive new clean air strategy that will produce significant reductions in the emissions that contribute to global warming.

By adopting one integrated strategy that addresses all the major pollutants—including mercury and carbon dioxide, the largest contributor to global warming—we can give electric utilities the flexibility they need to meet our clean air goals in a cost-effective way. A key part of this strategy is the use of emissions trading, which has proven so effective in curbing the pollution that causes acid rain. There is strong bipartisan support for this approach, and I urge the next Congress to take it up as soon as possible.

As we accelerate our efforts here at home, we are committed to working with other nations to take strong and sensible action to curb global warming. As the world comes together next week in The Hague, the United States will work to make real progress toward a treaty that is both environmentally strong and cost-effective. We must continue to move forward together. The stakes of not acting are simply too high.

Thanks for logging on.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 11:45 a.m. on November 10 in the Map Room at the White House for broadcast at 8 a.m. on November 11. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 10 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast.

The President's Radio Address

November 11, 2000

Good morning. On this Veterans Day, as America honors the service and sacrifice of our men and women in uniform, we are witnessing the extraordinary resilience of the democracy they've pledged their lives to defend.

From our earliest days, the right to vote has meant the right to participate and be heard. If ever there was a doubt about the importance of exercising the most fundamental right of citizenship, it sure was answered on Tuesday. No American will ever again be able to seriously say, "My vote doesn't count."

President Franklin Roosevelt once said, "Democracy is not a static thing; it is an everlasting march." Our Founders may not have foreseen every challenge in the march of democracy, but they crafted a Constitution that would.

The people have spoken. The important thing for all of us to remember now is that a process for resolving the discrepancies and challenges to the election is in motion. The rest of us need to be patient and wait for the results.

I want to congratulate both Vice President Gore and Governor Bush for a vigorous and hard-fought campaign. Once again, the world is seeing democracy in action. The events unfolding in Florida are not a sign of the division of our nation, but of the vitality of our debate, which will be resolved through the vibrancy of our Constitution and laws. Regardless of the outcome, we will come together as a nation as we always do.

As this election unfolds, the nation's business continues. Tomorrow I will begin a trip to Asia that will end in Vietnam. I will be the first President to visit that nation since the height of the Vietnam war. I will go to open a new chapter in our relationship with its people.

For nearly a decade now, we have been building a more normal relationship with Vietnam, basing each step forward on progress and accounting for Americans missing from the war in Vietnam. We've made great strides, repatriating remains, obtaining documents, never forgetting that each case

represents a brave American with a name, a home, a family that cares about his fate.

I will make clear to Vietnam that we expect continued cooperation. I will also offer the support of the American people as Vietnam becomes more open to the world, promoting trade and more ties among our people and championing human rights and religious freedom.

We also have important business here at home. As Congress prepares to finish its work for the year, I urge the members to build on the bipartisan progress we have already made. Let's finish the job of improving our schools, resolve our differences on immigration and worker safety, and let's raise the minimum wage. We should pledge to get these things done for the American people before the next President takes office in January.

A couple of nights ago, we celebrated the 200th anniversary of the White House. We marked much more than the bicentennial of a building. Through two centuries of war and peace, triumph and tragedy, the White House has stood as the living symbol of our democracy. It has welcomed every President since John Adams under its roof, always through a peaceful transition of power.

This January, as it has done for 200 years, it will do so again—because of the timeless power of our Constitution and our undying faith in we, the people.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 10:30 a.m. on November 10 in the Map Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on November 11. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 10 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast.

Remarks at a Veterans Day Ceremony in Arlington, Virginia

November 11, 2000

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. And thank you, Secretary Gober, for your many, many years of friendship and your service to our country. Thank you, Mr. Duggins, for the remarks you made today and your leadership of the Vietnam veterans. General Jackson, Superintendent Metzler, Chaplain Cooke. I think we ought to give a special applause to Lee Thornton for being with us all these years and all the work he's done. Thank you so much. Thank you. What a faithful friend to America's veterans you have been.

I thank our Defense Secretary, Bill Cohen, and his wife, Janet, for being here. And Secretary Slater, General McCaffrey, the service Secretaries, other members of the Cabinet and the administration, and former Cabinet members who are here, General Myers and other members of the Joint Chiefs. To the Medal of Honor recipients, the leaders of our veterans organizations who have been introduced and who do such a fine job. To the veterans and family members, members of the Armed Services, my fellow Americans.

I welcome you all to this sacred place as we again pay tribute to the men and women who have stood at the barricades so that we may enjoy the blessings of liberty. Here we are, surrounded by the white markers that measure the last full measure of their devotion.

Many veterans died in now historic places: the Battle of the Wilderness; Belleau Wood; Normandy; Iwo Jima; Inchon; Vietnam; Kuwait. Many others fought bravely and, thankfully, returned home to live out happy, accomplished lives among friends, families, and loved ones. Still others remind us that even when America is not at war, the men and women of our military risk and sometimes give their lives for peace.

Three such heroes were interred here just in the past few weeks. They were members of the United States Ship *Cole,* working to preserve peace and stability in a region vital to our interests, their lives taken on October 12th by a brutal act of terrorism. They are: Hull Maintenance Technician Second Class Kenneth Clodfelter, Electronics Technician Chief Petty Officer Richard Costelow, and Signalman Seaman Cheron Gunn.

Let us say to their families and to all the families who lost their loved ones on the *Cole,* we are grateful for the quiet, heroic service of your loved ones. Now they are in God's care. We mourn their loss, and we shall not rest until those who carried out this cruel act are held to account.

We all saw the TV images of the *Cole* and the massive hole in its side right at the water line. But what many Americans still don't know about is the heroism that took place after the attack. What we couldn't see was that entire compartments were flooded, hatches blown open, doorways bent, parts of the top deck buckled. So, in addition to finding and bringing home the dead and the wounded, the surviving crew had to save their ship.

They worked around the clock, some in 22-hour shifts, amid smoke, seawater, and twisted steel, with no respite from the desert heat. They used their ingenuity to restore the ship's electrical power so they would no longer have to bail water by hand, bucket by bucket. Some even slept on the deck because the air below was too foul.

In these incredibly difficult circumstances, one helicopter pilot from a ship assisting the *Cole* wrote these words home: "I wish I had the power to relay what I have seen," he said, "but words just won't do it. I do want to tell you the first thing that jumped out at me—the Stars and Stripes flying. Our flag was more beautiful than words can describe. I have never been so proud of what I do or of the men and women I serve with."

Soon the *Cole* will be back home in America for repairs, and soon thereafter, she will be back on the seas, serving America—those Stars and Stripes still flying. We are greatly honored to be joined here today by the commander of the *Cole*—the captain of the *Cole,* Commander Kirk Lippold; his executive officer, Lieutenant Commander Chris Peterschmidt; the Command Master Chief, James Parlier; and some 20 members of their crew. I was honored to welcome them at the White House this morning. I would like to ask them now to stand and have you welcome them. [*Applause*]

There are many appropriate ways to honor not just the crew of the *Cole* but all the men and women who have defended liberty in our military service. We honor them, first of all, of course, by remembering them and their accomplishments, as we do here. Later today I will go to the groundbreaking of the World War II memorial to honor the service and sacrifice of the greatest generation, those who fought and died to free the world from tyranny, totalitarianism, and hate. And we will pledge there never to stop trying to build the world for which they sacrificed so much.

We also honor our veterans by cherishing with all our hearts the freedoms they paid such a price to defend. If ever there was a doubt about the value of citizenship and each individual's exercise of the freedom of citizenship to vote, this week's election certainly put it to rest. [*Laughter*] And if ever there was a question about the strength of our democratic institutions in the face of healthy and natural political argument, it has been answered by the measured response of the American people to these extraordinary events.

We have a Constitution. We have a rule of law. We voted, and now the system is trying to figure out exactly what we said. [*Laughter*] Eventually, they will—the system will do that, according to the Constitution and laws, and America will be just fine.

We honor Vice President Gore and Governor Bush. We honor all those who participated and all those who voted. And I hope they will remind us that the next time the polls are open, without regard to our party, our philosophy, we should show up because we certainly do count.

We honor our veterans as well, in Abraham Lincoln's words, by caring for him who should have borne the battle and for his widow and orphans. Just a few days ago I proudly signed legislation increasing funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs by $1.5 billion. These additional resources will help our Nation's 24 million veterans, serving more patients, ensuring high quality and timely medical care, improving the delivery of benefit payments for veterans, increasing compensation for disabilities, meeting our national shrine commitment to veteran cemeteries.

We also recently provided a 3.7 across-the-board increase in basic pay for the members of our Armed Forces; provided military retirees access to prescription drugs with low out-of-pocket costs; and provided lifetime health care coverage that will allow military retirees over 65 to receive affordable, high-quality health care across our Nation.

Finally, we honor our veterans by meeting our part of the solemn compact we have with

each and every soldier, sailor, airman, marine, and coast guardsman, regardless of the conflict in which they fought, that we will do all in our power to find them and bring them home if they are captured, missing in action, or fallen on the battlefield.

Today I am proud to announce that we are bringing home another 15 sets of remains, heroes from the Korean war. They are en route right now from Pyongyang to Hawaii for identification, and we praise God for this event.

Tomorrow I will begin a trip to Asia that will end in Vietnam, and I will be the first President to visit that country since 1969. Over the past decade we have moved, step by step, toward normalized relations with Vietnam, based on one central priority: gaining the fullest possible accounting of American prisoners of war and Americans missing in action in Southeast Asia. Continuing cooperation on these issues is on the top of my agenda for this trip, even as we open a new chapter in our relations with Vietnam.

Our Nation has sought to move forward in developing those relations in a way that both honors those who fought and suffered there and does right by the missing and their families. We have done so with the constant involvement and support of Members of Congress who served in Vietnam, America's Vietnam veterans, and their families.

The result has been tremendous progress, and today, full cooperation from the Vietnamese in repatriating remains, accounting for missing Americans, obtaining documents, and conducting over 60 joint field activities with the Vietnamese to search for our MIA's. As a result of that increased cooperation, the remains of 283 Americans have been repatriated since 1993.

On my second day in Vietnam, I will visit a site where Americans and Vietnamese have been searching for the remains of an American serviceman. We believe it to be the place where Air Force Captain Lawrence Evert was downed on November 8, 1967. I am pleased that I will be joined at the site by two of Captain Evert's sons, Dan and David. We are honored to have them and their sisters, Elizabeth and Tamra, with us here today. We thank them, the members of the Evert family, for their devotion.

When Captain Evert's plane was shot down 33 years ago, an airman on another flight heard a voice on a radio transmission calling out, "I'm hit hard." That hit his loved ones' lives just as hard. Again I say, we thank them for their sacrifice, and we thank them for joining us here today. Where are the Everts? Would you ask them to stand, please? There they are. [*Applause*] Thank you very much. Bless you.

The presence of these two fine men on our trip will help us all to make it clear in Vietnam that our work is not yet finished and that progress in our relations depends upon continued cooperation. We will always keep faith with these families and do our duty to the past, for we must never forget.

In our national memory, Vietnam was a war. But Vietnam is also a country—a country emerging from almost 50 years of conflict, upheaval, and isolation, and turning its face to a very different world, a country that can succeed in this new global age only if it becomes more interdependent and open to the world. This is something we should encourage. We should always remember something a great American Vietnam veteran and former POW Pete Peterson said when he went to Vietnam as our Ambassador: "We cannot change the past. What we can change is the future."

The future belongs to veterans and their families who deserve all the support and answers a grateful nation can provide. It belongs to the thousands of ordinary Vietnamese citizens who have helped them in this process. It belongs to the Vietnamese-Americans who have come to live among us, including right here in Arlington, and who now can finally travel home to reunite with their families. It belongs to all the good people who have gone to Vietnam to help clear landmines and aid the victims of flooding. It belongs to the next generation of Vietnamese who want to live in a normal, prosperous country, and to be free to shape their destinies and live their faith. It belongs to all those Americans and Vietnamese who want to build a common future.

On this first Veterans Day of the 21st century, the eighth and last in which I will have the honor to address you and the people of our Nation as President in this sacred place,

let us resolve never to stop trying to build that better world for which our veterans have sacrificed. Let us all draw strength from the long legacy of service.

When history looks back upon the records of our age and our Nation centuries from now, I believe it will be written that once there was a great nation of free people who sent their very best young men and women out to serve on the frontiers of freedom in uniform. They went forth to defend their Nation and its ideals, giving up the comforts and conveniences of home. Too many never returned to their families, but none who served ever sacrificed in vain.

They led lives of great consequence, for they kept the torch of liberty burning in the oldest democracy on Earth. Each and every one of them were heroes and gave to every child born thereafter a precious and irreplaceable gift. And their Nation remained eternally grateful.

Thank you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. in the Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery. In his remarks, he referred to George C. Duggins, national president, Vietnam Veterans of America; Maj. Gen. James T. Jackson, USA, Commanding General, Military District of Washington; John C. (Jack) Metzler, Jr., superintendent, Arlington National Cemetery; Chaplain Jeni Cooke, Director, Chaplain Service, Department of Veterans Affairs; Lee Thornton, master of ceremonies; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush. A portion of these remarks could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks at the Groundbreaking Ceremony for the World War II Memorial

November 11, 2000

Thank you very much. Secretary Cohen, thank you for your service. To the other members of the Cabinet and the administration, I thank you. General Woerner, thank you for your lifetime of service and your leadership of our Battlefield Monuments Commission. Ambassador Williams, thank you, and all the members of the World War II Memorial Committee. Archbishop Hannan, thank you for your prayers and your leadership in the war.

And to Captain Luther Smith of the Tuskegee Airmen, he and told you his story, but I can't help noting that in telling you his story he was rather like a lot of World War II veterans. He left out a few things. He left out the Distinguished Flying Cross, seven air medals, the Purple Heart, and a POW medal. Like many of our soldiers in World War II, his bravery went unmentioned, but we are, nonetheless, profoundly grateful for it.

I'd like to thank Fred Smith, my friend of many years, for stepping up and helping to raise all this money; and also, my friend Tom Hanks, who played Captain John Miller in "Saving Private Ryan" and is now making sure that America never forgets all the Private Ryans. We are grateful for him, as well.

I thank Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur, who recognized the vision of her constituent Roger Durbin and introduced this legislation and has fought for it ever since. I can tell you as someone who has dealt with her for 8 years, there is no more determined person in the United States Congress. I am only amazed that this memorial was not built in 1988, since she got behind it. Thank you, Marcy Kaptur, for what you are doing.

I thank the Members of Congress who are here. Senator Thurmond once told me that he was the oldest man who took a glider into Normandy. I don't know what that means, 56 years later, but I'm grateful for all of the Members of Congress, beginning with Senator Thurmond and all the others who are here, who never stopped serving their country.

But most of all, I want to say a thank-you to Bob Dole and to Elizabeth for their service to America. As my tenure as President draws to a close, I have had, as you might imagine, an up-and-down relationship with Senator Dole. But I liked even the bad days. I always admired him. I was always profoundly grateful for his courage and heroism in war and 50 years of service in peace. After a rich and long life, he could well have done something else with his time in these last few years, but he has passionately worked for this day. And I am profoundly grateful.

I also want to thank the men and women and boys and girls all across our country who

participated in this fundraising drive, taking this memorial from dream to reality. Their stories are eloquent testimony to its meaning. As Senator Dole and I were sitting up here watching the program unfold today, he told me an amazing story. He said, "One day a man from eastern Pennsylvania called our office. He was a 73-year-old Armenian-American named Sarkis Acopian. And he said, 'I'd like to make a contribution to this memorial. Where do I mail my check?'"—just called. So he was given the address, and shortly after, this man's—who was grateful for the opportunities America has given him—check arrived in the office, a check for $1 million.

But there were all the other checks, as well, amounting to over $140 million in private contributions. There were contributions from those still too young to serve, indeed, far too young to remember the war. More than 1,100 schools across our Nation have raised money for the memorial by collecting cans, holding bake sales, putting on dances.

Let me just tell you about one of them, Milwaukie High School in Milwaukie, Oregon. Five years ago a teacher named Ken Buckles wanted to pay tribute to the World War II veterans. He and his students searched out local veterans and invited them to school for a living history day. Earlier this week, Living History Day 2000 honored more than 3,000 veterans with a recreated USO show that filled the pro basketball arena. Last year's event raised $10,000 for the memorial, and students think that this year they'll raise even more.

Now, what makes those kids fundraise and organize and practice for weeks on end? Many have grandparents and other relatives who fought in the war, but there must be more to it than that. They learned from their families and teachers that the good life they enjoy as Americans was made possible by the sacrifices of others more than a half-century ago. And maybe most important, they want us to know something positive about their own generation, as well, and their desire to stand for something greater than themselves.

They didn't have the money to fly out here today, but let's all of us send a loud thank-you to the kids at Milwaukie High School and their teacher, Ken Buckles, and all the other young people who have supported this cause. [*Applause*]

The ground we break today is not only a timeless tribute to the bravery and honor of one generation but a challenge to every generation that follows. This memorial is built not only for the children whose grandparents served in the war but for the children who will visit this place a century from now, asking questions about America's great victory for freedom.

With this memorial, we secure the memory of 16 million Americans, men and women who took up arms in the greatest struggle humanity has ever known. We hallow the ground for more than 400,000 who never came home. We acknowledge a debt that can never be repaid.

We acknowledge, as well, the men and women and children of the homefront, who tended the factories and nourished the faith that made victory possible; remember those who fought faithfully and bravely for freedom, even as their own full humanity was under assault, African-Americans who had to fight for the right to fight for our country, Japanese-Americans who served bravely under a cloud of unjust suspicion, Native American code talkers who helped to win the war in the Pacific, women who took on new roles in the military and at home—remember how, in the heat of battle, and the necessity of the moment, all of these folks moved closer to being simply Americans.

And we remember how, after World War II, those who won the war on foreign battlefields dug deep and gave even more to win the peace here at home, to give us a new era of prosperity, to lay the foundation for a new global society and economy by turning old adversaries into new allies, by launching a movement for social justice that still lifts millions of Americans into dignity and opportunity.

I would like to say once more before I go to the veterans here today what I said in Normandy in 1994: "Because of you, my generation and those who have followed live in a time of unequaled peace and prosperity. We are the children of your sacrifice, and we thank you forever."

But now, as then, progress is not inevitable; it requires eternal vigilance and sacrifice. Earlier today, at the Veterans Day ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery, we paid tribute to the fallen heroes of the United States Ship *Cole,* three of whom have recently been buried at Arlington. The captain of the ship and 20 of the crewmembers were there today. We honor them.

Next week I will go to Vietnam to honor the men and women America lost there, to stand with those still seeking a full accounting of the missing. But at the same time, I want to give support to Vietnamese and Americans who are working together to build a better future in Vietnam, under the leadership of former Congressman and former Vietnam POW Pete Peterson, who has reminded us that we can do nothing about the past, but we can always change the future. That's what all of you did after the war with Germans, Italians, and Japanese. You built the world we love and enjoy today.

The wisdom this monument will give us is to learn from the past and look to the future. May the light of freedom that will stand at the center of this memorial inspire every person who sees it to keep the flame of freedom forever burning in the eyes of our children and to keep the memory of the greatest generation warm in the hearts of every new generation of Americans.

Thank you, and God bless America.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:22 p.m. on The National Mall. In his remarks, he referred to Gen. Fred F. Woerner, USA, (Ret.), Chairman, and Ambassador Haydn Williams, Commissioner, American Battle Monuments Commission; retired Archbishop Philip Hannan of New Orleans, a chaplain in the 82d Airborne Division, USA, during World War II; Capt. Luther Smith, USAF, (Ret.), member of the Tuskegee Airmen, an African-American bomber escort squadron in World War II; Frederick W. Smith, national cochairman, actor Tom Hanks, national spokesperson, and former Senator Bob Dole, national chairman, National World War II Memorial Campaign; and Senator Dole's wife, Elizabeth.

Statement on the Death of Leah Rabin

November 12, 2000

Hillary and I were deeply saddened this morning to learn of the death of Leah Rabin. We have lost a dear friend, and the Middle East has lost a friend of peace. But the work to which she and Yitzakh dedicated their lives must and will continue.

Our prayers are with the Rabin family and with the people of Israel.

Statement on Signing the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000

November 13, 2000

Today I am pleased to sign into law H.R. 782, the "Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000." The Older Americans Act of 1965, last reauthorized by the Congress in 1992, provides essential home and community-based services, such as congregate and home-delivered meals, transportation, legal assistance, employment and volunteer opportunities, health promotion activities, pension counseling programs, and protection from abuse in institutions and in the community for millions of older persons across the United States.

I am very pleased that this bipartisan legislation includes, for the first time, an important new program designed to assist families. It provides the authorization for the National Family Caregiver Support Program, which I first proposed in 1999 as part of my long-term care initiative. This program will help hundreds of thousands of family members—spouses, adult children, and others—who are struggling to care for their frail older loved ones who are ill or disabled. Studies have shown that caregiving can take a huge emotional, physical, and financial toll on families. The support provided through this new program includes critical information, training, and counseling, as well as much needed quality respite care for those caregivers who are juggling jobs and other family responsibilities while meeting the special needs of loved ones

in their care. This legislation also recognizes the challenges that grandparents and other relatives caring for children face, as well as those of older individuals who are caring for children who have disabilities. When funded, this program will provide valuable assistance to the families who need it most.

Beyond providing this important support to families, the bill I am signing today will strengthen and improve the delivery of important daily services to our most vulnerable aging citizens through our national network of State and area agencies on aging, tribal organizations, and other members of our community, including volunteers, many of whom are older persons themselves. The new legislation gives our States, area agencies, and Tribes more flexibility in serving elders in their own communities and regions, and enhances the coordination of Federal, State, and local programs to maximize the effectiveness of program activities.

This legislation does much to position our rapidly growing aging population for the decades ahead when the number of older persons in need of help will be much larger and more diverse. The Act continues to focus attention on the needs of those in greatest social and economic need, with particular attention to low-income minority elders, and it recognizes the needs of those older persons who live in rural areas of our country. It acknowledges the cultural differences among our tribal populations, and provides them with caregiver support and disaster relief assistance as well as promoting better coordination of services between State and tribal grantees. It promotes innovation and the development of best practices for supporting not only older persons, but family caregivers living at home, in the community, or on tribal reservations.

I am also pleased that this legislation incorporates the key features of my Administration's proposal for reauthorizing and enhancing the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP). This important program provides part-time community service employment to low-income individuals ages 55 and older, and assists them in obtaining unsubsidized employment. The bill would maintain the unique and complementary structure of SCSEP, under which national nonprofit organizations as well as States receive grants to operate the program. It also strengthens SCSEP by establishing an enhanced performance accountability system, reinforcing connections between SCSEP and the broader workforce investment system established under the Workforce Investment Act, and improving the planning process by providing for broad participation in the development of a plan in each State to ensure an equitable distribution of projects and the coordination of services to seniors.

Finally, the Act calls for the convening of a White House Conference on Aging by the end of 2005 in order to continue to prepare our Nation for its own gift of longevity.

Today's enactment of this legislation extending and improving the Older Americans Act, and establishing the new National Family Caregiver Support Program, reflects our continued commitment to our older population, and represents a victory for Americans of all ages.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 13, 2000.

NOTE: At the time of publication, H.R. 782, approved November 13, had not been received by the Office of the Federal Register in time for assignment of a public law number.

Statement on Signing the Reauthorization of the Export Administration Act of 1979

November 13, 2000

Today I have signed into law H.R. 5239, which reauthorizes the Export Administration Act of 1979 (EAA) until August 20, 2001.

Reauthorization and revision of the EAA is long overdue. The EAA is a Cold War statute and its authorities lapsed on August 20, 1994. Since the end of the Cold War, there has been a strong need for a modern export control law that will provide U.S. businesses an updated legal framework in which to operate. This revised Act must recognize the current realities of a fast-paced highly competitive global market and at the same time help ensure our national security by controlling the export of sensitive dual-use items that

have military and nonmilitary applications. My Administration proposed such a revision back in 1994. Despite several efforts, the Congress has not yet been able to pass a new revised Act.

In reauthorizing the EAA on a short-term basis, the Congress has taken a small but significant step. Reauthorizing the EAA will overcome the legal challenges now being made to the Department of Commerce's continued operation of its export control system under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act after the lapse of the EAA. In particular, the reauthorization confirms the Department's ability to keep export licensing information obtained during the lapse of the EAA from public disclosure, which is a critical part of the Department's export control system and protects sensitive business information and commercial interests of U.S. exporters. The Congress' actions have reaffirmed the view of the executive branch in this matter—that confidential treatment of export licensing information is continuous regardless of whether the EAA is in a lapse period. The reauthorization of the EAA also reaffirms that the Congress must abide by statutory limitations on public disclosure of such information.

While a comprehensive revision of the Export Administration Act is necessary, this reauthorization of the EAA is a needed short-term step.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 13, 2000.

NOTE: At the time of publication, H.R. 5239, approved November 13, had not been received by the Office of the Federal Register in time for assignment of a public law number.

Statement on Signing the National Marine Sanctuaries Amendments Act of 2000

November 13, 2000

Today I am pleased to sign into law S. 1482, the "National Marine Sanctuaries Amendments Act of 2000," which reauthorizes the National Marine Sanctuaries Act for 5 years.

The National Marine Sanctuaries Act (NMSA) authorizes the establishment of a unique system of marine protected areas dedicated to the conservation of special areas of the marine environment for the appreciation and enjoyment of present and future generations. The National Marine Sanctuary Program currently comprises 13 sanctuaries around the country, including sites in American Samoa and Hawaii. In the quarter century since its inception, the NMSA has provided a powerful mandate for marine resource protection, resulting in the permanent conservation of many invaluable habitats. Drawing upon this experience, S. 1482 refines the NMSA in substantive ways to reflect the growth and evolution of the Program.

The National Marine Sanctuary Program is a key part of my Administration's ocean policy. In particular, this long-standing program will be an integral part of the national system of marine protected areas, which I recently directed Federal agencies to establish. In addition, sanctuaries are essential to achieving the goals of the Coral Reef Task Force of protecting important coral areas and will be a focus of the Ocean Exploration initiative, which I recently announced, to better understand the unexplored ocean areas.

This legislation establishes the Dr. Nancy Foster Scholarship Program, which will support graduate students in oceanography, marine biology, and maritime archaeology. Much of the success of the National Marine Sanctuary Program is attributable to Dr. Foster's advocacy of the program and her tenure as the head of the program in its early years, and I am pleased that these scholarships will honor such a fine leader in ocean and coastal management. Throughout her career, Dr. Foster demonstrated a commitment to mentoring and supporting women and minorities in the marine sciences. She will be greatly missed.

I congratulate the congressional supporters of this Act. I am pleased by the increased interest in our oceans and coastal resources and the recognition of the value of the continued protection and management of these areas. S. 1482 will be instrumental in

helping to ensure our ocean legacy for future generations.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 13, 2000.

NOTE: At the time of publication, S. 1482, approved November 13, had not been received by the Office of the Federal Register in time for assignment of a public law number.

Statement on Signing the National Marine Sanctuaries Amendments Act of 2000

November 13, 2000

Today I am pleased to sign S. 1482, the "National Marine Sanctuaries Amendments Act of 2000," further strengthening Nation's commitment to ocean conservation. This Nation prides itself on its conservation ethic, as embodied in our national parks and refuges. The 13 marine sanctuaries extend this ethic into the sea, ensuring a healthy ocean environment for future generations of swimmers and surfers, fishermen and explorers, teachers and students.

National marine sanctuaries enjoy broad bipartisan support, and I am particularly grateful to the Congressional leadership of this legislation for their efforts. I am especially pleased that this act creates the Dr. Nancy Foster Scholarship Program, named in memory of Dr. Foster, who passed away in June after a 23-year career fighting for ocean conservation. It is a fitting tribute to Dr. Foster to encourage scholarship, particularly by women and minorities, in the fields of oceanography, marine biology, and maritime archeology.

This legislation builds on the Clinton-Gore administration's work to preserve our Nation's oceans. Over the past 7 years, the Vice President and I have fought for healthier beaches and cleaner coastal waters, greater protection for endangered and threatened marine species, sound fisheries management, and support for marine protected areas. We have worked with Congress to secure a fivefold increase in marine sanctuary funding to $26 million and add new sanctuaries off Massachusetts, Florida, Washington, Hawaii, and, most recently, Michigan. Today we extend this program into the future, and with it this Nation's commitment to an ocean ethic for the 21st century.

NOTE: At the time of publication, S. 1482, approved November 13, had not been received by the Office of the Federal Register in time for assignment of a public law number.

Statement on Signing the Coastal Barrier Resources Reauthorization Act of 2000

November 13, 2000

Today I am pleased to sign into law S. 1752, the "Coastal Barrier Resources Reauthorization Act of 2000." This Act reauthorizes and amends the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA), which protects lives, property, and key coastal barrier habitat by prohibiting Federal subsidies for development and disaster relief on many of our Nation's coastal barriers.

First enacted in 1982, CBRA established the Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS), which includes undeveloped coastal barrier habitats along the Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico, Great Lakes, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Last year, these coastal barriers were renamed the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System in honor of the late Senator, who authored the original CBRA and this reauthorizing legislation and championed numerous other environmental laws throughout his distinguished career of public service. Today, CBRA protects over 3 million acres of coastal barrier habitat.

Coastal barriers provide a multitude of services that are foundations of a strong economy and healthy environment. For example, coastal barriers often help provide the conditions necessary to support productive and lucrative fisheries. They also provide essential habitat for threatened and endangered species and protect the mainland from coastal storms, bearing the full force of storm surge and hurricane-level winds and shielding the mainland from the severest storm conditions. By limiting Federal subsidies such as flood insurance from units in the System, CBRA discourages development, keeping lives out of harm's way, protecting fish

and wildlife habitat, and reducing wasteful expenditures of taxpayer dollars.

This Act contains a number of amendments that will improve the CBRS and implementation of the CBRA. One provision allows the voluntary addition of lands to the System, which could increase the amount of coastal barrier habitat protected by CBRA. The Act also codifies a set of mapping guidelines, which will help the public understand the criteria used to delineate parts of the System. Most significantly, this Act recognizes the value that digital mapping techniques can add to coastal protection and authorizes a digital mapping pilot program that will help integrate the CBRA with Federal, State, and local government planning tools.

Ultimately, I believe this technology will better serve the public and protect natural resources.

Naming the System after Senator Chafee was a fitting tribute to a man who worked so hard, and so successfully, to find common ground in the struggle to protect and preserve the environment for future generations. Senator Chafee was very proud of CBRA, often stating his support during hearings of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, which he chaired. Given the laudable goals and achievements of CBRA, I am pleased that the Congress has reauthorized and strengthened the law. This Act reaffirms our Nation's commitment to protecting valuable coastal barrier habitat in this new century.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 13, 2000.

NOTE: At the time of publication, S. 1752, approved November 13, had not been received by the Office of the Federal Register in time for assignment of a public law number.

Proclamation 7376—International Education Week, 2000

November 13, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Today we live in a global community, where all countries must work as partners to promote peace and prosperity and to resolve international problems. One of the surest ways to develop and strengthen such partnerships is through international education programs.

These programs enable students to learn other languages, experience other cultures, develop a broader understanding of global issues, and make lasting friendships with their peers in other countries who will one day guide the political, cultural, and economic development of their nations. Some of America's staunchest friends abroad are those who have experienced our country firsthand as exchange students or who have been exposed to American values through contact with American students and scholars studying overseas.

Since World War II, the Federal Government has worked in partnership with colleges, universities, and other educational organizations to sponsor programs that help our citizens gain the international experience and skills needed to meet the challenges of an increasingly interdependent world. At the same time, American educational institutions have developed study programs that attract students from all over the world to further their education in the United States.

One of the largest and most renowned of these international education initiatives is the Fulbright Program, which was founded by Senator J. William Fulbright more than half a century ago. Since its inception, the program has provided nearly a quarter of a million participants from the United States and 140 other nations—participants chosen for

their academic and professional qualifications and leadership potential—with the opportunity to study and teach abroad and to gain knowledge of global political, economic, and cultural institutions. As Senator Fulbright envisioned, this program has proved to be a vital and positive force for peace and understanding around the world.

To build on this tradition of excellence in international education, I signed a memorandum in April of this year directing the heads of Executive departments and agencies to work with educational institutions, State and local governments, private organizations, and the business community to develop a coordinated national policy on international education. We must reaffirm our national commitment to encouraging students from other countries to study in the United States, promote study abroad by U.S. students, and support the exchange of teachers, scholars, and citizens at all levels of society. By doing so, we can expand our citizens' intellectual and cultural horizons, strengthen America's economic competitiveness, increase under standing between nations and peoples, and, as Senator Fulbright so eloquently stated, direct "the enormous power of human knowledge to the enrichment of our own lives and to the shaping of a rational and civilized world order."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim November 13 through November 17, 2000, as International Education Week. I urge all Americans to observe this week with events and programs that celebrate the benefits of international education to our citizens, our economy, and the world.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirteenth day of November, 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, 10:59 a.m., November 14, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on November 15.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the APEC Business Advisory Council in Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei

November 15, 2000

The President. Good morning, and thank you, Dr. Hamdillah. Your Royal Highness, fellow leaders, Madam Ambassador, members of the Business Advisory Committee. I thank you all for your support of this process. And if I might, I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to the three members of ABAC from the United States, Sy Sternberg, Paul Song, and Ernie Micek.

I appreciate what the private sector involvement has done for APEC—for example, last year's auto dialog, which brought regulators and firms together to lower trade barriers. I hope we can do the same this year with the chemical industry dialog. I thank you for your ideas and for your impatience, reminding us always that none of these commitments made at APEC mean anything if we don't follow them with actions.

As you know, this has been a rather interesting week in the United States. [*Laughter*] And as a result, I did not arrive here until late last night. One of the things I think we have learned is that we should all be very careful about making predictions about the future. [*Laughter*] But I know I can safely predict that this will be my last APEC Summit. [*Laughter*] I just don't know who will be here next year. [*Laughter*]

Let me say a few words about the organization, if I might. I remember our first summit in 1993, the first leaders' meeting in Washington State at Blake Island. Some of you were there. Before that, APEC had been doing good work but in a low-key way, I think largely unnoticed by many of the politic leaders among all the countries here represented. I wanted to establish a mechanism to bring together the leaders of the most economically dynamic region in the world. I thought that together we could work to be better prepared for a world that was becoming more and more integrated, more and more interdependent, a world in which the Asia-Pacific region was destined to play a larger and larger role.

In 1993 we didn't use the word "globalization" very much, but that is what we were preparing for. And I think we knew the process inevitably would be about more than economics. By bringing our economies and our societies closer together, I believed then, and I hope all believe now, that we could advance not only prosperity but the cause of human freedom and our common ability to avert conflict in this vital part of the world.

By inviting the APEC leaders to Blake Island, I wanted to send a clear message, also, that Asia was even more important to the United States after the cold war. I believe that our partnership with Asia is stronger today than a decade ago and that Asia's future is brighter.

There is no longer any doubt that our link to this region is permanent, not passing. Our troops remain here as a force for stability. We have renewed our alliance with Japan. We have worked to preserve the peace in the two likeliest flashpoints of conflict, the Taiwan Strait and the Korean Peninsula.

In 1994, with our ally South Korea, we negotiated an agreement that froze North Korea's production of plutonium for nuclear weapons. And now President Kim Dae-jung has made his courageous journey of reconciliation, for which he justifiably won the Nobel Peace Prize.

We have encouraged China's historic choice to open its economy to the world and applauded the similar choice made by Vietnam. I think it is a fitting symbol of where the world is going that Vietnam now chairs ASEAN, an organization originally created in part to contain Vietnam.

In Indonesia, 200 million people are struggling to overcome recent severe economic and political problems, but at least they now have the chance to shape their own destiny. They have great resources and great talent and a great future.

I believe in these years, APEC has made a difference. I believe these annual leaders summits and the business meetings associated with them have made a difference. I hope very much that they will continue indefinitely. I think it is very important for the leaders to meet, to work together in an informal atmosphere. It creates a much greater sense of community, and I think it's very important for all of you to come here to help us work through practical problems and keep the pressure on the political systems to move forward.

Particularly after the hard economic times of 1997 and 1998, I certainly hope we all know now we have a stake in each other's success. We have no interest in pitting one part of the region or one trading bloc against another. We are managing our crises better, and not just economic ones. Last year in New Zealand, for example, we used the annual APEC leaders summit to forge the coalition that ended the violence in East Timor.

During the last 8 years, we have worked also to ensure that the open world economy works as a means to raise living standards and lower poverty for all nations. We've learned that meeting that challenge requires more than the continued expansion of rules-based open trade. It also requires strong social safety nets, more quality education, anti-poverty efforts, and labor and environment standards so that people believe that globalization is leading not to a race to the bottom but to higher living standards for all who work hard and are a part of it.

In no part of the world has globalization been put to the test as much as in Asia in these last few years. You have felt both its great benefits and its temporary but brutal sting. On balance, the global economy and more open markets clearly have been a positive force in Asia and, indeed, around the world. That is not to downplay the impact of the financial crisis or the abject despair it brought to millions. It is also true that countries with more closed economies did not suffer as much during the crisis, but those same closed economies, isolated from the risks of the global economy, have also been isolated from its fullest rewards.

APEC has pushed all of us to seize those rewards. And the rewards are clear. Per capita GDP in East Asia has doubled since 1990. Among lower income economies in APEC, incomes have grown by 60 percent in the last decade, even as they have shrunk for many less developed countries outside APEC. In 1970, before economic expansion through trade began, infants in this region were 5 times more likely than today to die

at birth. Children were 6 times more likely than today to die before age 5.

I think a fair reading of history is that the greatest Asian financial crisis was not the brief one now coming to a close but the one that lasted almost two centuries before Asia began to open its economies to the world. Fifty years ago most of this region was desperately poor. Many economists predicted that the country with the best chance of success, because of its human and natural resources, was Burma. In reality, the most successful countries were not those which started with the biggest advantages but those that made the most of the advantages they had by opening their markets and ultimately their societies.

That is why APEC has been a force for free markets. In our 1994 summit, we agreed to achieve free and open trade in the Asia Pacific by 2010 for industrialized economies and by 2020 for developing economies. We've been making steady, sector-by-sector progress. In 1988 more than half the APEC economies had average tariffs of 10 percent or more. Today, only four do. APEC exports have more than doubled.

Of course, the region is not out of the woods. It would be a cruel irony, indeed, if the recovery were to breed a complacency that stalled the very changes making recovery possible. I believe we need to meet four related challenges to keep the recovery and our share of prosperity going.

First, we must continue to modernize our economies by promoting E-commerce and applying information technology to the full range of economic activity, from agriculture to heavy industry to transportation, to reduce costs and raise efficiency.

To maximize potential, we must turn the digital divide among and within our nations into digital opportunities. That will be a big subject of this summit. Internet use is growing in the region, and Asia is poised to participate in what will be a $7 trillion global E-commerce market by the year 2005. At the same time, it has been estimated that if we simply maintain the current rate of growth, in 11 of the 21 APEC economies the percentage of the population online by 2005 will average just 4 percent, compared to an average of 72 percent in the top eight economies.

As we discuss Internet access, we must also address the obstacles to E-commerce. For example, being able to order a package online is not enough if a competitive airline cannot fly it to you at low cost, if it can't get through redtape at customs, or if there's no delivery service to take it the final miles to your home. APEC has encouraged all its members to make a comprehensive assessment of their readiness for the information age. The assessment asked questions about access to the Internet, about the reliability and price of services, about the number of schools connected, about local language content, about the business environment for E-commerce, about the protection of intellectual property, and a host of other issues.

Now that the roadblocks are being identified, we propose that governments in this region and companies like yours launch pilot projects to start removing them. I hope as many of you as possible will participate. We cannot close the digital divide without your efforts to provide distance learning, to donate software and low-cost computers for villages, and to train people to use them. We need initiatives like APEC's Knowledge Network, which is compiling on one Internet site information on all the service companies—all the services which companies are providing to help economies close the digital divide.

Now, people are talking about tripling the number of people online in our region by 2005. With your help, I believe we can easily quadruple the number and perhaps do even better.

APEC has also agreed to adopt one test and one standard for all its members to use to measure the safety and quality of computers, agreed that only legitimately licensed software can be used in government offices so companies can be more certain of their copyrights, and to continue its moratorium on E-commerce duties. That's a good step toward meeting the second big challenge we face, to continue to open our markets to more trade and more investment.

At this summit, the United States, Brunei, Chile, New Zealand, and Singapore are announcing the first multilateral open-skies agreement in the world, a model we hope others will emulate and join. APEC members are also agreeing to post on the Internet our

individual action plans for reaching free trade in the region, so you can judge our progress and, frankly, so you can put a little more pressure on us to get it done. The most important thing we can do is to launch a new trade round at the WTO. It ought to happen as early as possible next year.

A third challenge is to continue doing what we all said had to be done in the wake of the recent financial crisis, to improve transparency, to speed up financial restructuring, to strengthen the rule of law, and to build more accountable political institutions. That's easy to say and hard to do. But surely it can't be as hard as living through another crisis. And the imperative for reform will only grow as our economies become more and more intertwined.

The challenge is especially profound for two nations in this region, China and Vietnam. Both have signed trade agreements with the United States as steps toward joining the WTO. For China and Vietnam, these agreements are about much more than lowering tariffs; they are declarations of interdependence, recognition that in a global age no country can succeed without continuing to open up to the world.

Both agreements require far-reaching change, dismantling command and control economies, giving people more access to information and, ultimately, I believe, more freedom to use that information to shape the decisions that affect their lives.

A final challenge is to recognize that open markets alone cannot guarantee the kind of growth that lifts everyone, as I said earlier. We know we need strong safety nets, especially in regions like Asia, with rapidly aging populations. We know we need to invest more in education and spread access to education as broadly as possible. As the private sector knows better than anyone, even if you have 100 percent literacy, every dollar you invest in education continues to bring ever greater economic returns.

We also need to fight the infectious diseases that kill people and progress in too many of our nations. There will not be a lasting recovery in Asia if Asia becomes the next epicenter of a global AIDS crisis. But that could happen without concerted leadership. Government cannot provide that leadership alone. Companies will have to educate their workers; CEO's will have to add their voices to those trying to destigmatize the disease. This is not someone else's problem; it is all our problem. As APEC is recognizing, we must fight it together.

In short, we have a lot to do if we don't want this recovery to be as fleeting as the latest Elvis fad in Japan. The good new is, we know what to do. Painful experience has also taught us what not to do. Experience has also taught us to have faith in this region's capacity to overcome very great challenges. After all, how many people foresaw a generation ago that Asia would grow so rapidly we would be talking today about a Pacific century? How many people said 2 years ago that Asia's success was a thing of the past? The truth is, the problems the financial crisis exposed were very real, and they haven't all been solved yet. But the achievements and the resilience of Asia's people are very real, too, and a lot has been done in the last couple of years.

The commitment of Asia's friends and the stake we have in Asia's success is also real. That is what drives APEC. With your help, it will keep us on the right path.

These last 8 years have been a great honor and opportunity for me to try to tie the United States firmly and forever in a very positive way to the Asia-Pacific region. I think this work should continue. I think the leaders' meeting should continue. I think the involvement of the business community is essential.

So I thank you for what you have done, and I hope that you will continue to move forward on these four challenges.

Thank you.

Dr. Hamdillah Ha Wahab. It is, sir, a very rare opportunity for the President of the largest economy in APEC to grace his presence in this year's summit, hosted by the smallest economy of APEC. [*Laughter*] And I would like to take this opportunity to invite our CEO summit delegates to raise questions to the President of the United States of America.

Please.

The President. I just want to say, after I saw this facility, I did not believe this was a small economy. [*Laughter*] I have here with

me today the Secretary of State, our Trade Ambassador, Charlene Barshefsky, as well as Secretary Albright and many other distinguished people from the American Government, and I know they're going to be pushing for us to build an outpost on the South China Sea. [*Laughter*] Now, this is an amazing place.

Does anyone have a question? Yes, sir.

Integration of Technology and Education

Q. [*Inaudible*]—and we're here with some students from—[*inaudible*]—and the United States, covering this event. And so, on behalf of the students, I'd like to ask a question, and that is, how do you feel APEC and the members of APEC can do a better job the integrate technology and education?

The President. Well, one of the things I think that—we're going to be talking about that at this meeting, and it's one of the subjects of the leaders' meeting. So I will answer that question, but I would also just say to you, sir, if you and the students have any ideas you want to share with us, this is the time to do it because it will be a major focus of the discussions we have all day tomorrow.

I think perhaps the most important thing we can do is to identify what is now taking place in every country and to see whether or not the best practices in each country can be spread to the others as quickly as possible. I also think it's worth looking at what's being done in some non-APEC countries that might have particular relevance to the developing economies.

I spent some time a few months ago in India, and I went out into a couple of small villages, as well as being in some of the larger cities. And in the State of Rajasthan, which is not one of the wealthiest States in India, they will have a community computer available to all the citizens and all the children of the community within 3 years in every village in the State. In another State where I was, they already have 18 government services on the Internet, more than most American States do, I think.

So I think what we need to do is to take—look, the technology is out there. We are going to have to have, as I said in my remarks, more activity from the business community in donating both the hardware, the software, and the expertise and a lot of things that particularly are needed in the developing areas. But I think we ought to make a commitment to quadruple access over the next 5 years. And I think we can do much better than that.

But I think that it shouldn't just be E-commerce. There ought to be a serious focus on the schools and having Internet access in the schools and making sure the proper educational software is available and that international communications are available among the schools, which I think are quite important.

Anything else? Yes, in the back.

Asian Economic Integration

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. I think that there are inherent constraints on APEC which—the EU is becoming a common economic unit, and I do think that there will be more regional economic cooperation within Asia, as well as more cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region in the future. And I tried to make a very pointed reference to that in my remarks. I don't see the two things in conflict. And I know there are some people who apparently believe that building a stronger Asia-Pacific cooperative economic network is inconsistent with building greater Asian economic integration. I simply don't agree with that.

And I think that we make a grave mistake when we start to create zero-sum games in the global economy. I think it's a mistake; it ought to be avoided at all costs.

Now, I do think that we should look at ways in which this organization could be stronger and more effective in actually pushing for the changes that we recommend. But you know what the problems are. I mean, many of you agree that we ought to do certain things, but the things that you think we ought to do are politically difficult for some nations to do once the leaders go back home and have to deal with the political reality on the ground.

So I think one of the most important things that perhaps could be done is an examination of what the business community both within countries and beyond countries could do to support the political leaders who are willing to try to make the changes that we all think ought to be made. Because it's very easy for

us to come to this beautiful place and recommend all these changes, and these changes may well be beneficial to all the business people represented here from all the countries. But it doesn't mean that they can be made painlessly by political leaders when they go back home.

So I think one of the things I'd like to see all of you discuss is what you could do not only to put more pressure on the leaders here once a year but what you could do to provide more systematic support to the leaders who are prepared to make these tough decisions who live in the countries where the decisions are indeed difficult to make.

Yes.

Next President and the Trade Agenda

Q. [*Inaudible*]

The President. Well, without commenting on what kind of leadership we will have in the other countries, which I think is inappropriate for me to comment on and also not possible to predict, one of the things that both Vice President Gore and Governor Bush agreed on in this election is that the United States should continue its strong leadership for a more integrated global economy and for expanded trade. And as nearly as I could tell, there was virtually no disagreement on that, except that there were disagreements about the extent to which we also ought to push the trade-plus agenda, if you will, that I've been talking about for the last several years. But on the question of leadership for trade, I think the world can rest easy because both our candidates made strong commitments to do that.

Yes, sir.

Post-Presidential Plans

Q. [*Inaudible*]—NAFTA and trade relations with China, but I have a question to ask you. You're still young, articulate, intelligent, and the President of the United States. What do you do now? [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, now I have a United States Senator to support. I understand that's an expensive proposition. [*Laughter*] I don't know.

Let me just say that the important thing for a former President, it seems to me, is to find a way to be a useful citizen of both my country and the world and to continue to pursue the things that I think are most important to making the world a better place but to do it in a way that does not get in the way of my successor.

The United States can only have one President at a time, and it's very important to me that I continue to be active in the things that I care about—many of which I was talking about here today—in a way that is respectful of the fact that the country has a new President, and the people need to bond with the new President, and the new President needs to establish his relationships and role in the world.

But I think I can find a way to do that. So I'll be around. But I also have to support a Senator, and I'm going to do my best to do that, as well.

Thank you very much. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:25 a.m. in the Ballroom at the Empire Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Hamdillah Ha Wahab, chairman, APEC-CEO Summit 2000; Prince Abdul Qawi of Brunei; U.S. Ambassador to Brunei Sylvia Stanfield; Sy Sternberg, Paul Y. Song, and Ernest S. Micek, U.S. members, APEC Business Advisory Council; President Kim Dae-jung of South Korea; and Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Vladimir Putin of Russia in Bandar Seri Begawan

November 15, 2000

2000 Presidential Election

Q. President Clinton, any comment on the U.S. election?

President Clinton. Yes, let him talk about it. [*Laughter*]

President Putin. We're interested, but with respect to the feelings of the American people, are waiting for the outcomes.

Russia-U.S. Relations

[*At this point, a question was asked in Russian, and a translation was not provided.*]

President Putin. President Clinton, during the term of his Presidency, has caused a breakthrough in the U.S.-Russian relations.

And we expect this torch to be given to whoever will be the successor.

2000 Presidential Election

Q. Mr. President, how are you going to explain what's going on back home to Mr. Putin and other foreign leaders?

President Clinton. Well, I think it's pretty clear that no one knows yet who won the election. There are recounts in progress, and there will be a full accounting according to an accepted legal process in America. We have plenty of time. There's nothing to worry about.

I think other leaders should have the same reaction the American people have about it. I think they are pretty relaxed about it now. They're going to let the process play out. Both sides are certainly very well represented, and they'll argue their points, and we'll see how it works.

NOTE: The exchange began at 1:10 p.m. at the Assara Guest House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on Ratification of the Convention To Combat Desertification

November 15, 2000

On November 13 I signed the instrument of ratification for the Convention To Combat Desertification. Degradation of dry lands affects hundreds of millions of people around the world, especially in Africa. The Convention will help countries marshal the resources needed to mitigate the effects of desertification. It will enhance the effectiveness of foreign assistance and promote a strong role for nongovernmental organizations. Finally, it properly places affected local communities at the heart of international efforts to meet this critical challenge. I look forward to working with our partners in Africa and around the world to implement this innovative international agreement. I commend the Senate for its approval of this important treaty.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Kim Dae-jung of South Korea in Bandar Seri Begawan

November 15, 2000

2000 Presidential Election

Q. Have any of the leaders asked you about the election results, sir?

President Clinton. Just briefly.

Q. Did they accept your explanation of what's going on?

President Clinton. No, they were just interested in it. I told them it would all be worked out. The process was underway.

Possible Visit to North Korea

Q. Mr. President, what exactly are you waiting for from the North Koreans, in terms of commitments on their missile program? What do you need to hear from them?

President Clinton. Well, we're working on a number of issues, of which the missile program is one. We're obviously trying to make as much progress as we can, and I'll make an appropriate decision about the trip sometime in the not too distant future.

Q. Sir, do you think it would be helpful to bring the South Koreans' President with you if you make a trip?

President Clinton. Well, I don't—he just went, and he deserves a lot of credit for doing it. I was actually quite thrilled, as I've told him several times, that the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to him for a lifetime of devotion to peace and human rights, and especially for the breakthrough he's achieved here.

So I think he's put this whole business on a different footing. Secretary Albright, as you know, had a very good trip to North Korea. So I think we're going to work together. We've always worked in partnership with South Korea, and we will continue to do so.

NOTE: The exchange began at 6:42 p.m. at the Istana Edinburgh Guest House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Interview With Terence Hunt and Walter M. Mears of the Associated Press

November 14, 2000

Impact of 2000 Election

Q. Why don't we start with the election? Do you think either Vice President Gore or Governor Bush is going to be able to govern effectively in a situation as divided and increasingly embittered as it is now?

The President. I think it's too soon to draw that conclusion. I think the American people are pretty good about uniting around a President, particularly if the President gets a certain grace period. And I don't think that the circumstances are as rife, or ripe, for discord as they were in '93, where Newt Gingrich was in control and—the Republican apparatus in the Congress—and had a certain theory about what he was trying to do. I think now the country may be quite sobered by this, and the Congress may be somewhat sobered by it. You might well find that there is a real willingness to work together.

The fact that the American people were closely divided on the candidates for President, and would have been closely divided even if Ralph Nader weren't in here, the Vice President would have won the election probably, what, 51.5 to 48.5 or something. That indicates that the American people—I don't think that means that they don't believe there's a dynamic center that can be achieved. And I think that's what they will want from the next President and from the next Congress. So I think it's too soon to say that bitterness and partisanship will paralyze the next President. We don't know that, and I hope it won't be the case.

This is actually, if you think about it, while it was a hard-fought campaign, there wasn't a lot of personal criticism in it—some from the Republican side against the Vice President but not nearly as harsh as we've seen in some campaigns of the past and even less from the Democratic side against Governor Bush. There was some, but not much. I think, on balance, it was an election fought out over two different approaches to the country's challenges and opportunities and different positions on specific issues. So I don't think we are necessarily doomed to 4 years of stalemate and partisanship, and I hope that won't be the case.

Q. People are talking about the—some people were even saying the election is being stolen, and there's all this bitterness, suits. You don't think that that poisons the atmosphere?

The President. Well, I think that depends on what happens in the next few days. And so far what I've tried to tell the American people is, they have spoken, and we're trying to determine what they said. I think there's another million or so votes to be counted in California, New York, and Washington State, maybe even a little more. I guess still the—some prospect of asking for a recount in Iowa and Wisconsin by the Bush people.

And then there's the attempt to resolve all the questions that are out there about the Florida vote. And I think we just—you know, the process is underway. Both sides are clearly very equally represented. And I just think we ought to let the thing play out. It will work itself out in some way or another. We've had this happen before. In 1800 Thomas Jefferson was elected in a very divisive, highly partisan election and went into the House of Representatives. I think he even had to vote on the fitness of the electors. He was a sitting Vice President. You know, he gave a very conciliatory Inaugural Address, saying, "We are all Federalists; we're all Republicans," and led to a whole new era in American politics, out of what was an exceedingly divisive election. He was reelected, and Mr. Madison was elected, served two terms; Mr. Monroe was elected, served two terms. It was actually probably the most stable period in our country's history, in terms of leadership, born out of an exceedingly divisive election in 1800.

So I think it depends upon whether the people believe that this whole thing plays out in a fair way. So that's why I've encouraged the American people to just relax, take a deep breath, recognize that a result of this kind is always possible in a democratic election that's hard-fought, and that the most important thing is that, when it's all said and done, that people believe that all the issues were resolved in a fair way and that the people—franchise was protected and the integrity of the process was. It's unfolding. We just—and

I think as long as it—I just think that's what we ought to keep in mind here.

There's lots of time, you know. The Electoral College is not supposed to meet until December 18th; Inauguration is January 21st. It's a very stable country, and they're working through it, and we'll see what happens.

Court Involvement

Q. Are you comfortable with the courts being as heavily involved as they're becoming? Should a judge decide whose vote counts and whose doesn't?

The President. I think, in some of these cases, there may not be any alternative, because the right to vote is protected and defined in both State and Federal law. There's probably no alternative here.

Now, in the first case, I understand today the judge actually declined to get involved. Isn't that right?

Q. Yes, she would not stay the hand-counting.

The President. I think that the courts probably will be reluctant to be involved as long as they believe that nothing—there's been no legal or constitutional infringement on the franchise. We'll just see what happens.

Q. The Vice President has gone back to court against the secretary of state's ruling that it has to be done by 5 p.m. tomorrow.

The President. Like I said, I've done my best not to comment on the process but just to say it's unfolding; both sides are well represented; they're arguing their points strongly. We should not expect either side to do anything less than to make their strongest case. That's what they're supposed to do.

Electoral College

Q. Do you agree with Senator-elect Clinton that the Electoral College should be abolished?

The President. Well, I have mixed feelings about it. I think the idea—first of all, it was established to some extent for practical reasons, as you know, in the 18th century, and the practical reasons are no longer relevant. You know, we know how people voted when they vote. So nobody has to come tell us.

The other argument is that it gives some more weight to the small States, because the votes are not proportional to the House of Representatives; every State gets the two Senate votes, too, in the Electoral College. And arguably, it gets more attention from the candidates to the small States.

Now, I think that ought to be examined. I'm not necessarily sure that's so. For example, if you're a Democrat and you know you're going to lose every State that's not on the Mississippi River, until you get to California, Washington, Oregon, and maybe Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, would you not go there? Would you be any less likely to go there if there were no Electoral College? Or might you take a run through the high plains and stop in Denver and think that it matters what margin you lose by?

Because what happens is, when these candidates have public funds—they have limited funds and limited time—it affects not only their advertising budget but their travel budget. If you're a Republican and you know you can't win New York, you don't go there. But if you knew that it might make the difference in whether you got 35 or 42 percent of the vote—in this case, if you're Al Gore and you don't think you're going to win Ohio, it might make the difference in 46 and 49 percent of the vote—might you go?

So I don't—I'm not quite sure. Again, I believe how this plays out will determine it—not only my opinion about it but maybe a lot of people's opinion about it.

Q. Do you expect there to be a serious move? I mean, do you think that there is——

The President. I don't have any idea. I know that Hillary feels strongly about it, and it has really nothing to do with the fact that she's a Senator-elect from New York now. But you can ask her why she feels that way.

I have mixed feelings. I think that, you know, certainty and clarity of outcome is important, so I think it depends on—I think that a lot of people's views will be determined by the sense they have about the fairness and adequacy of this process over the next however long it takes to resolve. And we'll just have to see.

Presidential Transition

Q. Do you think it's appropriate at this point for either Governor Bush or the Vice President to be planning a transition?

The President. I don't think I should comment on what they do. I don't think it's appropriate for me to comment on that.

Resolution of 2000 Election

Q. Do you think that this is going to be resolved by the time you get back to Washington next Monday? Do you think it should be resolved by then? And at what point do you think Americans begin to lose faith in the outcome?

The President. I don't know whether it will be resolved when I get back. I don't have an opinion about that.

I think the important thing is that the process be resolved in a way that is as fair as possible, meaning that the American people on both sides of this have the highest possible level of confidence that the people who went to the polls and voted—that the totals reflect, as far as possible, a fair assessment of the people who went to the polls and voted.

And I think that, you know, there are lots of questions out there, and I don't think I should comment on it. There is a process in place. They are both arguing their points strongly, as they both should. And I think that's the most important thing, more than whether it's one week or 8 days or 6 days or 12 days or whatever.

Q. Given how far we've come, do you think it's possible that we're going to come out of this and people are going to think it was fair, with all the angry charges that are going back and forth and the court challenges?

The President. First of all, this is not just a matter of charges; there are certain facts. And I think the facts will come out and be established, and then the disputes about how the factual situation should be handled will be resolved, and people will reach a conclusion about whether they believe that or not.

I think it's quite possible that people will think in the end that the matter has been fairly resolved. They may or may not. I certainly hope that they will. But I think it depends upon what the facts are and then how the facts are resolved.

But again I say, this process is still in play. I don't think the American people should—and I don't think the press should rush to judgment here and just conclude that no matter who is declared the winner that the people who voted for the other candidate will think that something wrong was done. I think it depends on how it is handled and what the facts are.

Q. Sir, what's your outside timetable, and what's a reasonable amount of time?

The President. I just don't want to comment on it because I don't want to prejudice the process. That would be unfair to both candidates for me to say. I think my role now is to uphold the basic principles of democracy and the integrity of the vote and to ask the American people to give this process a chance to play itself out.

Vietnam

Q. Moving on to your major stop on this trip, Vietnam. In 1969, which was the last year an American President went to Vietnam, you wrote a letter saying you hated and despised the war and had worked and demonstrated against it.

Now that you've been in the position of making decisions of war and peace, do you still feel that way about Vietnam?

The President. What I feel about Vietnam is that, thanks in large measure to the bipartisan leadership of Vietnam veterans in the Congress—Bob Kerrey, John Kerry, John McCain, Chuck Robb, and Pete Peterson, when he was there, now is our Ambassador—the American people have been able to look to the future and hope that a future can be built which opens a new page in our relations with Vietnam, and hopefully one that will put an end to the divisions between the Vietnamese people and the American people and between the American—within America and within Vietnam and within the Vietnamese people, including the Vietnamese who are in America, who believed in what we were doing.

That's what I think. Now, when we look back on it, the most important thing is that a lot of brave people fought and died in the North Vietnamese Army, the Viet Cong and the South Vietnamese Army and the United States Army; our allies, the Republic of

Korea and other allies who were there. A lot of people still bear the wounds of war in this country and in Vietnam. And the best thing that we can do to honor the sacrifice and service of those who believed on both sides that what they were doing is right, is to find a way to build a different future, and that's what we're trying to do.

Everything I have done for the last 8 years has been premised on that, starting with trying to obtain the fullest possible accounting for the POW's and the MIA's. And none of what I have done, as I say, would have been remotely possible if it hadn't been for John McCain and Chuck Robb and Senator Bob Kerrey and Senator John Kerry and Pete Peterson. They literally made this possible, they and the veterans groups and the Vietnamese living in America who all supported the American position in the war.

So I think—I don't see this so much as coming to terms with the past as moving forward into the future.

Q. Were there ever points when you were grappling with some of these questions in the past 8 years, when you thought about Lyndon Johnson facing those things in that very troubled period and having to make those decisions which, at the time, you very much disagreed with?

The President. I see now how hard it was for him. I believe he did what he thought was right under the circumstances. Let me just say parenthetically, I'm glad to see that there is a reassessment going on about the historic importance of President Johnson's term of office, the work he did for the civil rights movement, the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act.

Some people are even beginning to acknowledge that his war on poverty was not a total failure, that in fact poverty was reduced. In fact, we just this year finally had the biggest drop in child poverty since 1966, since Lyndon Johnson was President. And I believe that—you know, these decisions are hard. And one of the things that I have learned, too, is when you decide to employ force, there will always be unintended consequences.

Q. You talked about all the losses on both sides, 3 million Vietnamese losses, 58,000 Americans. Were all those lives wasted?

The President. Well, first of all, I don't think that any person is fit to make that judgment. People fight honorably for what they believe in, and they lose their lives. No one has a right to say that those lives were wasted. I think that would be a travesty.

Every war is unfortunate, and when it's over, you always wish it could have been avoided. But I think it's a real mistake to look at it in that way. I think what we have to do is to think about what we can do today and tomorrow and in the years ahead to honor the sacrifice of the people who believed in what they were doing. And I think that for 8 years that's been the policy of this country. And as I said, it had bipartisan support and absolutely critical support from leading veterans in the country—in the Congress and in the country.

Q. Do you think the United States owes Vietnam an apology for its involvement in the war?

The President. No, I don't.

MIA's/POW's

Q. The MIA/POW question is very crucial to us and obviously has been through these 8 years. Do you have any feeling about the Vietnamese, who have many, many more people never accounted for after this year. Is there anything we can do to help them come to terms?

The President. I think if there is anything that we can do to help them, we ought to do it. Of course, their people mostly died there, in their country. I think that we should always be in a position of doing whatever we can to help them get whatever information or records we might have to resolve anything on their front.

They have let us look at tens of thousands of pages of archives and other pieces of evidence which have helped us to identify hundreds of remains and return them, and we're still working on it. And I think this is something we ought to keep doing together. I think this effort we have undertaken is what made it possible for the veterans groups and the families of the people who are still missing to support this step-by-step advancement in our relationship. And I think it ought to be a two-way street.

Q. Do you have any reason to believe that any Americans remain in captivity in Vietnam, after the last American POW's were released in 1973?

The President. We have no evidence of it. I know there are people who still believe that may be the case. And all I can say is that every time we've gotten any lead, we've done our best to run it down completely, and we will continue to do that.

Q. Nothing has panned out in any of these reported——

The President. Nothing has panned out. You know, I'm like every other American, I think. I've always hoped against hope that a few of them were still there and still alive and that somehow we could find them. But so far all the rumors and all the leads have turned up dead ends. But I would never close the door on that. If there is ever any indication of anything else, I'd be glad to look into it, and I think any subsequent American Government would.

Vietnam-U.S. Relations

Q. How would you describe Vietnam, in terms of its relationship with the United States? Where are we now? Friend? Partner? How would you describe the relationship?

The President. I would say that our relationship is evolving. I think our work on the POW/MIA issue has been quite positive and has improved. I think the interviews that they have done of the people we've asked to be approved for relocation to the United States, they've improved that quite a bit in the last couple of years.

I would say that the trade agreement is a very good thing, for the same reason I thought it was a good thing for us to make the trade agreement with China. It's not as extensive, and it requires year-by-year renewal, and will do so until they meet all the terms of becoming members of the World Trade Organization. But it's a very positive thing.

I hope that we will continue to see some progress there on the human rights issues. There are still political prisoners, religious prisoners that we feel should be released. And I hope they will continue to do that. We've had some—seen some movement there in the last year of the release of some of the Protestants and some Catholics from prison. And I think we have to just keep working on that. And then I hope there will be an opportunity for some educational exchanges. And eventually, I hope that some of the Vietnamese living in America will become part of our ongoing development of relationship, because I think that's kind of the next big step, I think, from our point of view.

Q. What do you mean, that the Vietnamese community would become a bridge to their original home or—what do you mean?

The President. I think that a lot of the Vietnamese living in America, as you know, or as I said, were basically people who were strongly supportive of the position the United States took in the Vietnam war, or their children. But the younger people also want to build a new relationship with Vietnam. They want to see Vietnam modernized. They want to be, I think, eventually reconciled with their relatives or the people that lived in their villages. And I think that over time, we'll see some more contacts there, and that will be positive.

Q. Do you ever reflect on what it means for an American President now to go to the place that symbolized and distorted our politics? You know, for much of a generation—I mean, if you look at Watergate, Watergate could almost be traced to Vietnam. So much happened because of Vietnam. Is this a new chapter? Is this a closing of that door, do you think, in any way?

The President. Well, I think it's a new chapter. The thing that makes America work over time is our ability to visualize new futures and achieve them.

We don't need rose-colored glasses here. We still have differences with the Vietnamese about the form of government they have. But we've decided to approach them the same way we've approached China, the same way we deal with other countries with whom we have continuing differences.

But I think there's a strong sense that it's time to write a new chapter here. This is, after all—this country, the 12th or 13th biggest country in the world. They have about nearly 80 million people, and 60 percent of them are under 30, an enormous percentage of them under 18.

Q. So they know of the war, but they didn't experience it the way we did.

The President. What they know of the war is what they hear their parents talk about or what they'll learn in history books, the same way that our children do, those of us that are of that age. I think that what we want to do is give them a chance to—the Vietnamese a chance to find some greater prosperity, the global economy, and we believe it will bring greater openness to their society and a whole different future for them—a different relationship and a different relationship that will involve the Vietnamese who've come to our county and, on the whole, have done so very well in America and enriched our Nation.

Situation in the Middle East

Q. I was going to ask you if there really is anything left to be done in the Middle East, whether diplomats can now cause what's happening in the streets to stop happening?

The President. I think it depends on whether we can reduce the violence to the point where it's possible to resume negotiations.

Q. Can you do that?

The President. The unbelievable irony of the present situation is, with this level of violence is unfolding in the aftermath of the first serious discussion, official discussion that the Israelis and the Palestinians had, which occurred at Camp David on the serious, difficult final status issues of the Oslo agreement. And I might add, after Camp David, they continued to talk in informal ways. And they know that while there are still differences between them, they are agonizingly close to a resolution of these fundamental issues.

I think they also know that violence begets violence and that in the end they're still going to be neighbors. So they're either going to keep killing each other at varying rates with one side feeling beleaguered, the Israelis, and the others feeling oppressed, the Palestinians, or they're going to come to grips with this and complete the process they agreed to complete when they signed the agreement on the White House lawn in September of 1993.

So that's the frustration. The answer to your question is, yes, there's more that can be done, but I do not believe it can be done with this level of violence going on. I just don't think that's possible.

Q. How do you get control of that—Sharm al-Sheikh, you weren't able to do it there. You've had these——

The President. The Sharm al-Sheikh agreement was perfectly fine. It just hasn't been implemented. So that's why I saw Arafat and Barak this week, and I think within—in this coming week you'll see whether there is going to be any kind of effort to change course.

You know, somebody has got to quit shooting. And I think the demonstrations in the daytime have gone down among the Palestinians, but the nighttime shooting hasn't. I think everyone understands now that it may not be possible for Chairman Arafat to control everything every Palestinian does immediately. It may not be possible for Prime Minister Barak to control everything every Israeli does immediately. But this thing can be reduced dramatically if they want to get back to the negotiating table. I think the Israelis will respond in kind if the Palestinian shootings will diminish now. You know, we had a rough day today, and the Palestinians said it was in retaliation for the shooting of the resistance leader the other day. We'll just have to see what happens.

But the ironic answer to your question is, every time I talk to them, I come away more convinced that we could actually have an agreement if they could free themselves of this cycle of violence and get back to the negotiating table.

And I think if they—I think there's a way to do it, and I'm going to try to see what we can do this week. That's all I can say. I'll do my best.

Q. A secret plan? A Clinton secret plan?

The President. No, I don't have a secret plan. I just think the more I talk about this sort of thing, the harder it is to do.

North Korea

Q. We wanted to ask you about also North Korea. Did the missile talks fail in Malaysia—did they fail to give you what you wanted

to hear? How far apart is that, and what's the prospect of a trip there?

The President. Well, we're making some progress, but we haven't resolved it all. We think it's quite important to work out an arrangement with them in which, one, we stop the missile development—they stop the missile development and the sales of missiles. Now, they obviously need to earn some funds from some other places, and we think there are ways they can do that.

Secondly, we want to keep the North-South dialog going. We strongly support what President Kim Dae-jung did with Chairman Chong-il. We think that was a good thing to do, and we think it ought to continue. And we want to also continue the agreement we made with them early in my term, which ended the nuclear development program, which when I became President, I was told by my predecessors that it was the most serious national security problem we were facing at the time.

So I wouldn't rule out or in a trip, if that's where you're going on this. I just think the most important thing is that we're engaged with them and we're making constructive progress. And I hope we can make more before my tenure is over, because I think it will leave my successor an easier time.

President's Experience in Office

Q. What's your greatest personal satisfaction of your 8 years, as you near the end of them? And what's your greatest personal disappointment?

The President. Oh, that's hard to say; it's hard to say on both counts.

My greatest personal satisfaction, I think, is that our country is in so much better shape than it was 8 years ago and not just economically. I think it's economically probably the strongest it has ever been, but it's also a more equal society. We have incomes rising at all levels for the first time in three decades. We have a big drop in poverty. We have a big drop in crime. We have the welfare rolls cut in half. We have fewer people without health insurance, for the first time in a dozen years.

Performance of our students in the schools is getting better. We have more minority kids taking advanced placement courses and going on to college. And I think in each of these areas we've had policies which have contributed to this.

We also have a real—I think there is more social cohesion, notwithstanding the division of this vote. We've got 150,000 kids serving in AmeriCorps, more than served in the Peace Corps in the first 20 years. We've had, I think, a real attempt to try to bridge the racial divide in this country and deal with those issues and confront a lot of the problems that still exist in America.

So I feel good about both the fact that the country is in better shape and, I think, there is a lot of self-confidence, a sense of possibility in this country. I think in part that explains how free people felt to debate the issues in the last campaign and to make their choices. I'm very, very grateful for that.

And I will leave office with that sense of gratitude, because I think that's what every President wants to do. Every President wants to feel that during his tenure of service, America grew stronger and healthier and better. I feel good about where we are in our relations with the rest of the world. I think we've basically been a force for peace and prosperity.

What is my greatest regret? I may not be able to say yet. I really wanted, with all my heart, to finish the Oslo peace process, because I believe that if Israel and the Palestinians could be reconciled, first the State of Israel would be secure, which is very important to me, personally, and I think to the American people; secondly, the Palestinians would be in control of their own destiny; third, a peace with Syria would follow shortly; and fourth, the Middle East would not only be stable, which is good for America's interests, and not just because of the oil but the forces of progress and prosperity—progress and reconciliation, excuse me—would be stronger in all countries, including Iran. And I felt that I really think this is a sort of linchpin which could lead to a wave of positive developments all across the region. And I think that's very important.

Most of the people in the Middle East are young; there are all these kids out there. What are they going to—are they going to be raised to believe their faith requires them to hate the Israelis and the Americans and anybody else that's not part of their faith and

politics? Are they going to be perpetually poor, even if they have a fairly decent education? Are we going to see that whole region being integrated into a global system and these children having a whole different future, in which they're reconciled with their neighbors in Israel and deeply involved in the world in a positive way? Are they going to be using the Internet to talk to terrorist cells about chemical and biological weapons, or are they going to be using the Internet to figure out how to grow new businesses and have new opportunities and build new futures for their families and their children? So if it doesn't happen I'll be profoundly disappointed, but I'll never regret a minute I spent on it because I think it's very important for the future.

I have never bought the thesis—on an inevitable collision course with the Islamic societies, or that the 21st century had to be dominated by terrorists with highly sophisticated weapons, fueled by broad popular resentment from people who are both disenfranchised and poor. I don't think it has to be that way, and I think if we could really make a big dent in this problem, it would give confidence to the forces of reason and progress throughout the region.

NOTE: The interview was taped at 12:40 a.m. aboard Air Force One en route from Kona, HI, to Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei, and the transcript was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 16. In his remarks, the President referred to Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel; President Kim Dae-jung of South Korea; and Chairman Kim Chong-il of North Korea. A reporter referred to Secretary of State Katherine Harris of Florida. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Proclamation 7377—America Recycles Day, 2000

November 15, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As we look forward to Thanksgiving, our annual celebration of America's great bounty, it is appropriate to observe America Recycles Day and focus on how to preserve that bounty for the benefit of future generations.

Recycling waste and purchasing products made from recycled materials are among the easiest and most effective measures every American can take to conserve our resources and create a cleaner environment. Currently, our country recovers more than 28 percent of the billions of pounds of waste generated by Americans annually—an effort that translates into enough savings to supply the energy needs of 9 million U.S. households. But the recycling process succeeds only when recovered materials are returned to retailers as new products that are purchased by consumers; otherwise, the recycled products themselves must be disposed of as waste.

Buying recycled products conserves resources, reduces water and air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, and saves energy. While beneficial for the environment, the recycling process is good for our economy as well. By promoting the development of markets for recycled products, we are also creating new jobs, many of which are in America's inner cities, where job creation is particularly critical. It is estimated that while incinerating 10,000 tons of waste creates 1 job, and landfilling the same amount creates 6 jobs, recycling the same 10,000 tons creates 36 jobs. Nationwide, recycling and remanufacturing provide 1 million jobs and $100 billion in revenue.

To ensure the Federal Government's leadership in the recycling effort, I signed an Executive Order in 1998 directing all Federal agencies to expand and strengthen their commitment to recycling and buying recycled-content and environmentally preferable products. The Federal Government now purchases more than $350 million in recycled-content products annually—an increase of $112 million a year, or 30 percent, from just a decade ago.

America Recycles Day helps us to build on this progress by uniting environmental and community organizations, business and industry, and agencies at all levels of government as partners in the vital effort to keep recycling working. By encouraging every business and consumer in America to start or enhance recycling efforts and to buy recycled-content products, we can sustain our

economy, improve our environment, and preserve our precious natural resources for the sake of generations to come.

Now, Therefore, I, Wiliiam J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim November 15, 2000, as America Recycles Day. I urge all Americans to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities and to take personal responsibility for the environment not only by recycling, but also by choosing to purchase and use products made from recycled materials.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifteenth day of November, 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, 11:02 a.m., November 16, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 16, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on November 17.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Prime Minister Yoshiro Mori of Japan in Bandar Seri Begawan

November 16, 2000

APEC Summit

Q. Mr. President, are you disappointed at the lack of consensus on free trade at APEC?

The President. I might have more to say about that before we go. Don't be too discouraged.

2000 Presidential Election

Q. How about the Florida court ruling, sir?

The President. I'm over here, so I'm not sure what it means. It's obviously going to have to be interpreted now, since the two sides have a different reading on it.

Q. How about the secretary of state denying the hand recount?

The President. I'm over here doing this work; I don't think I should get involved in that. The American people deserve a full and fair count, and I hope the process will produce it. And they're over there debating it in the appropriate way. I shouldn't be involved in that.

Q. Should Gore and Bush meet?

The President. What?

Q. Should Gore and Bush meet?

The President. I don't think I should be involved in that.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:20 p.m. at the Royal Brunei Golf Club. In his remarks, the President referred to Republican Presidential candidate Gov. George W. Bush. A reporter referred to Florida Secretary of State Katherine Harris. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Jiang Zemin of China in Bandar Seri Begawan

November 16, 2000

2000 Presidential Election

Q. President Clinton, do you feel the chaos in Florida makes it difficult for the U.S. to criticize other countries' elections?

The President. Well, first of all, they're having their—let's wait and see how it's resolved here. I think that there will be a lot of pressure to improve the form and ballots and the methods in voting and have more clear standards around the country. But I think as long as this thing is resolved in a way that people perceive as fair and having counted everybody's vote who lawfully went to the polls to vote—I think that it shouldn't be surprising if over 100 million people vote and the result is close—it takes a while to resolve. It depends on whether the people perceive it's fair when it's over.

China-U.S. Relations

Q. Mr. President, what message do you have for your successor on U.S.-China relations?

The President. That I believe we have made some real progress in developing a mature, honest, and open relationship that is basically quite positive. And I'm very pleased that the Congress approved the permanent

normal trading relations and that China's going into the World Trade Organization. I'm very pleased that the work we've done together on nonproliferation and a host of other items, and I think we should continue to build on this relationship. I think it's very important for the United States. And I hope that we'll continue to be active across a whole broad range of issues, including through this organization, to build a common economic future. That would be my message.

You probably want to know more about it than my successor will.

NOTE: The exchange began at 5:53 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the Orchid Garden Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Joint Statement by President Bill Clinton and Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong on a United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement

November 16, 2000

The United States of America (USA) and Singapore have agreed to start negotiations on a bilateral Free Trade Agreement (FTA).

USA and Singapore are both firm supporters of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), and are committed to APEC's Bogor Goals of free and open trade and investment by 2010 for industrialized economies and 2020 for developing economies.

The USA and Singapore reaffirm their strong commitment to the multilateral trading system and the launch of a New Round in 2001.

The FTA will be modeled after the US-Jordan FTA.

We have directed Ambassador Charlene Barshefsky and Minister George Yeo to endeavor to conclude negotiations before the end of the year.

NOTE: The joint statement referred to Minister of Trade and Industry Yong Boon George Yeo of Singapore. An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

Statement on Signing the FSC Repeal and Extraterritorial Income Exclusion Act of 2000

November 15, 2000

Today I am pleased to sign into law H.R. 4986, the "FSC Repeal and Extraterritorial Income Exclusion Act of 2000." This legislation is necessary to address a World Trade Organization Appellate Body finding that the Foreign Sales Corporation (FSC) provisions of U.S. tax law violated the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, and the Agreement on Agriculture. Enactment of this legislation is possible due to extraordinary bipartisan cooperation between the Congress and my Administration and the strong involvement of the business community.

Never before has the United States had to enact legislation—and particularly legislation in the sensitive field of taxation policy—in order to implement the findings of a dispute settlement panel of the World Trade Organization (WTO). We believe that this legislation specifically addresses the concerns raised by the WTO Appellate Body and will be found to be WTO-compliant.

Under a procedural agreement reached between the European Union and the United States, enactment of this legislation will avoid an immediate confrontation with the EU by ensuring that the World Trade Organization must review the new law before any decision authorizing retaliation may be made. We plan to continue working with the EU to manage this difference of views responsibly and to avoid any harm to our strong bilateral relationship, and we remain open to further discussions with the EU about resolving this issue.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
November 15, 2000.

NOTE: At the time of publication, H.R. 4986, approved November 15, had not been received by the Office of the Federal Register in time for assignment of a public law number. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 17.

Proclamation 7378—National Great American Smokeout Day, 2000

November 15, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

In the 24 years since the American Cancer Society organized the first Great American Smokeout, our country has made encouraging progress in our battle to reduce the devastating human and economic toll that tobacco products take on our society. Today we have a more comprehensive understanding of the dangers of tobacco use and the sophisticated marketing tactics used by tobacco companies, and we have developed more effective methods for helping people break their addiction to tobacco products.

Despite the progress we have made, tobacco remains the leading cause of preventable death in our Nation, with more than 400,000 casualties from tobacco-related illness each year. Since the first report of the Surgeon General on smoking and health was issued in 1964, 10 million Americans have died from causes attributed to smoking. More than 50 million Americans are currently addicted to tobacco. Every day, another 3,000 young Americans become regular smokers; of these, nearly 1,000 will die prematurely.

A recent study funded by the National Institutes of Health has shown that young people become addicted to nicotine much more quickly than we previously thought. Adolescents who smoke as infrequently as once a month still experience symptoms of addiction. That is why my Administration has urged the Congress to raise the tax on cigarettes and grant authority to the Food and Drug Administration to limit tobacco marketing and sales to youth. I have also called on all the States to devote a substantial portion of their tobacco settlement funds to reduce youth smoking. Currently, tobacco companies are spending nearly $7 billion a year to market their products, dramatically more than the Federal Government and all 50 States combined are spending on tobacco prevention and cessation programs.

My Administration has also joined with the American Cancer Society and other public health organizations in calling for public and private health plans to provide coverage for and access to proven tobacco cessation methods. We know that helping people quit smoking produces immediate and long-term health benefits—saving money and saving lives.

National Great American Smokeout Day presents all of us with the opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to the health and safety of all Americans. Smokers who quit smoking for the duration of the day can lead by example and take the first crucial step toward better health. Nonsmokers can teach children about the dangers of using tobacco and strengthen our Nation's efforts to eliminate young people's exposure to secondhand smoke.Through efforts like the Great American Smokeout and the implementation of proven tobacco prevention programs, we are moving toward my Administration's goal of cutting smoking rates among teens and adults in half within the decade.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim November 16, 2000, as national Great American Smokeout Day. I call upon all Americans to join together in an effort to educate our children about the dangers of tobacco use and to take this opportunity to practice a healthy lifestyle that sets a positive example for young people.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifteenth day of November, 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., November 20, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on November 17, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on November 21.

Remarks at Vietnam National University in Hanoi, Vietnam

November 17, 2000

Thank you very much, and good afternoon. I can think of no more fitting place to begin my visit at this hopeful moment in our common history than here at Hanoi National University. I was given a Vietnamese phrase; I am going to try to say it. If I mess it up, feel free to laugh at me. *Xin chao cac ban.*[1]

So much of the promise of this youthful nation is embodied with you. I learned that you have exchanges here with students from nearly 100 universities, from Canada to France to Korea, and that you are now hosting more than a dozen full-time students from your partner school in the United States, the University of California. I salute your vigorous efforts to engage the world.

Of course, like students everywhere, I know you have things to think about other than your studies. For example, in September you had to study for your classes and watch the Olympic accomplishments of Tran Hieu Ngan in Sydney. And this week you have to study and cheer Le Huynh Duc and Nguyen Hong Son in Bangkok at the football matches.

I am honored to be the first American President to see Hanoi and to visit this university. But I do so conscious that the histories of our two nations are deeply intertwined in ways that are both a source of pain for generations that came before and a source of promise for generations yet to come.

Two centuries ago, during the early days of the United States, we reached across the seas for partners in trade, and one of the first nations we encountered was Vietnam. In fact, one of our Founding Fathers, Thomas Jefferson, tried to obtain rice seed from Vietnam to grow on his farm in Virginia 200 years ago. By the time World War II arrived, the United States had become a significant consumer of export from Vietnam. In 1945, at the moment of your country's birth, the words of Thomas Jefferson were chosen to be echoed in your own Declaration of Independence: "All men are created equal. The Creator has given us certain inviolable rights—the right to life, the right to be free, the right to achieve happiness."

Of course, all of this common history, 200 years of it, has been obscured in the last few decades by the conflict we call the Vietnam war and you call the American war. You may know that in Washington, DC, on our National Mall, there is a stark black granite wall engraved with the name of every single American who died in Vietnam. At this solemn memorial, some American veterans also refer to the "other side of the wall," the staggering sacrifice of the Vietnamese people on both sides of that conflict, more than 3 million brave soldiers and civilians.

This shared suffering has given our countries a relationship unlike any other. Because of the conflict, America is now home to one million Americans of Vietnamese ancestry. Because of the conflict, 3 million American veterans served in Vietnam, as did many journalists, embassy personnel, aid workers, and others who are forever connected to your country.

Almost 20 years ago now, a group of American servicemen took the first step to reestablish contacts between the United States and Vietnam. They traveled back to Vietnam for the first time since the war, and as they walked through the streets of Hanoi, they were approached by Vietnamese citizens who had heard of their visit. "Are you the American soldiers?" they asked. Not sure what to expect, our veterans answered, "Yes, we are." And to their immense relief, their hosts simply said, "Welcome to Vietnam."

More veterans followed, including distinguished American veterans and heroes who serve now in the United States Congress: Senator John McCain, Senator Bob Kerrey, Senator Chuck Robb, and Senator John Kerry from Massachusetts, who is here with me today, along with a number of Representatives from our Congress, some of whom are veterans of the Vietnam conflict.

When they came here, they were determined to honor those who fought, without refighting the battles; to remember our history, but not to perpetuate it; to give young people like you in both our countries the chance to live in your tomorrows, not in our yesterdays. As Ambassador Pete Peterson has

[1] Hello, everybody.

said so eloquently, "We cannot change the past. What we can change is the future."

Our new relationship gained strength as American veterans launched nonprofit organizations to work on behalf of the Vietnamese people, such as providing devices to people with war injuries to help them lead more normal lives. Vietnam's willingness to help us return the remains of our fallen servicemen to their families has been the biggest boost to improve ties. And there are many Americans here who have worked in that endeavor for many years now, including our Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Hershel Gober.

The desire to be reunited with a lost family member is something we all understand. It touches the hearts of Americans to know that every Sunday in Vietnam, one of your most-watched television shows features families seeking viewers' help in finding loved ones they lost in the war so long ago now. And we are grateful for the Vietnamese villagers who have helped us to find our missing and, therefore, to give their families the peace of mind that comes with knowing what actually happened to their loved ones.

No two nations have ever before done the things we are doing together to find the missing from the Vietnam conflict. Teams of Americans and Vietnamese work together, sometimes in tight and dangerous places. The Vietnamese Government has offered us access to files and Government information to assist our search. And in turn, we have been able to give Vietnam almost 400,000 pages of documents that could assist in your search. On this trip, I have brought with me another 350,000 pages of documents that I hope will help Vietnamese families find out what happened to their missing loved ones.

Today I was honored to present these to your President, Tran Duc Luong. And I told him, before the year is over, America will provide another million pages of documents. We will continue to offer our help and to ask for your help as we both honor our commitment to do whatever we can for as long as it takes to achieve the fullest possible accounting of our loved ones.

Your cooperation in that mission over these last 8 years has made it possible for America to support international lending to Vietnam, to resume trade between our countries, to establish formal diplomatic relations and, this year, to sign a pivotal trade agreement.

Finally, America is coming to see Vietnam as your people have asked for years, as a country, not a war, a country with the highest literacy rate in Southeast Asia, a country whose young people just won three gold medals at the International Math Olympiad in Seoul, a country of gifted, hard-working entrepreneurs emerging from years of conflict and uncertainty to shape a bright future.

Today the United States and Vietnam open a new chapter in our relationship, at a time when people all across the world trade more, travel more, know more about and talk more with each other than ever before. Even as people take pride in their national independence, we know we are becoming more and more interdependent. The movement of people, money, and ideas across borders, frankly, breeds suspicion among many good people in every country. They are worried about globalization because of its unsettling and unpredictable consequences.

Yet, globalization is not something we can hold off or turn off. It is the economic equivalent of a force of nature, like wind or water. We can harness wind to fill a sail. We can use water to generate energy. We can work hard to protect people and property from storms and floods. But there is no point in denying the existence of wind or water, or trying to make them go away. The same is true for globalization. We can work to maximize its benefits and minimize its risks, but we cannot ignore it, and it is not going away.

In the last decade, as the volume of world trade has doubled, investment flows from wealthy nations to developing ones have increased by 6 times, from $25 billion in 1990 to more than $150 billion in 1998. Nations that have opened their economies to the international trading system have grown at least twice as fast as nations with closed economies. Your next job may well depend on foreign trade and investment. Come to think of it, since I have to leave office in about 8 weeks, my next job may depend on foreign trade and investment.

Over the last 15 years, Vietnam launched its policy of *doi moi,* joined APEC and

ASEAN, normalized relations with the European Union and the United States, and disbanded collective farming, freeing farmers to grow what they want and earn the fruits of their own labor. The results were impressive proof of the power of your markets and the abilities of your people. You not only conquered malnutrition; you became the world's second-largest exporter of rice and achieved stronger overall economic growth.

Of course, in recent years the rate of growth has slowed and foreign investment has declined here, showing that any attempt to remain isolated from the risks of a global economy also guarantees isolation from its rewards, as well.

General Secretary Le Kha Phieu said this summer, and I quote, "We have yet to achieve the level of development commensurate with the possibilities of our country. And there is only one way to further open up the economy." So this summer, in what I believe will be seen as a pivotal step toward your future prosperity, Vietnam joined the United States in signing an historic bilateral trade agreement, building a foundation for Vietnam's entry eventually into the World Trade Organization.

Under the agreement, Vietnam will grant to its citizens, and over time to citizens of other countries, rights to import, export, and distribute goods, giving the Vietnamese people expanding rights to determine their own economic destiny. Vietnam has agreed it will subject important decisions to the rule of law and the international trading system, increase the flow of information to its people, and accelerate the rise of a free economy and the private sector.

Of course, this will be good for Vietnam's foreign partners, like the United States. But it will be even better for Vietnam's own entrepreneurs, who are working hard to build businesses of their own. Under this agreement, Vietnam could be earning, according to the World Bank, another $1.5 billion each and every year from exports alone.

Both our nations were born with a Declaration of Independence. This trade agreement is a form of declaration of interdependence, a clear, unequivocal statement that prosperity in the 21st century depends upon a nation's economic engagement in the rest of the world.

This new openness is a great opportunity for you, but it does not guarantee success. What else should be done? Vietnam is such a young country, with 60 percent of your population under the age of 30, and 1.4 million new people entering your work force every year. Your leaders realize that government and state-owned businesses cannot generate 1.4 million new jobs every year. They know that the industries driving the global economy today—computers, telecommunications, biotechnology—these are all based on knowledge. That is why economies all over the world grow faster when young people stay in school longer, when women have the same educational opportunities that men have, when young people like you have every opportunity to explore new ideas and then to turn those ideas into your own business opportunities.

You can be—indeed, those of you in this hall today must be—the engine of Vietnam's future prosperity. As President Tran Duc Luong has said, the internal strength of the country is the intellect and capacity of its people.

The United States has great respect for your intellect and capacity. One of our Government's largest educational exchange programs is with Vietnam, and we want to do more. Senator Kerry is right there, and I mentioned him earlier—is leading an effort in our United States Congress, along with Senator John McCain and other veterans of the conflict here, to establish a new Vietnam Education Foundation. Once enacted, the foundation would support 100 fellowships every year, either here or in the United States, for people to study or teach science, math, technology, and medicine.

We're ready to put more funding in our exchange programs now so this effort can get underway immediately. I hope some of you in this room will have a chance to take part. And I want to thank Senator Kerry for this great idea. Thank you, sir, for what you have done.

Let me say, as important as knowledge is, the benefits of knowledge are necessarily limited by undue restrictions on its use. We Americans believe the freedom to explore,

to travel, to think, to speak, to shape decisions that affect our lives enrich the lives of individuals and nations in ways that go far beyond economics.

Now, America's record is not perfect in this area. After all, it took us almost a century to banish slavery. It took us even longer to give women the right to vote. And we are still seeking to live up to the more perfect Union of our Founders' dreams and the words of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution. But along the way over these 226 years—224 years—we've learned some lessons. For example, we have seen that economies work better where newspapers are free to expose corruption and independent courts can ensure that contracts are honored, that competition is robust and fair, that public officials honor the rule of law.

In our experience, guaranteeing the right to religious worship and the right to political dissent does not threaten the stability of a society. Instead, it builds people's confidence in the fairness of our institutions and enables us to take it when a decision goes in a way we don't agree with. All this makes our country stronger in good times and bad. In our experience, young people are much more likely to have confidence in their future if they have a say in shaping it, in choosing their governmental leaders and having a government that is accountable to those it serves.

Now, let me say emphatically, we do not seek to impose these ideals, nor could we. Vietnam is an ancient and enduring country. You have proved to the world that you will make your own decisions. Only you can decide, for example, if you will continue to share Vietnam's talents and ideas with the world, if you will continue to open Vietnam so that you can enrich it with the insights of others. Only you can decide if you will continue to open your markets, open your society, and strengthen the rule of law. Only you can decide how to weave individual liberties and human rights into the rich and strong fabric of Vietnamese national identity.

Your future should be in your hands, the hands of the Vietnam people. But your future is important to the rest of us, as well. For as Vietnam succeeds, it will benefit this region and your trading partners and your friends throughout the world.

We are eager to increase our cooperation with you across the board. We want to continue our work to clear landmines and unexploded ordnance. We want to strengthen our common efforts to protect the environment by phasing out leaded gasoline in Vietnam, maintaining a clean water supply, saving coral reefs and tropical forests. We want to bolster our efforts on disaster relief and prevention, including our efforts to help those suffering from the floods in the Mekong Delta. Yesterday we presented to your Government satellite imagery from our Global Disaster Information Network, images that show in great detail the latest flood levels on the Delta, that can help Vietnam to rebuild.

We want to accelerate our cooperation in science, cooperation focused this month on our meeting in Singapore to study together the health and ecological effects of dioxin on the people of Vietnam and the Americans who were in Vietnam, and cooperation that we are advancing further with the science and technology agreement our two countries signed just today.

We want to be your ally in the fight against killer diseases like AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. I am glad to announce that we will nearly double our support of Vietnam's efforts to contain the AIDS crisis through education, prevention, care, and treatment. We want to work with you to make Vietnam a safer place by giving you help to reduce preventable injuries on the streets, at home, and in the workplace. We want to work with you to make the most of this trade agreement by providing technical assistance to assure its full and smooth implementation, and finding ways to encourage greater United States investment in your country.

We are, in short, eager to build our partnership with Vietnam. We believe it's good for both our nations.

We believe the Vietnamese people have the talent to succeed in this new global age, as they have in the past. We know it because we've seen the progress you have made in this last decade. We have seen the talent and ingenuity of the Vietnamese who have come to settle in America. Vietnamese-Americans have become elected officials, judges, leaders in science and in our high-tech industry. Last

year a Vietnamese-American achieved a mathematical breakthrough that will make it easier to conduct high-quality videoconferencing. And all America took notice when Hoang Nhu Tran graduated number one in his class at the United States Air Force Academy.

Vietnamese-Americans have flourished not just because of their unique abilities and their good values but also because they have had the opportunity to make the most of their abilities and their values. As your opportunities grow, to live, to learn, to express your creativity, there will be no stopping the people of Vietnam. And you will find, I am certain, that the American people will be by your side. For in this interdependent world, we truly do have a stake in your success.

Almost 200 years ago, at the beginning of the relations between the United States and Vietnam, our two nations made many attempts to negotiate a treaty of commerce, sort of like the trade agreement that we signed today. But 200 years ago, they all failed, and no treaty was concluded. Listen to what one historian said about what happened 200 years ago, and think how many times it could have been said in the two centuries since. He said, "These efforts failed because two distant cultures were talking past each other, and the importance of each to the other was insufficient to overcome these barriers."

Let the days when we talk past each other be gone for good. Let us acknowledge our importance to one another. Let us continue to help each other heal the wounds of war, not by forgetting the bravery shown and the tragedy suffered by all sides but by embracing the spirit of reconciliation and the courage to build better tomorrows for our children.

May our children learn from us that good people, through respectful dialog, can discover and rediscover their common humanity and that a painful, painful past can be redeemed in a peaceful and prosperous future.

Thank you for welcoming me and my family and our American delegation to Vietnam. Thank you for your faith in the future. *Chuc cac ban suc khoe va thanh cong.*[2]

[2] May you have health and success.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:50 p.m. in the auditorium of the university. In his remarks, he referred to Hieu Ngan Tran, Vietnamese Olympic silver medalist in tae kwon do; Vietnamese national soccer team members Le Huynh Duc and Nguyen Hong Son; and Lt. Gen. Le Kha Phieu, secretary general, Vietnam Communist Party. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary included the English translation of the Vietnamese phrases. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on Signing Legislation To Establish National Birmingham Pledge Week

November 17, 2000

Recently I signed into law House Joint Resolution 102, designating National Birmingham Pledge Week. This resolution recognizes that the Birmingham Pledge is making a significant contribution in fostering racial harmony and reconciliation in the United States and around the world. By signing the pledge, signatories state their belief in the worth of every individual, that every person is entitled to dignity and respect regardless or race or color, and that every act of racial prejudice is harmful to all. Those who sign pledge themselves to actively discourage racial prejudice in themselves and others. They recognize that in honoring this pledge, they are making the world a better place.

It is entirely fitting that this pledge began in the city of Birmingham, a place of some of our most painful racial strife. We remember in particular the September 15, 1963, bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church and the death of four children there. We know that the conflicts of the past are not fully resolved today and that we have new challenges before us. The United States is now more diverse than ever in terms of race, ethnic groups, and religion. At the same time, our world is witness to a resurgence of society's oldest demon, the inability to love our neighbors as ourselves.

In my lifetime, our Nation has never had the chance we now have to build the future of our dreams for our children. To do it, we

will have to embrace our common humanity with humility and gratitude.

Hillary and I were proud to sign the Birmingham Pledge in 1998. We applaud this effort to recognize its importance nationally. We urge all Americans to use National Birmingham Pledge Week as a powerful tool for helping to build the future of our dreams for all our children, a dream of one America.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 102, approved November 9, was assigned Public Law No. 106–483.

Statement on the Death of Hosea Williams

November 17, 2000

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the death of an American foot soldier for freedom and a driving force for the Voting Rights Act, Hosea Williams. From his bravery in the fields of battle in World War II to his leadership in the civil rights struggle at home, Hosea Williams was a profile in courage. One of the greatest honors of my Presidency was walking across the Edmund Pettus Bridge with him on the 35th anniversary of the Selma march earlier this year. Hosea Williams dedicated his entire life to making sure we never take a detour on the road to freedom. He helped us all cross the bridge to a better and more just world. With his memory as a guide, we'll keep marching on. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends.

Statement on Signing Legislation To Establish a Memorial and Gardens in Honor of Frederick Douglass

November 17, 2000

I recently signed into law H.R. 5331, a bill "To authorize the Frederick Douglass Gardens, Inc., to establish a memorial and gardens on Department of the Interior lands in the District of Columbia or its environs in honor and commemoration of Frederick Douglass."

It is appropriate that the memorial and gardens be located in Washington, DC, the Nation's Capital, as Mr. Douglass' life was a testament to the democratic principles upon which the Nation was founded. Born into slavery, Frederick Douglass became a renowned international spokesman for liberty, the abolition of slavery, and social reform. Throughout his life, he was a noted publisher of several periodicals and papers in which he discussed the political and social disenfranchisement of Americans of African ancestry. As an American truly committed to the Nation's progress toward the attainment of liberty and justice for all, Frederick Douglass recruited African-Americans for the Union Army during the Civil War; two of his sons served in the 54th Massachusetts Regiment, which was solely comprised of African-Americans. Moreover, Frederick Douglass served as the president of the Freedmen's National Bank, the U.S. Marshal for the District of Columbia, and in several diplomatic positions in Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Because of his unyielding faith in and his commitment to the fundamental democratic principles of our Nation, I am pleased to approve this legislation honoring one of the Nation's great citizens.

NOTE: H.R. 5331, approved November 9, was assigned Public Law No. 106–479.

Remarks to the American Embassy Community in Hanoi

November 17, 2000

The President. Thank you very much. I want to thank Senator Kerry for what he said and for what he's done all these years and for being a wonderful friend to Hillary and me in many, many ways. And I want to thank Sandy Berger and our whole team in the White House and State Department for supporting this trip from the beginning. And I want to associate myself with what Hillary said—now that she's going to be a Senator, I can just let her give the speeches, and I can say, "I completely agree." And that will save everyone from having to hear two speeches. [*Laughter*]

But I do want to say a couple of things, if I might. First, I, too, want to thank you for the endless hours you have put in in preparation for this trip and for the work you have

done representing our Nation here in Vietnam. I want to thank especially the Vietnamese nationals who work at our Embassy and who, therefore, embody this new partnership we have worked so hard to build these last several years.

We started this process of reconstructing our relationship a long time ago, and I have been working at it now, with the people on this stage and others, for at least 8 years. And I'm very grateful to all of them. But I want to take my time tonight to say a special word of thanks to Pete Peterson.

Most everybody, I guess, in Vietnam knows that he was a fighter pilot here, that he was a prisoner of war here. You may know that his wife was 9 months pregnant with their third child when he came here. He was supposed to fly 100 missions, and he was shot down two-thirds of the way through. And by the time he got home, his son was 6 years old.

What you may not know is that when I met him, he was a Congressman from northern Florida, and he represented a district in which, I promise you, he was the only American in my party who would have ever been elected from that district. [*Laughter*] Otherwise, any normal person would have had to be a member of the other party.

And I remember the times we spent driving through his congressional district, talking about his commitment to public service and talking about how desperately he wanted us to have a new relation with Vietnam and how he wanted to embody that, going beyond.

So when the time came for a new Ambassador to be named, I literally only considered one person. America has, I don't know how many, 270-something million people; I only considered one person to be our Ambassador to Vietnam, and Pete agreed to do it.

Now, he gave all those speeches about letting go of the past and looking toward the future, and all we can change is the future. So he—one thing I like about Pete is, he always practices what he preaches. So he comes to Vietnam, meets Vi Le, and starts a new life. So you are the embodiment, madam, of the future for Pete, and we thank you, and we thank you for what you have done.

He traveled all over Vietnam, just like he traveled all over America, promoting this relationship. He worked on the POW/MIA issue. He worked to advance the economy of Vietnam. Three times he led the lobbying to get our Congress to support our Jackson-Vanik waiver. His enthusiasm is completely infectious.

I understand, Pete, today that CNN and BBC carried the signing of our bilateral trade agreement live at 3 a.m. Hanoi, and watch parties were held all over town. Now, that's pretty amazing.

I also want to thank him for the work he did to prevent injuries and accidents here with his safety campaign. And I want to express my sympathies, because I understand after you started this safety campaign, a mischievous television film crew caught you in a rare moment riding your motorcycle without a helmet. [*Laughter*] Now, that's something all of us who have been in public life can identify with. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank you for befriending the villagers in the area where you were shot down and joining them to inaugurate a school. And I want to thank those of you who work in this Embassy, especially those of you who have extended your tours from 2 years to 3. I want to thank the members of the American business community, apparently who have signed a resolution cautioning the new President not to change the Ambassador in Hanoi. [*Laughter*] That's good advice to the new President. [*Laughter*]

One of the most famous sayings of the Buddha is, "Never does hatred by hatred cease; hatred ceases by love alone." This is an eternal law. Even eternal laws have to be made real in the lives of particular people, and that is a law which has been made real in the life and service of Pete Peterson.

He doesn't know I'm going to do this today, but the Ambassador has been honored for his military service with the Silver Star, the Purple Heart, and the Legion of Merit for heroism in the uniform of his country. I think his service as Ambassador to Vietnam is the most important service he has ever rendered to the United States. And so, in the presence of all of his co-workers and friends and many of their rambunctious children, which makes it even better, I am going to

award Pete Peterson with the President's Citizen's Medal. And I would like the commander to read the citation and then bring the medal up here so I can give it to Pete.

[*At this point, Lt. Comdr. Pat DeQuattro, USCG, Coast Guard Aide to the President, read the citation, and the President presented the medal to Ambassador Peterson. The Ambassador then made brief remarks.*]

The President. Thank you all very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7 p.m. in the Ballroom at the Daewoo Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador Peterson's Vietnamese wife, Vi Le. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of Ambassador Peterson. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a State Dinner Hosted by President Tran Duc Luong of Vietnam in Hanoi

November 17, 2000

Mr. President, Madam Luong, distinguished representatives of the Vietnamese Government, ladies and gentlemen: Let me thank you for your welcome to me and to my family and to our entire American delegation.

We are honored to join you in writing a new chapter in the relationship between the United States and Vietnam and grateful that this chapter has a happy beginning. Yes, the history we leave behind is painful and hard. We must not forget it, but we must not be controlled by it. The past is only what precedes the future, not what determines it.

America and Vietnam are making a new history today. A generation from now, people will look back on this time and see the American veterans who came back to Vietnam searching for answers about the past and the Vietnamese who enlisted them in building a common future. They will see the young Vietnamese students, eager to absorb all the world has to offer, and the young Americans who have come here to learn with them. They will see the entrepreneurs and the scientists and the conservationists and the artists, forging links between Vietnam and the world.

In short, people will look back and reach the same conclusion as the great Vietnamese statesman Nguyen Trai when he said 500 years ago, "After so many years of war, only life remains."

Today, our people face a changing world and a changing life together, with the same basic aspirations and even some of the same worries. How can we seize the opportunities of a global economy while avoiding its turmoil? How can we open our doors to new ideas while protecting our traditions, our cultures, our way of life?

Globalization is bringing the world to Vietnam and also bringing Vietnam to the world. Films about life in Vietnam, from "The Scent of the Green Papaya" to "The Three Seasons" are winning awards all over the globe. The paintings of the Vietnamese artist Do Quang Em command fortunes at international art shows. The 200-year-old poems of Ho Xuan Huong are published in America, in English, in Vietnamese, and even in the original Nom, the first time ancient Vietnamese script has come off a printing press. Fashion designers like Armani and Calvin Klein base new collections on the traditional Vietnamese dress, the *ao dai*. Americans are tasting lemon grass, garlic chives, and even bitter melon, all of which, by the way, grow on a Vietnamese farm in our State of Virginia, just a 20-minute drive from the White House.

Mr. President, globalization also means that on the Internet, Americans can read the latest Vietnamese financial news or learn about the challenges in restoring Hanoi's Old Quarter or support the organizations working to preserve new species being found in the central highlands. It means we can download fonts in the Vietnamese language. Indeed, before long, sophisticated translation technologies will make the Internet a force for linguistic diversity, not uniformity.

When we open our doors, we not only let new ideas in; we let the talent and creativity and potential of our people out. That, too, will come to Vietnam. After just one day in your country, I am certain there will be no stopping the people of Vietnam as they gain the chance to realize their full potential. The people of the United States are happy that the time has come when we can be partners.

As "The Tale of Kieu" foretold, "Just as the lotus wilts, the mums bloom forth; time softens grief; and the winter turns to spring."

Now the frozen images of the past have begun to thaw. The outlines of a warmer shared future have begun to take shape. Let us make the most of this new spring together.

I ask you to join me in a toast to the President of Vietnam, to Madam Luong, to the people of this great country, and to our future friendship together.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:38 p.m. at the Presidential Palace. In his remarks, he referred to President Luong's wife, Nguyen Thi Vinh.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

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

November 11

In the morning, the President attended a Veterans Day breakfast in the Blue Room at the White House, and later, he traveled to Arlington, VA, where he participated in a wreath-laying ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknowns at Arlington National Cemetery. In the afternoon, he returned to Washington, DC.

November 12

In the afternoon, the President met with Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel in the Oval Office Dining Room at the White House.

November 13

In the morning, the President and Chelsea Clinton traveled to Kona, HI. In the afternoon, he met with Gov. Benjamin J. Cayetano of Hawaii. Later, the President and Chelsea Clinton traveled to Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei, arriving the next evening.

November 14

Upon his arrival in Brunei, the President had a telephone conversation with Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority concerning the Middle East peace process.

November 15

In the evening, the President attended a dinner for APEC leaders in the Plenary Hall of the International Convention Center.

November 16

In the afternoon, the President attended a luncheon for APEC leaders in the Dining Room of the Royal Brunei Golf Club. In the evening, he traveled to Hanoi, Vietnam.

November 17

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton participated in a welcoming ceremony at the Presidential Palace and met with President Tran Duc Luong of Vietnam in Room B of the Presidential Palace and participated in an agreement-signing ceremony with President Luong in Room A of the palace. Later, the President toured the Temple of Literature, and in the afternoon, he met with Prime Minister Phan Van Khai of Vietnam in the Receiving Room of the Government Guest House.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

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

Submitted November 14

Larry Carp,
of Missouri, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the 55th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Richard N. Gardner,
of New York, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the 55th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Jay T. Snyder,
of New York, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the 55th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

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

Released November 11

Announcement: Highlights of the APEC Leaders' Meetings

Released November 13

Statement by the Press Secretary on the release of newly declassified and other documents related to events in Chile from 1968 to 1991

Statement by the Press Secretary announcing that First Lady Hillary Clinton will travel to Israel to represent the President at the funeral of Leah Rabin

Released November 15

Transcript of a telephone press briefing by Ambassador Douglas Peterson on the President's trip to Vietnam

Transcript of a press briefing by Wendy Sherman, Special Adviser to the President and Policy Coordinator on North Korea

Transcript of a press briefing by National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling on the APEC Summit

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Jake Siewert

Fact sheet: President Clinton and APEC Leaders: Working Together To Meet the Challenges of the 21st Century New Economy

Fact sheet: President Clinton and APEC Partners Announce Multilateral "Open Skies" Aviation Agreement

Announcement: Official Delegation Accompanying the President to Brunei and Vietnam

Released November 17

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Adviser Samuel Berger on the President's visit to Vietnam

Transcript of a press briefing by Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for POW and Missing Personnel Bob Jones and Lt. Col. Franklin Childress on a Joint Task Force-Full Accounting excavation site

Fact sheet: Expanding Cooperation Between the United States and Vietnam

Acts Approved by the President

Approved November 9

H.R. 1235 / Public Law 106–467
To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the Solano County Water Agency, California, to use Solano Project facilities for impounding, storage, and carriage of nonproject water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes

H.R. 2780 / Public Law 106–468
Kristen's Act

H.R. 2884 / Public Law 106–469
Energy Act of 2000

H.R. 4312 / Public Law 106–470
Upper Housatonic National Heritage Area Study Act of 2000

H.R. 4646 / Public Law 106–471
To designate certain National Forest System lands within the boundaries of the State of Virginia as wilderness areas

H.R. 4788 / Public Law 106–472
Grain Standards and Warehouse Improvement Act of 2000

H.R. 4794 / Public Law 106–473
Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Heritage Act of 2000

H.R. 4846 / Public Law 106–474
National Recording Preservation Act of 2000

H.R. 4864 / Public Law 106–475
Veterans Claims Assistance Act of 2000

H.R. 4868 / Public Law 106–476
Tariff Suspension and Trade Act of 2000

H.R. 5110 / Public Law 106–477
To designate the United States courthouse located at 3470 12th Street in Riverside, California, as the "George E. Brown, Jr. United States Courthouse"

H.R. 5302 / Public Law 106–478
To designate the United States courthouse located at 1010 Fifth Avenue in Seattle, Washington, as the "William Kenzo Nakamura United States Courthouse"

H.R. 5331 / Public Law 106–479
To authorize the Frederick Douglass Gardens, Inc., to establish a memorial and gardens on Department of the Interior lands in the District of Columbia or its environs in honor and commemoration of Frederick Douglass

H.R. 5388 / Public Law 106–480
To designate a building proposed to be located within the boundaries of the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, as the "Herbert H. Bateman Education and Administrative Center"

H.R. 5410 / Public Law 106–481
Library of Congress Fiscal Operations Improvement Act of 2000

H.R. 5478 / Public Law 106–482
To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by donation suitable land to serve as the new location for the home of Alexander Hamilton, commonly known as the Hamilton Grange, and to authorize the relocation of the Hamilton Grange to the acquired land

H.J. Res. 102 / Public Law 106–483
Recognizing that the Birmingham Pledge has made a significant contribution in fostering racial harmony and reconciliation in the United States and around the world, and for other purposes

S. 484 / Public Law 106–484
Bring Them Home Alive Act of 2000

S. 610 / Public Law 106–485
To direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management in Washakie County and Big Horn County, Wyoming, to the Westside Irrigation District, Wyoming, and for other purposes

S. 698 / Public Law 106–486
To review the suitability and feasibility of recovering costs of high altitude rescues at Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes

S. 710 / Public Law 106–487
Vicksburg Campaign Trail Battlefields Preservation Act of 2000

S. 748 / Public Law 106–488
To improve Native hiring and contracting by the Federal Government within the State of Alaska, and for other purposes

S. 893 / Public Law 106–489
To amend title 46, United States Code, to provide equitable treatment with respect to State and local income taxes for certain individuals who perform duties on vessels

S. 1030 / Public Law 106–490
To provide that the conveyance by the Bureau of Land Management of the surface estate to certain land in the State of Wyoming in exchange for certain private land will not result in the removal of the land from operation of the mining laws

S. 1367 / Public Law 106–491
To amend the Act which established the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, in the State of New Hampshire, by modifying the boundary and for other purposes

S. 1438 / Public Law 106–492
National Law Enforcement Museum Act

S. 1778 / Public Law 106–493
To provide for equal exchanges of land around the Cascade Reservoir

S. 1894 / Public Law 106–494
To provide for the conveyance of certain land to Park County, Wyoming

S. 2069 / Public Law 106–495
To permit the conveyance of certain land in Powell, Wyoming

S. 2425 / Public Law 106–496
Bend Feed Canal Pipeline Project Act of 2000

S. 2872 / Public Law 106–497
Indian Arts and Crafts Enforcement Act of 2000

S. 2882 / Public Law 106–498
Klamath Basin Water Supply Enhancement Act of 2000

S. 2951 / Public Law 106–499
To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to investigate opportunities to better manage the water resources in the Salmon Creek watershed of the Upper Columbia River

S. 2977 / Public Law 106–500
To assist in establishment of an interpretive center and museum in the vicinity of the Diamond Valley Lake in southern California to ensure the protection and interpretation of the paleontology discoveries made at the lake and to develop a trail system for the lake for use by pedestrians and nonmotorized vehicles

H.R. 660 / Private Law 106–9
For the private relief of Ruth Hairston by waiver of a filing deadline for appeal from a ruling relating to her application for a survivor annuity

H.R. 848 / Private Law 106–10
For the relief of Sepandan Farnia and Farbod Farnia

H.R. 3184 / Private Law 106–11
For the relief of Zohreh Farhang Ghahfarokhi

H.R. 3414 / Private Law 106–12
For the relief of Luis A. Leon-Molina, Ligia Padron, Juan Leon Padron, Rendy Leon Padron, Manuel Leon Padron, and Luis Leon Padron

H.R. 5266 / Private Law 106–13
For the relief of Saeed Rezai