

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Folder Title:

[Miscellaneous Materials and Dartmouth]] [1]

Staff Office-Individual:

Speechwriting-Orzulak, Paul

Original OA/ID Number:

4022

Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:	Stack:
48	6	9	2	V

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. email	To National Security Advisor from Paul K. Orzulak. Subject: Draft SRB Dartmouth remarks (1 page)	03/01/2000	P5
001b. statement	re: Draft remarks by Samuel R. Berger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, at Dartmouth University (9 pages)	03/01/2000	P5
002. memo	To President Clinton from Samuel Berger. Subject: Communications plan for your trip to South Asia (11 pages)	02/28/2000	P5
003. memo	To President Clinton from Samuel Berger. Subject: Russia (2 pages)	n.d.	P1/b(1)
004. memo	To President Clinton from Samuel Berger. Subject: Communications plan for your trip to South Asia (9 pages)	02/25/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Speechwriting (Paul Orzulak)
OA/Box Number: 4022

FOLDER TITLE:

[Miscellaneous Materials and Dartmouth] [1]

2008-0702-F

jm218

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

PAUL K. ORZULAK

high-tech-unNet

↳ Graff-Penn

→ Cal Tech

→

→

→ people who oppose her, also oppose her.

Or a legislative debate

Ricetti
Sperling
Ucelli
Stesol

Stephanie Flando

[Flando]

622-0073

- Matthew Schneider
- Lindsey Drenell
- Sharon Yuan

→ 622-4358

Jay Murphy

5625x
6190-202-

[Barbara Black]

Chuck Allen

→ 69116

69110

→

708-3815

708-0019

Attn: Barbara Black

EMICS

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. email	To National Security Advisor from Paul K. Orzulak. Subject: Draft SRB Dartmouth remarks (1 page)	03/01/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Speechwriting (Paul Orzulak)
OA/Box Number: 4022

FOLDER TITLE:

[Miscellaneous Materials and Dartmouth] [1]

2008-0702-F
jm218

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001b. statement	re: Draft remarks by Samuel R. Berger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, at Dartmouth University (9 pages)	03/01/2000	P5
-----------------	---	------------	----

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Speechwriting (Paul Orzulak)
OA/Box Number: 4022

FOLDER TITLE:

[Miscellaneous Materials and Dartmouth] [1]

2008-0702-F
jm218

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or
financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President
and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of
personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed
of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C.
2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of
an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial
information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of
personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement
purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of
financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information
concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

1/23/00 Final
Orzulak

Big Red vs.
Big Green

**NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR SAMUEL R. BERGER
REMARKS TO
CONSTITUENTS OF SENATOR JOE BIDEN
WILMINGTON, DELAWARE
JANUARY 24, 2000**

Thank you, Senator Biden. It's an honor for me to be here today with a few of Joe's closest and dearest friends. I want to thank you for inviting me. Please forgive me if I was a few minutes late. I was trying to leave for the ride up from Washington, but members of my staff only wanted to talk about which actor would be playing them in tomorrow night's episode of "The West Wing." Actually, I have a beef with that show. In the cast, they have actors who portray the President, the Vice President, the Chief of Staff, the Deputy Chief of Staff, the Press Secretary, and even the speechwriter. But even though many of the episodes involve foreign policy decisions -- decisions of war and peace -- there is no National Security Advisor.

It's probably just as well, considering how Hollywood has portrayed national security advisors recently. He was a stuffed shirt in "the Peacemaker." An egomaniac killed off in "Air Force One." A calculating sell-out in "Clear and Present Danger." And just last week on television, as a zealot with really bad hair in "Murder at 1600." I can't imagine who was the model for these characters, but let me stress that each of these movies was in process before I assumed the job.

But one role I have been proud to play for nearly two decades is an admirer and friend of Joe Biden. I am particularly fond of one early episode. When Joe was a 30 year-old Senator serving his first term on the Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger came to the Hill to testify. He had arranged with Chairman Frank Church that, at a particularly sensitive point, the room would be cleared and the Committee would go into Executive Session. The time came, Church discharged all the press and staff and the hearing resumed. Kissinger surveyed the Senatorial podium and his eyes fixed on this young kid sitting up with the Senators. Kissinger's face grew red. He turned to Chairman Church and said indignantly that he understood that all staff were to be cleared from the Committee room. "They have been," said Church. "Then who is that young man sitting up with the Senators?" huffed Kissinger.

Unfazed, quick on his feet as always, your Senator Biden spoke up. "Let me introduce myself. My name is Joe Biden. I am the Junior Senator from Delaware. And it's a great honor to meet you, Secretary Acheson."

Every generation of Americans has had one Senator who, more than any other, has helped define America's role in the world. Arthur Vandenberg was that Senator in 1950s; William Fulbright in the 1960s; Frank Church in the 1970s; Sam Nunn in the 1980s. In the 1990s, that leader has been Joe Biden: a clear and compelling voice for American interests and American ideals. The leading voice for sensible American internationalism in the United States Senate. The successor to Vandenberg, Fulbright, Church, and Nunn.

It's easy to be cynical about the world we live in today. But it's a lot harder to stand in the arena, to believe in a cause and work day and night to convince others to believe in that cause, too. Joe Biden is one of the people who believes. The people of Delaware should be very proud of the

role Joe Biden plays in assuring that the United States is a voice for peace and freedom in the world. It is truly indispensable.

With much fanfare, we just said goodbye to a Century in which America sent its sons and daughters further and more often from its own shores to fight for freedom than any nation in history. In the 20th Century, millions of American men and women – including more than 75,000 from Delaware -- worked to defeat fascism, contain communism, and sustain liberty when it was most imperiled.

Thanks in no small measure to their sacrifice, we enter a new Century with America's power and its values ascendant. Today, for the first time in human history, more than half the world's people elect their own leaders. For the first time in history, the world's leading nations are not engaged in a deadly struggle for security or territory. And America today is in a unique position. Our military might and reach are unrivaled, and nations look to us to deliver decisive influence wherever it is needed. Our economy not only has produced unprecedented prosperity at home; it is the engine of global growth and technological innovation -- we are home to half the world's computers and the world's eight biggest high-tech companies. People around the world look to our open, creative society as a model of what it takes to succeed in a globalized world.

As Senator Biden said in a speech last year, "the good news is that we are the world's only remaining superpower. The bad news is that we are the world's only remaining superpower." In other words, we have a remarkable opportunity to advance the cause of peace, prosperity and freedom for our people and the world. But we also have a responsibility – now, perhaps more than ever -- to lead.

The President has worked over the past seven years to make sure we seize that opportunity, and meet that responsibility. And America has a lot to be proud of. Over the past seven years, we've aided the remarkable transitions to free-market democracy in Central Europe; stopped two cruel wars in the Balkans; worked with Russia to deactivate thousands of nuclear missiles; helped broker historic peace agreements from Northern Ireland to the Middle East, Sierra Leone to the Peru-Ecuador border; and signed more than 270 trade agreements that have opened markets and raised living standards here at home. We've also worked to focus our national security strategy on the new dangers of a new age: the organized forces of crime, narco-trafficking, cyber-terrorism, and governments too weak to handle the forces of globalization.

Along the way, we've had passionate discussions with people from both parties about what our proper role in the world really is. With the Cold War over, some people, understandably, are tempted to say we don't need to play an active role in the world, or to worry about distant conflicts, or play our part in international institutions like the UN. You could say their view is one part go-it-alone and another part don't-go-at-all. So the President has worked hard to bring people together around the basic principle that Americans benefit when nations come together to deter aggression, to resolve conflicts, to open markets, to raise living standards, to prevent the spread of dangerous weapons, and meet other dangers that no nation can meet alone. And with the help of people like Joe Biden, We've managed to sustain a consensus for a principled and active American role in the world.

The beginning of a new Century should cause us to reflect on the larger purpose of that leadership. For we are experiencing something more than just a changing of the digits on the calendar; this period in history has been a genuine changing of the times – a time of collapsing

empires, expanding freedoms, eroding barriers and emerging threats. The question now is: what do we do with the opportunity we have? What are the really big challenges facing us at the beginning of the 21st Century? What fundamental, long-term questions will affect the success of our foreign policy in this new era? Let's go through a few.

One critical question is whether our former adversaries Russia and China will emerge as stable, prosperous democratic partners of the United States.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, our engagement with a democratic Russia has produced concrete results – the dismantlement of 5,000 former Soviet nuclear weapons, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the Baltics, Russia's role in ending the conflict in Kosovo, and defending the peace along-side NATO. Russia is still struggling with the legacy of totalitarianism, poverty, corruption, and conflict in the Caucasus. But the way President Yeltsin left office last month reflected how much has changed. For the first time in their 1,000-year history, a Russian leader voluntarily transferred power, under constitutional rules, instead of holding on till death or being forced from office, and elections will be held to select his replacement.

Of course, we will continue to oppose actions we believe are contrary to our interest or self-defeating for Russia, such as the cruel, costly war in Chechnya. Russia's indiscriminate use of force there is wrong. It is inviting far more serious problems for Russia than it can possibly solve. But that doesn't mean we should stop supporting those forces in Russia that are trying to strengthen the rule of law and build faith in democratic institutions. Russia is paying a price for its conduct in Chechnya; Russian democracy must not.

As for China, we must press our interests on issues like the proliferation of dangerous weapons, and speak out clearly about the abuses of human rights. But even as we defend our interests, we shouldn't isolate China from the global forces that are empowering its people to seek a better life.

That's why we recently signed an agreement to bring China into the World Trade Organization. As it stands now, our markets are already open to China's goods and services. Our new agreement requires China to open its markets – the largest in the world -- in every sector from agriculture to telecommunications to automobiles. It will mean jobs and increased exports for American workers and American products. And in the long run, the WTO will also obligate China to reform its economic system in a way that will get the government increasingly out of people's lives and increase the freedom of its people – while committing China to play by international rules. We want to see China on the inside, playing by the rules, rather than on the outside, denying them.

A second question for our future is whether our security will be threatened by regional conflicts that pose the risk of a wider war, especially those rooted in ethnic and religious tensions.

Through the courage of the men and women of our armed forces, we turned the tide against ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. We should be proud that, in the last year of the bloodiest century of all, America led its allies to stand up against the extermination and expulsion of an entire people, and we prevailed. Now, there is a great deal more we must do to realize our vision of a peaceful, undivided, democratic Europe for the first time in history: helping the people of Kosovo rebuild while continuing to clamp down on violence; bolstering the democratic opposition to Slobodan Milosevic in Serbia; promoting investment in the Balkans so the people there have a better future

to build for; encouraging progress greater cooperation between Greece and Turkey and an end to the long dispute over Cyprus; helping more new democracies get ready for membership in NATO. If we're persistent, we may one day reach a time when no American will ever again be asked to fight and die in Europe.

We should also be proud of the role America has played to help bring the Middle East closer to peace than they have ever been before. Today, Israeli, Palestinian, and Syrian leaders all are ready for peace. This is a unique moment. The gaps between them are not so wide as they are deep, and the President is working today to find a way to make sure that everyone's needs are met. It's hard work. But let's keep this in perspective: this conflict has been a source of serious tension in the world for 50 years. And we have never had a better chance to end it. The President is going to work as hard as he needs to this year to get this done.

A third question is whether the inexorable march of technology is going to give terrorists and hostile nations the means to undermine our defenses, and force us to live in fear again.

Thankfully, the New Year's celebrations worldwide passed without a terrorist attack. But just because we dodged a bullet doesn't mean there was no bullet to dodge. The last weeks of 1999 saw the largest US counter-terrorism operation in history. Terrorist cells were disrupted in eight countries and attacks almost certainly were prevented thanks to the good work of our law enforcement and intelligence agencies. But the threat remains real. We'll need to keep meeting this challenge the same way: with both vigilance and a refusal to be intimidated.

Part of the challenge will be to make it more difficult for weapons of mass destruction and the missiles that can carry them to fall into the wrong hands. In Russia today, the average salary of a highly-trained weapons scientists is less than \$100 a month. For a small investment, we can help them turn that expertise to peaceful projects that help the world. Or, we can do nothing and pray that each and every one of them resists the temptation to market their expertise to those who wish us harm. Common sense says to help them. That's why we are working with Senator Biden to increase funding for threat reduction by two-thirds over the next five years.

It also means we must continue to work to prevent potentially hostile nations like North Korea, Iraq, and Iran from obtaining weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them. It means that we must work to protect our computers and critical infrastructure – like our air traffic control system and nuclear power plants – from attacks by cyber-terrorists and nations who wish us harm. And it means strengthening global standards against the spread of deadly weapons, so that other nations stand with us when we need them. We did that when we signed and ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention with Joe Biden's help. So far, we have failed to convince two-thirds of the Senate to ratify the comprehensive ban on nuclear testing. With Senator Biden's leadership, I hope we will be able to find common ground on that treaty as well.

A fourth question is whether the stability of the 20th Century will be threatened by an ever-widening gap between rich and poor. As the President has said many times, it is unacceptable that in a world with so many riches, that more than 1.2 billion people live on less than one dollar a day. It is unacceptable that more than two billion people get sick every year – many of them children – because they don't have clean water to drink. It is unacceptable that more than three million African children already have died of AIDS. It is not only morally unacceptable, it is economically unsustainable. It robs the world of the contributions of much of its population.

What can we do about this? Part of the answer is to promote freedom and good government, so that leaders are responsive to the needs of their people. And freedom is expanding: with the hopeful transitions to democracy in Nigeria and Indonesia, more people won the right to choose their leaders in 1999 than in 1989, the year the Berlin Wall fell.

But even countries making all the right choices often have to struggle to benefit from the global economy. That's why the President has led a global effort to alleviate the crushing debt in so many nations. No country should have to choose between educating its children and paying interest on debt. It is also why we have begun a concerted effort to fight AIDS and other diseases that are holding so many impoverished nations back. In his State of the Union Address later this week, the President will propose new initiatives to address these challenges.

Finally, we also have to work to expand trade. It's hard to see how people living on a dollar a day will ever be able to live in dignity if we deny them the chance to sell the fruits of their labor and creativity beyond their own borders. There are practices such as forced labor and unregulated child labor that the world should not tolerate. But we must also understand that, for the poorest countries, trade means growth and growth means improved working conditions. We don't want a race to the bottom in the international economy, but neither do we want to keep the bottom down. What we want is a steady march to the top that leaves no one behind.

In the years ahead, we will face many other fundamental questions, and challenges we can hardly foresee, whether tragedies or hopeful breakthroughs. But as a result of the last several years, we look to that distant horizon from higher and more hopeful ground. Every day, we have a chance to make real for the world what Delaware set into motion more than two centuries ago.

Today, we are closer than ever to turning the promise of freedom's call that began here in Delaware into a reality for more than half the world. Seven years after Time Magazine asked the question "is the U.S. in an irreversible decline as the world's premier power" – America has arrived at a moment when our strength and prosperity are unparalleled. For all the billions of people who came before us, it has been left to this generation to secure the triumph of freedom and justice, to walk away from war and hatred, and to walk toward peace. When historians look back on this Century, let them say that is exactly what we did.

Thank you.

By donations of specific
vaccines, new strains
comitment to intensify
research across
the board.

When President Yeltsin resigned and Acting President Putin took office, Russia saw its first constitutional transfer of power in its thousand year history. Soon, Russians will elect a president and set the course of a society that is freer than ever before. We can't be sure if they will choose to move forward fast or slow. But one speed I do not believe they will choose is reverse. For the Russian people have repeatedly rejected a return to communism, and there's no reason to doubt they will again.

In these ways, Russia is a completely different country than what it was ten years ago, different in many ways from the country it was when I took office seven years ago. Yet the fundamental question for America remains the same: It is not who rules Russia, but how Russia is ruled.

In Russia, as in any new democracy, the second election is often more important than the first. We hope Russians will be able to vote in a country that welcomes competing points of view, that protects the freedoms of its independent press, that treats opposition parties fairly. And we hope they'll be able to live in a country that respects the fundamental human rights of all its people.

It is partly for that reason that we have been so troubled by the way force has been used in Chechnya. The Russian government has said that Chechnya is part of Russia, and we have long agreed. But that only accentuates the Russian government's responsibility to protect the lives of the people who live there. I am concerned about what kind of country Russia is going to be if its response to the destruction of apartment buildings full of innocent Russian citizens is the destruction of a city full of innocent Russian citizens. I am concerned about what kind of democracy Russia is going to be if its government feels it has to prevent journalists from doing their job, if it has to organize itself to rule a whole province by force indefinitely.

I've said many times that the Russians have legitimate concerns about terrorism. But legitimate goals do not justify killing civilians indiscriminately. The most recent reports of human rights

violations by Russian troops in are especially disturbing. But they also offer Russia an opportunity to show that it takes its own laws and international obligations seriously: by investigating all credible allegations in a transparent, unbiased way, by holding those who may be responsible accountable, by letting international observers from the OSCE back in, by giving the Red Cross full access to Chechnya, including to detention camps. I hope Russia will do these things. And I call on Russia once again to seek a peaceful, negotiated solution to this tragic crisis.

It's great to be back with the Council on Competitiveness, and it's great to be back at MIT. I was honored to deliver the commencement address here two years ago. And I always enjoy returning to Cambridge, where I spent so many happy days as a student at a school down the road.

I'm reminded of the story of the student here in Cambridge who set down a few too many items in the express lane at the grocery store. The cashier looked at him and said: "The sign says six items or fewer. What's the matter -- are you from MIT and can't read, or from Harvard and can't count?"

I don't know about you, but I think that cashier was pretty harsh -- I mean, half of one, six dozen of another...what's the difference?

Critical yr from Russian democracy - 1st test, free elections -
Czechy - we've accepted it's part of Russia, but that
accidentally resp of Russia to respect rights + freedoms of
people - not allow m. to corrode... other
China - you are generation that

Fadia -

[Middle East + Ireland - more sober]
→

Martha Stealy
\$7000

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. memo	To President Clinton from Samuel Berger. Subject: Communications plan for your trip to South Asia (11 pages)	02/28/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Speechwriting (Paul Orzulak)
OA/Box Number: 4022

FOLDER TITLE:

[Miscellaneous Materials and Dartmouth] [1]

2008-0702-F

jm218

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE
THOMAS JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL
Saturday, June 20, 1999

Principal Jones; faculty and staff; family and friends: I want to thank you for the honor of being here tonight. Most of all, I want to say congratulations to the Class of 1999!

I know I wasn't your first choice to be here tonight. A few weeks ago, the Washington Post asked local high school students who they would like to see speak to their graduating class.

Unfortunately, Ricky Martin couldn't be here tonight.

Leonardo DiCaprio is shooting a movie.

And Jennifer Love Hewitt is trying to work things out with Bailey.

So instead, you're stuck here tonight with a guy who thinks that Dawsons Creek is a river in Southeast Virginia. Which it is, by the way.

I am not here tonight to do what other graduation speakers have done the past month. I'm not going to tell you to wear sunscreen. I'm not going to say: "Oh, *behave*." And I still have no idea why Anakin Skywalker turned to the dark side.

I think maybe it's because he didn't wear sunscreen.

[Ricky Martin is the hottest singer in America today. Leonardo DiCaprio starred in Titanic and is loved by teenage girls. Jennifer Love Hewitt stars in the popular teen hit Party of Five, where her character dates a character named Bailey. Dawson's Creek is America's most popular teen show, and Dawsons Creek is a river near Richmond. The sunscreen reference is from that famous commencement address attributed to Kurt Vonnegut, which is now a popular song running on local radio stations. "Oh behave" is Austin Power's favorite saying, currently the #1 movie in America. Anakin Skywalker is Darth Vader as a young child. Fans were upset that the new Star Wars movie didn't explain why he turned to the "Dark Side of the Force."]

The truth is, this is not that kind of school. The real reason I am here was revealed in an airline magazine a few years ago. They had a list of 31 signs that technology has taken over your life. According to the list, you know technology has taken over your life:

If you know your E-Mail Address, but not your Social Security number.

If you rotate your screen saver more than your tires.

If you have never sat through a movie without having at least one device on your body beep or buzz.

And my personal favorite, number 23: If Al Gore strikes you as an "intriguing" fellow.

But I understand the role of a commencement speaker. As an old friend of mine once reminded me: "commencement speakers should think of themselves as the body at an old-

fashioned Irish wake. They need you in order to have the party, but they don't expect you to say very much." That's advice I intend to follow tonight.

But you don't need my advice. As a proud father who watched one of his three daughters graduate from college last week, I understand: the best advice all of you are going to receive today will not come from the person standing in front of you, but from the people who are sitting behind you. Before we go any further, let's hear it for your parents and your families

If I could offer one piece of advice to the class of 1999, I'd say this: make sure you stay in touch with members of your class – because the friendships you've made here could last a lifetime. Just ask one of your classmates, Katie Day. Back in 1965, I graduated from high school with her father, Bart – who is here with us tonight.

The world we graduated into back in 1965 was very different than today. Terms that you use at this school every day had very different meanings for us. Back then, chips were something you ate, windows were something you washed, discs were something you played, bugs were something you zapped, semiconductors were small musicians – and the Internet . . . well, let's just say, it hadn't been invented yet.

Today, we stand at the dawn of a new century with our eyes wide open and our mouths agape at the possibilities of the future. All of you are stepping into a world today in which new advances in science and technology are allowing us to explore vast new frontiers -- from a galaxy 12 billion light years away to the smallest genetic switch inside a human cell. Today, the road of discovery is rapidly becoming a highway of light and speed connecting our largest cities to the smallest villages across the globe.

Just look at the pace of change. NASA announced released details that early next year, it will flight test the first air-breathing space engine, which promises to make space travel routine in the 21st Century. Scientists working on the Human Genome project say they will finish a year earlier than predicted, in 2002 – making possible new treatments to prevent cancer, diabetes, and Alzheimer's Disease. A small company in California has even unveiled camera-on-a-chip technology that can capture 500 images a second – fast enough to trace the path of a speeding bullet, or watch a virus reproduce inside a cell.

What is most remarkable is that all of these developments have occurred not in the last 12 months or the last 12 weeks – but the last 12 days. Who knows what the next 12 will bring.

What we do know is that Thomas Jefferson has given you the academic knowledge you need to prosper in this accelerated world. As the last class of this century, you were almost guaranteed a special spot in history. But together, you've made history for an entirely different reason. This class has 126 National Merit Finalists – which is surely a national record. And you've matched your accomplishment in the classroom with accomplishment on the playing field. Women's crew – national champs. Men's crew – state champs. Track team – district champs. And the football team even beat Chantilly High. Who would have imagined that this school's bumper sticker would read: "Jefferson: I came for the sports."

But if you came for the sports, you'll be remembered for the science. This is probably the only high school in America with its very own computer virus [TJ2000] – and students who

not only understand how it works, but know how to disable it. And let's not forget the 15 students who were semi-finalists in Intel's 1999 Science Talent Search. Listen to some of these paper topics: "Short Time-Scale Variability in the External Shock Model of Gamma Ray Bursts." "Acellular Hemoglobin Degradation in the Presence of Glutathion." And, my favorite: "the Development of a Speaker-Independent Discrete Utterance Voice Recognition System to Control Peripheral Devices."

I did some checking on that last gadget. The experts tell me that it's a simple device that when operational, will make something do what you tell them to do. Parents, I know what you're thinking: this couldn't be invented soon enough.

There's no question that all of you have the knowledge to succeed. But tonight, our hearts are also filled with hope that this school and this community have given you something far greater than raw knowledge. We hope that they have grounded you with values. The secrets of science may define the parameters of your adult existence, but it is your values that will truly determine the quality of your communities. And it is your values that will animate the culture you create.

For all the stunning capabilities of the information revolution, we can never forget that at its heart, our newest technology must be a vehicle to deepen and extend our oldest and most enduring values. More than any other time in our history, our newest discoveries are making it possible to make real what centuries of human experience have aspired to create – to end suffering, to eradicate disease, to promote freedom, to educate our children, and to lift our families and our communities. In a world once limited by borders and geography, the only limits we face today are the limits of our own imaginations.

More and more, it will be a world shaped by your imaginations. For more than 200 years, America has been shaped by its young. It was a 32 year-old Thomas Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence, and a 26 year-old Martin Luther King who led the bus boycott at Montgomery. But there has never been an age when young people have been more responsible for defining the world we live in than today. Steve Jobs started Apple, Bill Gates started Microsoft, and Michael Dell started Dell Computers – when they were 21. By contrast, Marc Andressen and Jeff Bezos were old men when they launched Netscape and Amazon.com. They were both 22.

And let us not forget: more than 160 years ago, it was a woman named Ada Byron Lovelace who is credited with being the world's first computer programmer. As a student of the renowned mathematician Charles Babbage – whose work on the analytical engine preceded the modern computer – Ada Lovelace greatly expanded his work, predicted the uses and limitations of computers, and provided many of the programs the Engine would use. Today, the computer language Ada is named after her. But when she started, she wasn't much older than all of you.

Now, it is your time. The next Bill Gates or Ada Lovelace could be sitting in front of me today. Which one of you will it be? I urge all of you: seize this age. Make it yours. Take what you have learned at this school and change the world. But at the same time, promise me this: that you will strive to create a world that is not just better off, but better; that you will judge success not by the number of networks you connect, but the number of people you connect; that you will endeavor not just to make better computers, but better communities. That is the special responsibility that Thomas Jefferson High School has left all of you with.

As a nation, we have used technology to create great economic growth – and that growth must continue in the years ahead. But economic growth alone cannot help heal the pain we saw in Columbine. It will not help stop the savagery we saw in Jasper. It will not, by itself, build bonds between neighbors who, every single day, seem to be living further and further away. Our technology today is different than anything that has ever come before. Unlike radio or television, the Internet can connect people to each other. It can bring us together. It can unite us or divide us, depending on how we use it. Today, we are at a crucial turning point. As Steve Case has said, “cyberspace is big enough to matter, but small enough to be shaped.” Let us work together to shape our new technology in a way that brings us all together to create a stronger America.

Along the way, your generation will wrestle with questions no other generation has had to face. Think about the ethical questions. The biological revolution we are living through today is unlocking the secrets of human life – but it is also opening a potential Pandora’s box of cloning for personal physical characteristics. Which way will we go? There are privacy issues: how do we protect sensitive medical information that is stored on-line? How will the nature of work be affected if computers can watch your every move? And then, there is the issue of equity – how do we make sure that nobody gets left behind? When steam technology was first developed, both the French and the British had it at the same time. The French used it to pump water into royal fountains. The British used it to power what would become the Industrial Revolution. How do we use our new technology in a way that helps us all?

There are no one-size-fits-all solutions to these questions, and even fewer absolutes. I’m reminded of the linguistics professor who told his class, “Remember, in English, a double negative forms a positive. In some languages though, such as Russian, a double negative is still a negative. But there is no language where a double positive forms a negative. At which point, a voice from the back of the room piped up: “Yeah . . . right.”

The only absolute is that all of you must be involved in the debates of your time. Your education and your training demand it. By involved, I mean committed – not just interested. The difference between the two is sort of the difference between the role of the chicken and the role of the pig at a bacon and egg breakfast. The chicken is involved. The pig is committed. Stay committed. Stay interested. Stay motivated. That means voting. That means volunteering. That means making service and citizenship an active part of your lives.

You’ve learned a lot about cyberspace here. The word “cyber” comes from the Greek word “kybernautis,” meaning helmsman, the one who steers the ship. That’s what we need you to be. Help us chart a course toward the new American horizon. Help us move into a new century with the same sense of wonder, the same sense of discovery, and the same sense of courage as the century we are leaving behind. Help us create an America that is not just better off, but better.

But start tomorrow. Tonight, enjoy your friends, enjoy your families, enjoy this celebration, and know how proud we are when we say: congratulations, class of 1999! Thank you.

1/06/00 11:30 p.m.
Orzulak

**PRESIDENT WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON
REMARKS ON
DEFENDING AMERICA'S CYBERSPACE
WASHINGTON, DC
JANUARY 7, 2000**

Acknowledgements: Secretary Daley; Director Lachance; Administrator Barram; Dr. Lane; President Rose; distinguished guests; ladies and gentlemen:

Last week, our world took time to look back on the last millennium and look ahead to the next one. One of the things that you realize is that there has never been a time quite like this one in which the power to create knowledge and the power to create havoc rest in the same exact hands.

We live in an age when one person sitting at one computer can come up with an idea, travel through cyberspace, and take humanity to new heights. Yet, we also live in an age when that same person can sit at the same computer, double-click on a mouse, hack into a computer system, and potentially paralyze an entire company, or city, or government. We are here today to take the next steps to defend our citizens and our nation from those who would use cyberspace to do us harm.

It was a week ago today that America held its collective breath and waited to see how the world would react to Y2K. I remember seeing one commercial that imagined two joggers running down a street on New Year's Day in which traffic lights failed, communication systems broke down, aircraft went haywire, and ATM Machines spit out dollar bills. But just because we dodged that bullet doesn't mean there wasn't a bullet to dodge. A crisis was averted only because thousands of talented people – in both the public and private sector – worked hard and spent billions to make sure our computer systems were ready for the test. Once again, I want to thank John Koskinen for the terrific job he did in coordinating our response to Y2K.

But while Y2K didn't render us helpless, it did underscore how connected we all are. Fifteen years ago, critical systems like our power structures, water supplies, air traffic control, financial systems, and computer networks were separate and manually operated. Today, they are all connected and run by computers. Two years ago, we saw the enormous impact of a single failed electronics link when one satellite malfunction disabled pagers, ATM's, credit card systems, TV and radio networks worldwide.

That was an accident – and we must continue to take steps to ensure that in the event of natural disasters or human errors, our interconnected information systems remain strong. But as we've heard here today, we face other challenges that are not accidents. As our nation learns to master this new technology to do good, hackers, criminals, and potential adversaries could seek to disrupt our economy and damage our national security by attacking our computer networks.

Stopping them is not a job that the Federal Government can do alone. Because most key components of our society are operated by the private sector, we must continue to build a public-private partnership to protect America in the 21st Century. Together, we must make our critical systems more secure, so that America can be more secure.

This is a real threat, but one that calls for prudence, not panic.

Three years ago, I established a commission chaired by Retired General Tom Marsh to begin to assess the vulnerability of our nation's critical infrastructures – the information, telecommunications, banking and finance, transportation, energy and other systems on which our economy, our national security, and our way of life depend.

Today, we are publishing a National Plan to defend America's cyberspace. You will notice that this version is labeled "Version 1.0." We see this plan not so much as the end of the discussion, but the beginning of a dialogue with Congress, the American people, and private sector owners and operators of our critical systems to find the best solutions to protect our nation. This is a national challenge – and it must be a national effort.

From the work that we have already done, we know some of the elements that will be essential to meeting this challenge. One thing we know is the we need to do more to bring people into the field of computer security. There are thousands of positions going unfilled today because we simply don't have people trained to work them.

That's why I am proposing to create a new program that will offer college scholarships to students in the field of computer security in exchange for public service afterwards. This program – which will work like a Civilian ROTC for Cyberspace -- will create a new generation of computer security specialists by training hundreds of experts who will work to defend our nation's own computers. Colleges like James Madison University are standing by right now to help us fill the void. In the meantime, the Office of Personnel Management – under Director Janice Lachance – will work to certify our existing Information Technology workers. I hope Congress will work with us this year to get it done.

We also need to accelerate and broaden our research into computer security. That is why I am proposing the creation of a new institute that will fill key research gaps that neither the public nor private sectors are meeting today. Today, information technology companies, the Pentagon, and civilian government agencies fund computer research, including research in information security. However, top private sector experts – including my Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology – have made clear to me that today's research efforts have gaps that neither market forces or Pentagon research programs are going to fill. For example, we need to find "trap doors," "logic bombs," and "Trojan horses" buried in millions of lines of computer code.

The institute – which we are calling the Institute for Information Infrastructure Protection – will bring to bear the finest computer scientists and engineers from the private sector, universities, and other research facilities to find ways to close these research gaps. We are not proposing a new bureaucracy, a new building, or a big organization. We want to build a flexible entity that will work directly with the private sector to bring the nation's best technical expertise to bear on our most pressing computer challenges.

Those who would attack our computers are already hard at work with their research. We must be equally vigilant with ours. That is why, as part of the 2001 budget, I am requesting \$91 million for these and other reforms as part of an overall \$2 billion budget to help meet our security challenges.

Let me make very clear: I will work very hard to get these measures passed. I will continue to work equally hard to uphold the privacy rights and other constitutional protections of the American people; as well as the proprietary rights of American businesses. I have said it before: it is essential that we do not undermine liberty in the name of liberty. We can protect our security by drawing on the very best in our free society – the skill and courage of our troops, the genius of our scientists and engineers, the strength of our factory workers, and determination and talents of our public sector, and the vision of leaders in every vital sector.

Information technology has helped create unprecedented prosperity at the end of the Twentieth Century. Let us work together to ensure that it creates unprecedented security as well in the Twenty-first Century. Thank you.

Draft US-India Vision Statement

At the dawn of a new century, President Clinton and Prime Minister Vajpayee resolve to create a qualitatively new relationship between the United States and India.

We are the world's oldest democracy, and the world's largest. We are nations forged from many traditions and faiths, proving year after year that diversity is our strength. From vastly different origins and experiences, we have come to the same conclusions: that freedom is a parent to both peace and prosperity, and that it is a universal aspiration, constrained neither by culture nor levels of economic development.

There have been times in the past when our relationship drifted without a steady course. But times have changed. Globalization is erasing boundaries and building networks between nations and peoples, economies and cultures. The world is increasingly coming together around the democratic ideals India and the United States have long championed and tried to live by.

Together, we represent a fifth of the world's people, more than a quarter of the world's economy. We have built creative, entrepreneurial societies. We are leaders in the information age. The currents of commerce and culture that link our societies run strong and deep. In many ways, the character of the 21st century world will depend on the success of our cooperation for peace, prosperity and freedom.

That presents us with an opportunity, but also a profound responsibility to work together. Our partnership of shared ideals must increasingly be a partnership of shared endeavors.

In the new century, India and the United States will be partners in peace, with a common interest in ensuring that regional conflicts do not threaten global security. We will engage in regular consultations on strategic stability in Asia and beyond, bolster joint efforts to counter terrorism and other challenges to regional peace, support the United Nations in its peacekeeping efforts. We acknowledge that tensions in South Asia can only be resolved by the nations of South Asia. To that end, India reaffirms its commitment to do its part through the pursuit of peaceful dialogue.

India and the United States share an unequivocal commitment to eliminating weapons of mass destruction. Though we have not always agreed how reach our common goal, we agree on the need to take concrete strides toward a world without nuclear weapons. In the meantime, we recognize that the introduction of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery into regions of tension carries dangers. We are committed to steps to build confidence, to minimize the risks of miscalculation, and to avoid arms races. India and the United State reaffirm their commitment to forego further nuclear explosive tests and to join the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We will work together to launch negotiations on a treaty to end the production of fissile materials. We agree that strong controls are needed to prevent the spread of dangerous technologies.

So long as the world remains a dangerous place, military strength will be essential to our security. But the true measure of our strength lies in the ability of our people to shape their destiny and to realize their aspirations for a better life.

That is why the United States and India are and will be allies in the cause of democracy. We will stand with those still struggling for freedom in Asia and around the world, and cooperate with others to launch an international Community of Democracies this year.

The United States applauds India's success in opening its economy, its achievements in science and technology, its commitment to a new wave of economic expansion and reform, and its determination to bring the benefits of economic growth to all its people. Our nations pledge to remove impediments to bilateral trade and investment and to expand commerce between us, especially in the emerging knowledge-based industries.

We will work together to preserve stability and growth in the global economy as well. And we will join in an unrelenting battle against extreme poverty in the world, so that the promise of a new economy is felt everywhere and no nation is left behind. That is among the fundamental challenges of our time, and open trade is the best engine we know for meeting it. Therefore, we call for a new round of trade negotiations with development as its guiding principle. We agree developed countries should reject policies that deny developing countries the opportunity to grow, because growth is the key to rising incomes and rising standards. At the same time, we share the conviction that human development ultimately depends on human rights, for men, for women, and for children.

We believe that in the information age, there is no contradiction between economic growth and protection of the environment. Indeed, we can only sustain growth if we preserve the natural inheritance on which the wealth – and health – of nations is ultimately based. We also pledge a common effort to battle infectious diseases such as AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, which kill people and progress in so many countries.

We are proud of the cooperation between Indians and Americans in advancing frontiers of knowledge. But even as we unravel the mysteries of time and space, we must continue to apply our knowledge to our oldest challenges: eradicating human suffering, disease and want. In the past, our cooperation helped ease mass hunger in the world. In the future, it will focus as well on the development of clean energy, health, and education.

Our partnership is not an end in itself, but a means to all these ends. And it is reinforced by the ties of scholarship, commerce, and increasingly of kinship among our people. The industry, enterprise and cultural contributions of Americans of Indian heritage has enriched and enlivened both our societies.

Today, we pledge to deepen the Indian-American partnership in tangible ways, always seeking to reconcile our differences through dialogue and engagement, always seizing opportunities to advance the countless interests we have in common. As a first step, President Clinton has invited Prime Minister Vajpayee to visit Washington at a mutually convenient opportunity, and the Prime Minister has accepted that invitation. Henceforth, the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of India should meet regularly to institutionalize our dialogue. [Further points on “architecture” TK]. We will encourage even stronger people-to-people ties.

For India and the United States, this is a day of new beginnings. We have before us for the first time in 50 years the possibility to realize the full potential of our relationship. We will work to seize that chance, for our benefit and all those with whom we share this increasingly interdependent world.

10/15/98 7:25 pm

SAMUEL R. BERGER
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
"AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE WORLD"
HANOVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE
OCTOBER 16, 1998

[Acknowledgments: President James Wright (tentative); Professor Michael Mastanduno (MASS-tan-doo-no), Director of John Dickey Center for International Understanding; members of the Dartmouth community]

I. INTRO

I am proud to be part of the Dickey Center's new lecture series on war and peace. It has been an especially Tolstoyan week in Washington – a week in which we have focused intensely on the problems of war in the Balkans and the possibilities of peace in the Middle East. For the moment, we and our NATO allies have brought a measure of calm to Kosovo, and we will be closely monitoring the situation to make sure Milosevic holds to his agreements. And as I speak to you, Yasir Arafat and Benjamin Netanyahu are negotiating hard issues on the eastern shore of Maryland.

All of us can be proud that the United States is playing a lead role in ending the violence in Kosovo and working for peace in the Middle East. And we can take confidence in the fact that, as what has been called the "American Century" draws to a close, we are poised to pick up where we left off in the next century. Our country is at peace. Our economy is the best it has been in thirty years. Our military is strong. Around the world, people look to us for the power of our example and, when necessary, the example of our power.

But it would be foolish to say that all is right with the world. The economic unrest of the past year has badly disrupted economies around the world, and threatens to damage our own prosperity. This unrest has serious ramifications for our foreign policy. From Moscow to Seoul, Jakarta to Brasilia and many places in between, sudden decisions are being made under intense economic pressure – decisions that will determine whether hundreds of millions of people lead lives of partnership with the rest of the world, or whether recent reverses force retreat and mutual suspicion.

There is a tendency among busy people to let the urgent take precedence over the truly important. The White House is no exception. So I have been looking forward to this chance to take a broader perspective with you ... to discuss our strategy for protecting American interests in this rapidly changing world ... protecting them not only today, or this month, but for generations to come.

When future historians look at the present situation of the United States in the world, they will see things quite differently than those of us who are distracted by the relentless parade of headlines and the cacophony of soundbites. They will look at overarching trajectories rather than daily events. Notwithstanding the economic turmoil of the last year, they will see the past decade as an extraordinary time for the promotion of democracy and free markets.

I don't think the word "revolution" is too strong to describe the progress we have all witnessed over a relatively brief span. The end of the Cold War was a seismic change whose ramifications are still unfolding. As fear receded across the landscape, freedom filled its place, encouraging political aspirations along with entrepreneurial energy.

The story of the 1990s has basically been the story of three parallel and overlapping revolutions: 1) a democratic revolution 2) a revolution of free markets and 3) an information revolution, connected to these two others, and partly responsible for them. For the first time in human history, most of the world's people choose their own leaders. In South Korea, South Africa and the Czech Republic, men imprisoned for their steadfast opposition to authoritarianism now serve their as their countries' presidents. More nations are determining their destiny. Not millions, but billions are now linked by currents of commerce and communication. Around the world, the idea of free market democracy is becoming a reality – an idea that has been the American ideal for half a century and more.

The revolution in information technology has rapidly accelerated the process. In a world that links north and south, city and countryside in an electronic network of shared images in real time, the more universal rights of freedom are taking hold, the more people who do not enjoy them are demanding them. And information technology has allowed faster and faster circulation of the lifeblood of free markets – capital, goods and ideas. All of these trends reinforce each other.

But the trend toward democracy and market economies is neither inevitable nor irreversible. We have not reached the end of history. There are still very serious challenges out there – forces both accidental and intentional that threaten our progress: Ethnic rivalries and religious tensions. Self-serving leaders who stir up ancient hatreds, pursue conflict as a source of power, and threaten their neighbors. A nexus of new threats – terrorism, drug trafficking, the spread of weapons of mass destruction – with no respect for borders.

Unless human nature changes, we will always have to contend with these sorts of challenges. And we are – by strengthening our security alliances as we have done with NATO; building strong international arms control regimes like the CWC and CTBT; forging multinational cooperation to combat terrorism and drug trafficking; and making international commitments to safeguard human rights and protect the environment. And, in the case of the United States, making sure we maintain the military and diplomatic tools we need to advance our security and prosperity.

But today I want to focus on a problem unique to this moment, and to our situation in history. It is a problem that emanates from our very success at promoting democracy and free markets over the last decade. We now face a generation of new challenges created by the suddenness with which the world has grasped for democracy and free markets – without always implementing the institutions necessary to sustain them.

I do not think it an exaggeration to say we are at a crossroads, a second turning point in the post-Cold War world. The breakup of the Soviet empire, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the end of the

Cold War was a triumph of freedom over repression, of democracy and free markets over authoritarian states and command economies. It was a euphoric victory for the human spirit.

But it was really only the beginning of a long process, of a less dramatic but in some ways more difficult challenge: making democracy and free markets work. From the former Soviet Union to Central Europe, from Latin America to parts of Africa, people are confronting different manifestations of this same fundamental problem – how to spread the benefits and share the burdens of democracy and free markets ... how to move beyond elections and privatizing economies to building self-reliant, responsive civil societies.

Let there be no mistake – this is a crucial test. The hard truth is that, in many countries, we must now contend with a crisis in confidence in democracy and free markets, fueled by a worldwide economic crisis, exacerbated by the failure of some fledgling democracies to give their citizens a real say in their governance. If we do not address these challenges to democracy and free markets quickly and effectively, people will come to question the historic choice that they made – and reverse the course of history.

II. PROMOTE GLOBAL PROSPERITY

In the wake of World War II, a visionary generation of leaders gathered in this state to create what came to be called the Bretton Woods institutions -- the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Their goal, in the words of FDR, was to “bind nations together to support prosperity and overcome disorder.” They succeeded beyond anyone’s imagination. The past half century has seen an exponential expansion in world trade. Phenomenal economic growth. Dramatic progress in reducing hunger, combating disease and eliminating poverty. And an ever stronger desire around the world for economic and political liberty.

But the very success of a system created fifty years ago has helped create dramatic challenges to that system -- and to the ideals of democracy and free markets it promoted.

First, the sheer volume of economic activity, magnified by a technological revolution of computers, modems and satellites, moves more capital more quickly around the world than ever before -- literally a trillion dollars every day. For capital no less than cars, it is a global economy. The result can be a rising tide of investment that floods emerging markets in newfound prosperity -- only to violently recede when investors suddenly lose confidence, leaving entire countries to founder on the rocks of bankruptcy, debt and dislocation. Millions of people feel as if the rug has been pulled out from under them ... people who worked hard to climb up to the middle class, only to find their progress shattered when foreign investors call in their debts all at once.

Second, in rushing to embrace democracy and market economies, people have not always created the institutional pillars that allow them to withstand the winds of rapid economic change – institutions like the rule of law, enforceable rights and contracts, the open awarding of contracts. For example, in Russia, many people want to participate in free markets. But they are discouraged by inequities ... a government that does not always collect taxes properly ... courts that do not always protect property and intellectual rights ... banks that are unreliable ...

business rivals who resort to bribery and intimidation. These are all disincentives to enterprise and foreign investment.

Faced with these challenges, some are tempted to defy the new rule of gravity of the global economy: to close their economies to the world ... to solve systemic problems by printing money, thereby igniting hyperinflation ... to look for bailouts from the world without at the same time doing the hard things they must do to prevent new money from simply leaking through old holes.

Countries cannot say, to paraphrase an old song, "Stop the Global Economy, I Want to Get Off." Economic integration is neither inherently good nor bad, but it is almost certainly a fact. Countries that try to turn back will find that the road has disappeared behind them. And if the past fifty years have taught us anything, it is that closed economies condemn countries to stagnation and mediocrity. The only path to progress is forward, toward more openness and integration.

At the same time, those of us who believe in democracy and market economies have an obligation to help restore confidence, restart stalled economies -- and adapt the system we built to the new demands of the global economy. In recent weeks, some of you may have heard President Clinton speak in detail to our ideas on how to do just that -- in Moscow, at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, in his meetings with Japanese Prime Minister Obuchi and, most recently, at the annual meeting of the World Bank and the IMF.

Some solutions involve short term responses to the current crisis -- adopting policies in the industrial countries that spur growth, opening new lines of credit for nations on the right course, increasing World Bank support for crucial social safety net programs that help people adjust to the hardship of change, and meeting our own obligations to the IMF. Others involve long-term fixes to the Bretton Woods system -- including developing mechanisms to tame the cycles of expansion and contraction that are shaking the world economy. Still others concern reforms we have urged new market economies to adopt -- like ending crony capitalism and nepotism, strengthening government institutions and making them more transparent, and giving workers the tools they need to succeed in the information age.

III. DEEPEN GLOBAL DEMOCRACY

We are not immune to the global economic crisis. US jobs depend upon exports, the fastest part of our growing economy. The US must lead in these efforts, not only because the world looks to us for leadership, but because ultimately, our own prosperity depends upon it.

But there is another crucial front to this battle. We must help strengthen the institutions of new democracies facing hard times or the pendulum will sweep back toward authoritarianism and away from democracy, as desperate people look for simple solutions from apparently strong leaders more interested in power than working with the world community. So we must help new democracies deliver or they will be swept away in a tide of economic turmoil.

Indeed, the best way out of the economic difficulty is not less freedom but more. Franklin Roosevelt once said, "my anchor is democracy -- and more democracy." By and large,

democratic countries like Korea and Thailand have fared better in the recent crisis because the difficult solutions proposed by responsible, democratically-elected leaders have more legitimacy. And over the longer term, democracy is vital to economic growth and rising standards of living because in the 21st century, the true wealth of nations will be based on the free flow of ideas and information.

One of the most important lessons of American history – and the last few years of world history – has been that democracy is a continuing process, always correcting itself, always trying to do better. It is not enough simply to have elections ... elections are only a beginning. The voting booth should be a gateway to a future that works.

Now that old autocratic governments of the left and the right have by and large been swept away, we need to be support a second generation of reforms, to help nominal democracies become efficient, responsive governments that do neither too little nor too much. New democracies need to prove they serve their people ... demonstrating openness and accountability, supporting a strong judiciary. They need to nurture good citizens for the future through decent schooling. And they need to encourage the emergence of trur civil society by supporting an independent media, opposition parties and independent groups that promote human rights, health and other worthy causes.

Only broad and deeply-rooted democracy can express and then exert the collective willpower that each nation needs to fight the current problems. It requires hard decisions to collect taxes, keep budgets balanced, cut subsidies, reduce crony capitalism, and build a banking system with integrity. It requires public confidence and consent. It will not be easy. But over the long term, no political system better allows these choices to be made than democracy.

All of these suggestions seem obvious to an American audience. But many new democracies have a good distance still to travel on this road. They have already moved from bullets to ballots ... now they need to move from ballots to something better still. Despite frustration, there is a constant desire in those places to learn the right lessons, and then to put them into practice. Young people are especially trying to find this guidance. We must not let them down. We must make democracy work for a new generation.

Here, too, we are taking concrete action. The U.S. devotes \$400 million a year to programs that promote democracy, human rights and civil society ... helping political parties form in South Africa ... building independent judiciaries in Latin America ... helping create a civilian police in Haiti to replace a thuggish army ... supporting an independent media in Bosnia ... and encouraging women to enter the public sector in traditional societies around the world. We spend another \$100 million a year on public education, teaching people how to hold elections, how to choose candidates, and how to resolve their differences peacefully. There are limits to what the US can do, of course – at a certain point, each nation must learn democracy on its own. But this aid is one of our best investments in the future.

IV. US INTERESTS

Building democracy and market economies abroad is profoundly in America's interest. Democracies have always been slower to conduct war than totalitarian states, and the number of

conflicts between mature democracies has dwindled to nearly zero. There will always be crises, but a world of confident democracies will see less genocide in places like Rwanda and Algeria ... less repression in places like Iraq and Kosovo ... less mistreatment of women in places like Afghanistan ... less mistreatment of children in places like Sudan. Countries that allow vigorous debate are bad breeding grounds for dictators who seek conflict. What do Milosevic, Saddam Hussein, and Khadafi have in common? None of them rules a democracy.

Such a world is clearly in the long-term interest of the United States. Not merely from the perspective of Wilsonian idealism – that we want to promote a better world with happier news stories. But because of the practical reason that we want stable, prosperous partners to work with as we shape the next century. We want partners who enjoy the same benefits we do, so they will act with us to defend peace and prosperity when our common interests are threatened. Indeed, it is a central reality of our time that, while America's economic, military and political power is stronger than it ever has been before, our need to cooperate closely with other countries to advance our interests in a world of new challenges also has never been greater.

The world is profoundly different today than it was fifty years ago, or a century ago, or 150 years ago, when a Dartmouth alumnus, Daniel Webster, was twice Secretary of State. Even a visionary like Webster would be stunned at our progress. In his day, it was a significant diplomatic triumph if we could get a European state to pay attention to the U.S. Today, the entire world is counting on us.

The future you inherit and build will be significantly affected by the immediate problems we are dealing with today in the Middle East, Kosovo and other places. But it will also be profoundly affected by how we shape the larger course of history. We often hear it said that freedom and democracy are birthrights. But the people of your grandparent's generation knew learned that these birthrights could be taken away all too easily. Their sacrifice and commitment meant a great deal to the prosperity of my own generation, and we will try to pass on the same legacy to you.

But ultimately, it's not just what we do – it's what you do, too. I hope all of you here today will think hard about these problems and make your voices heard. America has always met its challenges because there have always been Americans of generous vision and foresight who stood up to argue for the hard decisions that keep democracies functioning. I hope some of you will consider working for your country, and that you will write new chapters in the story we have all been writing together for 222 years – and counting.

###

Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)

From: Malinowski, Tomasz P. (SPCHW)
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2000 11:32 AM
To: Halperin, David E. (SPCHW); Camp, Donald A. (NESA)
Cc: @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters
Subject: RE: [UNCLASSIFIED]

Also see www.timesofindia.com and <http://news.indiamart.com/topstories.html>

-----Original Message-----

From: Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2000 10:38 AM
To: Camp, Donald A. (NESA)
Cc: @SPEECH - NSC Speechwriters
Subject: FW: [UNCLASSIFIED]

Thanks, Don!

-----Original Message-----

From: Camp, Donald A. (NESA)
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2000 10:08 AM
To: Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)
Subject: RE: [UNCLASSIFIED]

David, we're preparing a (short) reading list for POTUS but I am using as fodder a slightly-longer list that State supplied; i'll fax it to you.

We should all be reading India Today, India's version of Newsweek, for the next few weeks. It's on some newstands in town, and we get a copy though i usually don't see it until it's a week old.

Lots of websites. India-today.com is the magazine's website.

Indiaabroadonline.com is good for the South Asia community in the US

i just discover www.columbia.edu/cu/libraries/indiv/area/sarai which is run by the academic community but has lots of good reference links.

Don

-----Original Message-----

From: Halperin, David E. (SPCHW)
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2000 10:01 AM
To: Camp, Donald A. (NESA)
Subject: [UNCLASSIFIED]

Don --

Though my speechwriting colleagues are always experts, I for one need to get more educated about India. (My experience is mostly limited to 4 weeks backpacking when I was 22.) Following your lead, I just requested that we get on the cables/intel list. Are there any books, articles, web sites, other things that you would particularly recommend? I know you are swamped, but you have thoughts please let me know. Thanks. David (69377)

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

003. memo	To President Clinton from Samuel Berger. Subject: Russia (2 pages)	n.d.	P1/b(1)
-----------	--	------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Speechwriting (Paul Orzulak)
OA/Box Number: 4022

FOLDER TITLE:

[Miscellaneous Materials and Dartmouth] [1]

2008-0702-F

jm218

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 27, 2000

PRESIDENT WILLIAM J. CLINTON
STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

U.S. Capitol
Washington, D.C.

9:18 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, members of Congress, honored guests, my fellow Americans:

We are fortunate to be alive at this moment in history. (Applause.) Never before has our nation enjoyed, at once, so much prosperity and social progress with so little internal crisis and so few external threats. Never before have we had such a blessed opportunity -- and, therefore, such a profound obligation -- to build the more perfect union of our founders' dreams.

We begin the new century with over 20 million new jobs; the fastest economic growth in more than 30 years; the lowest unemployment rates in 30 years; the lowest poverty rates in 20 years; the lowest African American and Hispanic unemployment rates on record; the first back-to-back budget surpluses in 42 years. And next month, America will achieve the longest period of economic growth in our entire history. (Applause.)

We have built a new economy.

And our economic revolution has been matched by a revival of the American spirit: crime down by 20 percent, to its lowest level in 25 years; teen births down seven years in a row; adoptions up by 30 percent; welfare rolls cut in half to their lowest levels in 30 years.

My fellow Americans, the state of our union is the strongest it has ever been. (Applause.)

As always, the real credit belongs to the American people. (Applause.) My gratitude also goes to those of you in this chamber who have worked with us to put progress over partisanship.

Eight years ago, it was not so clear to most Americans there would be much to celebrate in the year 2000. Then our nation was gripped by economic distress, social decline, political gridlock. The title of a best-selling book asked: "America: What Went Wrong?"

In the best traditions of our nation, Americans determined to set things right. We restored the vital center, replacing outmoded ideologies with a new vision anchored in basic, enduring values: opportunity for all, responsibility from all, a community of all Americans. We reinvented government, transforming it into a catalyst for new ideas that stress both opportunity and responsibility, and give our people the tools they need to solve their own problems.

With the smallest federal work force in 40 years, we turned

record deficits into record surpluses, and doubled our investment in education. We cut crime, with 100,000 community police and the Brady law, which has kept guns out of the hands of half a million criminals. (Applause.)

We ended welfare as we knew it -- (applause) -- requiring work while protecting health care and nutrition for children, and investing more in child care, transportation, and housing to help their parents go to work. We've helped parents to succeed at home and at work, with family leave, which 20 millions Americans have now used to care for a newborn child or a sick loved one. We've engaged 150,000 young Americans in citizen service through AmeriCorps, while helping them earn money for college.

In 1992, we just had a road map; today, we have results. (Applause.)

But even more important, America again has the confidence to dream big dreams. But we must not let this confidence drift into complacency. For we, all of us, will be judged by the dreams and deeds we pass on to our children. And on that score, we will be held to a high standard, indeed, because our chance to do good is so great.

My fellow Americans, we have crossed the bridge we built to the 21st century. Now, we must shape a 21st century American revolution -- of opportunity, responsibility and community. We must be now, as we were in the beginning, a new nation.

At the dawn of the last century, Theodore Roosevelt said, "the one characteristic more essential than any other is foresight...it should be the growing nation with a future that takes the long look ahead." So, tonight, let us take our long look ahead -- and set great goals for our nation.

To 21st century America, let us pledge these things: Every child will begin school ready to learn and graduate ready to succeed. (Applause.) Every family will be able to succeed at home and at work, and no child will be raised in poverty. (Applause.) We will meet the challenge of the aging of America. We will assure quality, affordable health care, at last, for all Americans. (Applause.)

We will make America the safest big country on Earth. (Applause.) We will pay off our national debt for the first time since 1835. (Applause.) We will bring prosperity to every American community. We will reverse the course of climate change and leave a safer, cleaner planet. America will lead the world toward shared peace and prosperity, and the far frontiers of science and technology. And we will become at last what our founders pledged us to be so long ago -- one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. (Applause.)

These are great goals, worthy of a great nation. We will not reach them all this year. Not even in this decade. But we will reach them. Let us remember that the first American Revolution was not won with a single shot; the continent was not settled in a single year. The lesson of our history -- and the lesson of the last seven years -- is that great goals are reached step by step, always building on our progress, always gaining ground.

Of course, you can't gain ground if you're standing still. And for too long this Congress has been standing still on some of our most pressing national priorities. So let's begin tonight with them.

Again, I ask you to pass a real patients' bill of rights.

(Applause.) I ask you to pass common-sense gun safety legislation. (Applause.) I ask you to pass campaign finance reform. (Applause.) I ask you to vote up or down on judicial nominations and other important appointees. (Applause.) And, again I ask you -- I implore you -- to raise the minimum wage. (Applause.)

Now, two years ago -- let me try to balance the seesaw here -- (laughter) -- two years ago, as we reached across party lines to reach our first balanced budget, I asked that we meet our responsibility to the next generation by maintaining our fiscal discipline. Because we refused to stray from that path, we are doing something that would have seemed unimaginable seven years ago. We are actually paying down the national debt. (Applause.)

Now, if we stay on this path, we can pay down the debt entirely in 13 just years now and make America debt-free for the first time since Andrew Jackson was President in 1835. (Applause.)

In 1993, we began to put our fiscal house in order with the Deficit Reduction Act, which you'll all remember won passages in both Houses by just a single vote. Your former colleague, my first Secretary of the Treasury, led that effort and sparked our long boom. He's here with us tonight. Lloyd Bentsen, you have served America well, and we thank you. (Applause.)

Beyond paying off the debt, we must ensure that the benefits of debt reduction go to preserving two of the most important guarantees we make to every American -- Social Security and Medicare. (Applause.) Tonight, I ask you to work with me to make a bipartisan down payment on Social Security reform by crediting the interest savings from debt reduction to the Social Security Trust Fund so that it will be strong and sound for the next 50 years. (Applause.)

But this is just the start of our journey. We must also take the right steps toward reaching our great goals. First and foremost, we need a 21st century revolution in education, guided by our faith that every single child can learn. (Applause.) Because education is more important than ever, more than ever the key to our children's future, we must make sure all our children have that key. That means quality pre-school and after-school, the best trained teachers in the classroom, and college opportunities for all our children. (Applause.)

For seven years now, we've worked hard to improve our schools, with opportunity and responsibility -- investing more, but demanding more in turn. Reading, math, college entrance scores are up. Some of the most impressive gains are in schools in very poor neighborhoods.

But all successful schools have followed the same proven formula: higher standards, more accountability, and extra help so children who need it can get it to reach those standards. I have sent Congress a reform plan based on that formula. It holds states and school districts accountable for progress, and rewards them for results. Each year, our national government invests more than \$15 billion in our schools. It is time to support what works and stop supporting what doesn't. (Applause.)

Now, as we demand more from our schools, we should also invest more in our schools. (Applause.) Let's double our investment to help states and districts turn around their worst-performing schools, or shut them down. Let's double our investments in after-school and summer school programs, which boost achievement and keep people off the streets and out of trouble. (Applause.) If we do this, we can give every single child in every failing school in America -- everyone -- the chance to meet high standards.

Since 1993, we've nearly doubled our investment in Head Start and improved its quality. Tonight, I ask you for another \$1 billion for Head Start, the largest increase in the history of the program. (Applause.)

We know that children learn best in smaller classes with good teachers. For two years in a row, Congress has supported my plan to hire 100,000 new qualified teachers to lower class size in the early grades. I thank you for that, and I ask you to make it three in a row. (Applause.) And to make sure all teachers know the subjects they teach, tonight I propose a new teacher quality initiative -- to recruit more talented people into the classroom, reward good teachers for staying there, and give all teachers the training they need. (Applause.)

We know charter schools provide real public school choice. When I became President, there was just one independent public charter school in all America. Today, thanks to you, there are 1,700. I ask you now to help us meet our goal of 3,000 charter schools by next year. (Applause.)

We know we must connect all our classrooms to the Internet, and we're getting there. In 1994, only 3 percent of our classrooms were connected. Today, with the help of the Vice President's E-rate program, more than half of them are. And 90 percent of our schools have at least one Internet connection. (Applause.)

But we cannot finish the job when a third of all our schools are in serious disrepair. Many of them have walls and wires so old, they're too old for the Internet. So tonight, I propose to help 5,000 schools a year make immediate and urgent repairs; and again, to help build or modernize 6,000 more, to get students out of trailers and into high-tech classrooms. (Applause.)

I ask all of you to help me double our bipartisan Gear-Up program, which provides mentors for disadvantaged young people. If we double it, we can provide mentors for 1.4 million of them. (Applause.) Let's also offer these kids from disadvantaged backgrounds the same chance to take the same college test-prep courses wealthier students use to boost their test scores. (Applause.)

To make the American Dream achievable for all, we must make college affordable for all. For seven years, on a bipartisan basis, we have taken action toward that goal: larger Pell grants, more affordable student loans, education IRAs, and our HOPE scholarships, which have already benefitted 5 million young people.

Now, 67 percent of high school graduates are going on to college. That's up 10 percent since 1993. Yet millions of families still strain to pay college tuition. They need help. (Applause.) So I propose a landmark \$30-billion college opportunity tax cut -- a middle class tax deduction for up to \$10,000 in college tuition costs. (Applause.) The previous actions of this Congress have already made two years of college affordable for all. It's time to make four years of college affordable for all. (Applause.) If we take all these steps, we'll move a long way toward making sure every child starts school ready to learn and graduates ready to succeed.

We need a 21st century revolution to reward work and strengthen families, by giving every parent the tools to succeed at work and at the most important work of all -- raising children. That means making sure every family has health care and the support to care for aging parents, the tools to bring their children up right, and that no child grows up in poverty.

From my first days as President, we've worked to give families better access to better health care. In 1997, we passed the Children's Health Insurance Program -- CHIP -- so that workers who don't have coverage through their employers at least can get it for their children. So far, we've enrolled 2 million children; we're well on our way to our goal of 5 million.

But there are still more than 40 million of our fellow Americans without health insurance -- more than there were in 1993. Tonight I propose that we follow Vice President Gore's suggestion to make low income parents eligible for the insurance that covers their children. (Applause.) Together with our children's initiative -- think of this -- together with our children's initiative, this action would enable us to cover nearly a quarter of all the uninsured people in America.

Again, I want to ask you to let people between the ages of 55 and 65 -- the fastest growing group of uninsured -- buy into Medicare. (Applause.) And this year I propose to give them a tax credit to make that choice an affordable one. I hope you will support that, as well. (Applause.)

When the baby boomers retire, Medicare will be faced with caring for twice as many of our citizens; yet, it is far from ready to do so. My generation must not ask our children's generation to shoulder our burden. We simply must act now to strengthen and modernize Medicare.

My budget includes a comprehensive plan to reform Medicare, to make it more efficient and competitive. And it dedicates nearly \$400 billion of our budget surplus to keep Medicare solvent past 2025. (Applause.) And, at long last, it also provides funds to give every senior a voluntary choice of affordable coverage for prescription drugs. (Applause.)

Lifesaving drugs are an indispensable part of modern medicine. No one creating a Medicare program today would even think of excluding coverage for prescription drugs. Yet more than three in five of our seniors now lack dependable drug coverage which can lengthen and enrich their lives. Millions of older Americans who need prescription drugs the most pay the highest prices for them. In good conscience, we cannot let another year pass without extending to all our seniors this lifeline of affordable prescription drugs. (Applause.)

Record numbers of Americans are providing for aging or ailing loved ones at home. It's a loving, but a difficult and often very expensive choice. Last year, I proposed a \$1,000 tax credit for long-term care. Frankly, it wasn't enough. This year, let's triple it, to \$3,000. (Applause.) But this year, let's pass it. (Applause.)

We also have to make needed investments to expand access to mental health care. I want to take a moment to thank the person who led our first White House Conference on Mental Health last year, and who for seven years has led all our efforts to break down the barriers to decent treatment of people with mental illness. Thank you, Tipper Gore. (Applause.)

Taken together, these proposals would mark the largest investment in health care in the 35 years since Medicare was created -- the largest investment in 35 years. That would be a big step toward assuring quality health care for all Americans, young and old. And I ask you to embrace them and pass them. (Applause.)

We must also make investments that reward work and support families. Nothing does that better than the Earned Income Tax Credit -- the EITC. (Applause.) The "E" in the EITC is about earning, working, taking responsibility and being rewarded for it. In my very first address to you, I asked Congress to greatly expand this credit; and you did. As a result, in 1998 alone, the EITC helped more than 4.3 million Americans work their way out of poverty toward the middle class. That's double the number in 1993.

Tonight, I propose another major expansion of the EITC: to reduce the marriage penalty, to make sure it rewards marriage as it rewards work -- (applause) -- and also, to expand the tax credit for families that have more than two children. It punishes people with more than two children today. (Applause.) Our proposal would allow families with three or more children to get up to \$1,100 more in tax relief. These are working families; their children should not be in poverty. (Applause.)

We also can't reward work and family unless men and women get equal pay for equal work. (Applause.) Today, the female unemployment rate is the lowest it has been in 46 years. Yet, women still only earn about 75 cents for every dollar men earn. We must do better, by providing the resources to enforce present equal pay laws; training more women for high-paying, high-tech jobs; and passing the Paycheck Fairness Act. (Applause.)

Many working parents spend up to a quarter -- a quarter -- of their income on child care. Last year, we helped parents provide child care for about 2 million children. My child care initiative, before you now, along with funds already secured in welfare reform, would make child care better, safer and more affordable for another 400,000 children. I ask you to pass that. They need it out there -- (applause.)

For hard-pressed middle-income families, we should also expand the child care tax credit. And I believe strongly we should take the next big step and make that tax credit refundable for low-income families. (Applause.) For people making under \$30,000 a year, that could mean up to \$2,400 for child care costs. You know, we all say we're pro-work and pro-family. Passing this proposal would prove it. (Applause.)

Tens of millions of Americans live from paycheck to paycheck. As hard as they work, they still don't have the opportunity to save. Too few can make use of IRAs and 401-K plans. We should do more to help all working families save and accumulate wealth. That's the idea behind the Individual Development Accounts, the IDAs. I ask you to take that idea to a new level, with new Retirement Savings Accounts that enable every low- and moderate-income family in America to save for retirement, a first home, a medical emergency, or a college education. I propose to match their contributions, however small, dollar for dollar, every year they save. And I propose to give a major new tax credit to any small business that will provide a meaningful pension to its workers. Those people ought to have retirement as well as the rest of us. (Applause.)

Nearly one in three American children grows up without a father. These children are five times more likely to live in poverty than children with both parents at home. Clearly, demanding and supporting responsible fatherhood is critical to lifting all children out of poverty. We've doubled child support collections since 1992. And I'm proposing to you tough new measures to hold still more fathers responsible.

But we should recognize that a lot of fathers want to do right by their children, but need help to do it. Carlos Rosas of St. Paul,

Minnesota, wanted to do right by his son, and he got the help to do it. Now he's got a good job and he supports his little boy. My budget will help 40,000 more fathers make the same choices Carlos Rosas did. I thank him for being here tonight. (Applause.) Stand up, Carlos. Thank you. (Applause.)

If there is any single issue on which we should be able to reach across party lines, it is in our common commitment to reward work and strengthen families, similar to what we did last year. We came together to help people with disabilities keep their health insurance when they go to work. And I thank you for that. Thanks to overwhelming bipartisan support from this Congress, we have improved foster care. We've helped those young people who leave it when they turn 18, and we have dramatically increased the number of foster care children going into adoptive homes. I thank all of you for all of that. (Applause.)

Of course, I am forever grateful to the person who has led our efforts from the beginning, and who's worked so tirelessly for children and families for 30 years now: my wife, Hillary. And I thank her. (Applause.)

If we take the steps I've just discussed, we can go a long, long way toward empowering parents to succeed at home and at work, and ensuring that no child is raised in poverty. We can make these vital investments in health care, education, support for working families, and still offer tax cuts to help pay for college, for retirement, to care for aging parents, to reduce the marriage penalty. We can do these things without forsaking the path of fiscal discipline that got us to this point here tonight.

Indeed, we must make these investments and these tax cuts in the context of a balanced budget that strengthens and extends the life of Social Security and Medicare and pays down the national debt. (Applause.)

Crime in America has dropped for the past seven years -- that's the longest decline on record -- thanks to a national consensus we helped to forge on community police, sensible gun safety laws, and effective prevention. But nobody -- nobody here, nobody in America -- believes we're safe enough. So again, I ask you to set a higher goal. Let's make this country the safest big country in the world. (Applause.)

Last fall, Congress supported my plan to hire, in addition to the 100,000 community police we've already funded, 50,000 more, concentrated in high-crime neighborhoods. I ask your continued support for that.

Soon after the Columbine tragedy, Congress considered common-sense gun legislation, to require Brady background checks at the gun shows, child safety locks for new handguns, and a ban on the importation of large-capacity ammunition clips. With courage -- and a tie-breaking vote by the Vice President -- (applause) -- the Senate faced down the gun lobby, stood up for the American people, and passed this legislation. But the House failed to follow suit.

Now, we have all seen what happens when guns fall into the wrong hands. Daniel Mauser was only 15 years old when he was gunned down at Columbine. He was an amazing kid -- a straight-A student, a good skier. Like all parents who lose their children, his father Tom has borne unimaginable grief. Somehow he has found the strength to honor his son by transforming his grief into action. Earlier this month, he took a leave of absence from his job to fight for tougher gun safety laws. I pray that his courage and wisdom will at long last move

this Congress to make common-sense gun legislation the very next order of business. (Applause.)

Tom Mauser, stand up. We thank you for being here tonight. (Applause.) Tom. Thank you, Tom. (Applause.)

We must strengthen our gun laws and enforce those already on the books better. (Applause.) Federal gun crime prosecutions are up 16 percent since I took office. But we must do more. I propose to hire more federal and local gun prosecutors and more ATF agents to crack down on illegal gun traffickers and bad-apple dealers. And we must give them the enforcement tools that they need, tools to trace every gun and every bullet used in every gun crime in the United States. I ask you to help us do that. (Applause.)

Every state in this country already requires hunters and automobile drivers to have a license. I think they ought to do the same thing for handgun purchases. (Applause.) Now, specifically, I propose a plan to ensure that all new handgun buyers must first have a photo license from their state showing they passed the Brady background check and a gun safety course, before they get the gun. I hope you'll help me pass that in this Congress. (Applause.)

Listen to this -- listen to this. The accidental gun rate -- the accidental gun death rate of children under 15 in the United States is nine times higher than in the other 25 industrialized countries combined. Now, technologies now exist that could lead to guns that can only be fired by the adults who own them. I ask Congress to fund research into smart gun technology, to save these children's lives. (Applause.) I ask responsible leaders in the gun industry to work with us on smart guns, and other steps to keep guns out of the wrong hands, to keep our children safe.

You know, every parent I know worries about the impact of violence in the media on their children. I want to begin by thanking the entertainment industry for accepting my challenge to put voluntary ratings on TV programs and video and Internet games. But, frankly, the ratings are too numerous, diverse and confusing to be really useful to parents. So tonight, I ask the industry to accept the First Lady's challenge to develop a single voluntary rating system for all children's entertainment that is easier for parents to understand and enforce. (Applause.) The steps I outline will take us well on our way to making America the safest big country in the world.

Now, to keep our historic economic expansion going -- the subject of a lot of discussion in this community and others -- I believe we need a 21st century revolution to open new markets, start new businesses, hire new workers right here in America -- in our inner cities, poor rural areas, and Native American reservations. (Applause.)

Our nation's prosperity hasn't yet reached these places. Over the last six months, I've traveled to a lot of them, joined by many of you, and many far-sighted business people, to shine a spotlight on the enormous potential in communities from Appalachia to the Mississippi Delta, from Watts to the Pine Ridge Reservation. Everywhere I go, I meet talented people eager for opportunity, and able to work. Tonight I ask you, let's put them to work. (Applause.) For business, it's the smart thing to do. For America, it's the right thing to do. And let me ask you something -- if we don't do this now, when in the wide world will we ever get around to it? (Applause.)

So I ask Congress to give businesses the same incentives to invest in America's new markets they now have to invest in markets overseas. (Applause.) Tonight, I propose a large New Markets tax

credit and other incentives to spur \$22 billion in private-sector capital to create new businesses and new investments in our inner cities and rural areas. (Applause.)

Because empowerment zones have been creating these opportunities for five years now, I also ask you to increase incentives to invest in them and to create more of them. (Applause.)

And let me say to all of you again what I have tried to say at every turn -- this is not a Democratic or a Republican issue. Giving people a chance to live their dreams is an American issue. (Applause.)

Mr. Speaker, it was a powerful moment last November when you joined Reverend Jesse Jackson and me in your home state of Illinois, and committed to working toward our common goal, by combining the best ideas from both sides of the aisle. I want to thank you again, and to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with you. This is a worthy, joint endeavor. Thank you. (Applause.)

I also ask you to make special efforts to address the areas of our nation with the highest rates of poverty -- our Native American reservations and the Mississippi Delta. My budget includes \$110-million initiative to promote economic development in the Delta, and a billion dollars to increase economic opportunity, health care, education and law enforcement for our Native American communities. (Applause.) In this new century -- we should begin this new century by honoring our historic responsibility to empower the first Americans. (Applause.) And I want to thank tonight the leaders and the members from both parties who've expressed to me an interest in working with us on these efforts. They are profoundly important.

There's another part of our American community in trouble tonight -- our family farmers. When I signed the Farm Bill in 1996, I said there was great danger it would work well in good times, but not in bad. Well, droughts, floods, and historically low prices have made these times very bad for the farmers. We must work together to strengthen the farm safety net, invest in land conservation, and create some new markets for them by expanding our programs for bio-based fuels and products. Please, they need help -- let's do it together. (Applause.)

Opportunity for all requires something else today -- having access to a computer and knowing how to use it. That means we must close the digital divide between those who've got the tools and those who don't. (Applause.)

Connecting classrooms and libraries to the Internet is crucial, but it's just a start. My budget ensures that all new teachers are trained to teach 21st century skills, and it creates technology centers in 1,000 communities to serve adults. This spring, I'll invite high-tech leaders to join me on another New Markets tour, to close the digital divide and open opportunity for our people.

I want to thank the high-tech companies that already are doing so much in this area. I hope the new tax incentives I have proposed will get all the rest of them to join us. This is a national crusade. We have got to do this, and do it quickly. (Applause.)

Now, again I say to you, these are steps, but step by step, we can go a long way toward our goal of bringing opportunity to every community.

To realize the full possibilities of this economy, we must reach beyond our own borders, to shape the revolution that is tearing

down barriers and building new networks among nations and individuals, and economies and cultures: globalization. It's the central reality of our time.

Of course, change this profound is both liberating and threatening to people. But there's no turning back. And our open, creative society stands to benefit more than any other -- if we understand, and act on, the realities of interdependence. We have to be at the center of every vital global network, as a good neighbor and a good partner. We have to recognize that we cannot build our future without helping others to build theirs.

The first thing we have got to do is to forge a new consensus on trade. Now, those of us who believe passionately in the power of open trade, we have to ensure that it lifts both our living standards and our values, never tolerating abusive child labor or a race to the bottom in the environment and worker protection. But others must recognize that open markets and rule-based trade are the best engines we know of for raising living standards, reducing global poverty and environmental destruction, and assuring the free flow of ideas.

I believe as strongly tonight as I did the first day I got here, the only direction forward for America on trade -- the only direction for America on trade is to keep going forward. I ask you to help me forge that consensus. (Applause.)

We have to make developing economies our partners in prosperity. That's why I would like to ask you again to finalize our groundbreaking African and Caribbean Basin trade initiatives. (Applause.)

But globalization is about more than economics. Our purpose must be to bring together the world around freedom and democracy and peace, and to oppose those who would tear it apart. Here are the fundamental challenges I believe America must meet to shape the 21st century world.

First, we must continue to encourage our former adversaries, Russia and China, to emerge as stable, prosperous, democratic nations. Both are being held back today from reaching their full potential: Russia by the legacy of communism, an economy in turmoil, a cruel and self-defeating war in Chechnya; China by the illusion that it can buy stability at the expense of freedom.

But think how much has changed in the past decade: 5,000 former Soviet nuclear weapons taken out of commission; Russian soldiers actually serving with ours in the Balkans; Russian people electing their leaders for the first time in a thousand years; and in China, an economy more open to the world than ever before.

Of course, no one, not a single person in this chamber tonight, can know for sure what direction these great nations will take. But we do know for sure that we can choose what we do. And we should do everything in our power to increase the chance that they will choose wisely, to be constructive members of our global community.

That's why we should support those Russians who are struggling for a democratic, prosperous future; continue to reduce both our nuclear arsenals; and help Russia to safeguard weapons and materials that remain.

And that's why I believe Congress should support the agreement we negotiated to bring China into the WTO, by passing Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China as soon as possible this year. (Applause.)

I think you ought to do it for two reasons. First of all, our markets are already open to China; this agreement will open China's markets to us. (Applause.) And, second, it will plainly advance the cause of peace in Asia and promote the cause of change in China. No, we don't know where it's going. All we can do is decide what we're going to do. But when all is said and done, we need to know we did everything we possibly could to maximize the chance that China will choose the right future. (Applause.)

A second challenge we've got is to protect our own security from conflicts that pose the risk of wider war and threaten our common humanity. We can't prevent every conflict or stop every outrage. But where our interests are at stake and we can make a difference, we should be, and we must be, peacemakers.

We should be proud of our role in bringing the Middle East closer to a lasting peace; building peace in Northern Ireland; working for peace in East Timor and Africa; promoting reconciliation between Greece and Turkey and in Cyprus; working to defuse these crises between India and Pakistan; in defending human rights and religious freedom. And we should be proud of the men and women of our Armed Forces and those of our allies who stopped the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, enabling a million people to return to their homes. (Applause.)

When Slobodan Milosevic unleashed his terror on Kosovo, Captain John Cherrey was one of the brave airmen who turned the tide. And when another American plane was shot down over Serbia, he flew into the teeth of enemy air defenses to bring his fellow pilot home. Thanks to our Armed Forces' skill and bravery, we prevailed in Kosovo without losing a single American in combat. (Applause.) I want to introduce Captain Cherrey to you. We honor Captain Cherrey, and we promise you, Captain, we'll finish the job you began. Stand up so we can see you. (Applause.)

A third challenge we have is to keep this inexorable march of technology from giving terrorists and potentially hostile nations the means to undermine our defenses. Keep in mind, the same technological advances that have shrunk cell phones to fit in the palms of our hands can also make weapons of terror easier to conceal and easier to use.

We must meet this threat by making effective agreements to restrain nuclear and missile programs in North Korea; curbing the flow of lethal technology to Iran; preventing Iraq from threatening its neighbors; increasing our preparedness against chemical and biological attack; protecting our vital computer systems from hackers and criminals; and developing a system to defend against new missile threats -- while working to preserve our ABM missile treaty with Russia. We must do all these things.

I predict to you, when most of us are long gone, but some time in the next 10 to 20 years, the major security threat this country will face will come from the enemies of the nation state: the narco-traffickers and the terrorists and the organized criminals, who will be organized together, working together, with increasing access to ever-more sophisticated chemical and biological weapons.

And I want to thank the Pentagon and others for doing what they're doing right now to try to help protect us and plan for that, so that our defenses will be strong. I ask for your support to ensure they can succeed. (Applause.)

I also want to ask you for a constructive bipartisan dialogue this year to work to build a consensus which I hope will eventually lead

to the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.
(Applause.)

I hope we can also have a constructive effort to meet the challenge that is presented to our planet by the huge gulf between rich and poor. We cannot accept a world in which part of humanity lives on the cutting edge of a new economy, and the rest live on the bare edge of survival. I think we have to do our part to change that -- with expanded trade, expanded aid, and the expansion of freedom.

This is interesting -- from Nigeria to Indonesia, more people got the right to choose their leaders in 1999 than in 1989, when the Berlin Wall fell. We've got to stand by these democracies -- including, and especially tonight, Colombia, which is fighting narco-traffickers, for its own people's lives and our children's lives. I have proposed a strong two-year package to help Colombia win this fight. I want to thank the leaders in both parties in both Houses for listening to me and the President of Colombia about it. We have got to pass this. I want to ask your help. A lot is riding on it. And it's so important for the long-term stability of our country, and for what happens in Latin America.

I also want you to know I'm going to send you new legislation to go after what these drug barons value the most -- their money. And I hope you'll pass that as well. (Applause.)

In a world where over a billion people live on less than a dollar a day, we also have got to do our part in the global endeavor to reduce the debts of the poorest countries, so they can invest in education, health care and economic growth. That's what the Pope and other religious leaders have urged us to do. And last year, Congress made a down payment on America's share. I ask you to continue that. I thank you for what you did, and ask you to stay the course. (Applause.)

I also want to say that America must help more nations to break the bonds of disease. Last year in Africa, 10 times as many people died from AIDS as were killed in wars -- 10 times. The budget I give you invests \$150 million more in the fight against this and other infectious killers. And today, I propose a tax credit to speed the development of vaccines for diseases like malaria, TB and AIDS. I ask the private sector and our partners around the world to join us in embracing this cause. We can save millions of lives together, and we ought to do it. (Applause.)

I also want to mention our final challenge, which, as always, is the most important. I ask you to pass a national security budget that keeps our military the best-trained and best-equipped in the world, with heightened readiness and 21st century weapons; which raises salaries for our servicemen and women; which protects our veterans; which fully funds the diplomacy that keeps our soldiers out of war; which makes good on our commitment to pay our U.N. dues and arrears. I ask you to pass this budget. (Applause.)

I also want to say something, if I might, very personal tonight. The American people watching us at home, with the help of all the commentators, can tell from who stands and who sits, and who claps and who doesn't, that there's still modest differences of opinion in this room. (Laughter.) But I want to thank you for something, every one of you. I want to thank you for the extraordinary support you have given -- Republicans and Democrats alike -- to our men and women in uniform. I thank you for that. (Applause.)

I also want to thank, especially, two people. First, I want to thank our Secretary of Defense, Bill Cohen, for symbolizing our

bipartisan commitment to national security. Thank you, sir.
 (Applause.) Even more, I want to thank his wife, Janet, who, more than any other American citizen, has tirelessly traveled this world to show the support we all feel for our troops. Thank you, Janet Cohen. I appreciate that. Thank you. (Applause.)

These are the challenges we have to meet so that we can lead the world toward peace and freedom in an era of globalization.

I want to tell you that I am very grateful for many things as President. But one of the things I'm grateful for is the opportunity that the Vice President and I have had to finally put to rest the bogus idea that you cannot grow the economy and protect the environment at the same time. (Applause.)

As our economy has grown, we've rid more than 500 neighborhoods of toxic waste, ensured cleaner air and water for millions of people. In the past three months alone, we've helped preserve 40 million acres of roadless lands in the national forests, created three new national monuments.

But as our communities grow, our commitment to conservation must continue to grow. Tonight, I propose creating a permanent conservation fund, to restore wildlife, protect coastlines, save natural treasures, from the California redwoods to the Florida Everglades. (Applause.)

This Lands Legacy endowment would represent by far the most enduring investment in land preservation ever proposed in this House. I hope we can get together with all the people with different ideas and do this. This is a gift we should give to our children and our grandchildren for all time, across party lines. We can make an agreement to do this. (Applause.)

Last year, the Vice President launched a new effort to make communities more liberal -- livable -- (laughter) -- liberal, I know. (Laughter and applause.) Wait a minute, I've got a punchline now. That's this year's agenda; last year was livable, right? (Laughter.) That's what Senator Lott is going to say in the commentary afterwards. (Laughter.) To make our communities more livable. This is big business. This is a big issue. What does that mean? You ask anybody that lives in an unlivable community, and they'll tell you. They want their kids to grow up next to parks, not parking lots; the parents don't have to spend all their time stalled in traffic when they could be home with their children.

Tonight, I ask you to support new funding for the following things, to make American communities for liberal -- livable. (Laughter and applause.) I've done pretty well with this speech, but I can't say that. (Applause.)

One, I want you to help us to do three things. We need more funding for advanced transit systems. (Applause.) We need more funding for saving open spaces in places of heavy development. (Applause.) And we need more funding -- this ought to have bipartisan appeal -- we need more funding for helping major cities around the Great Lakes protect their waterways and enhance their quality of life. We need these things and I want you to help us. (Applause.)

The greatest environmental challenge of the new century is global warming. The scientists tell us the 1990s were the hottest decade of the entire millennium. If we fail to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases, deadly heat waves and droughts will become more frequent, coastal areas will flood, and economies will be disrupted.

That is going to happen, unless we act.

Many people in the United States -- some people in this chamber -- and lots of folks around the world still believe you cannot cut greenhouse gas emissions without slowing economic growth. In the Industrial Age that may well have been true. But in this digital economy, it is not true anymore. New technologies make it possible to cut harmful emissions and provide even more growth.

For example, just last week, automakers unveiled cars that get 70 to 80 miles a gallon -- the fruits of a unique research partnership between government and industry. And before you know it, efficient production of bio-fuels will give us the equivalent of hundreds of miles from a gallon of gasoline.

To speed innovation in these kind of technologies, I think we should give a major tax incentive to business for the production of clean energy, and to families for buying energy-saving homes and appliances and the next generation of super-efficient cars when they hit the showroom floor. I also ask the auto industry to use the available technologies to make all new cars more fuel-efficient right away.

And I ask this Congress to do something else. Please help us make more of our clean energy technology available to the developing world. That will create cleaner growth abroad and a lot more new jobs here in the United States of America. (Applause.)

In the new century, innovations in science and technology will be the key not only to the health of the environment, but to miraculous improvements in the quality of our lives and advances in the economy. Later this year, researchers will complete the first draft of the entire human genome, the very blueprint of life. It is important for all our fellow Americans to recognize that federal tax dollars have funded much of this research, and that this and other wise investments in science are leading to a revolution in our ability to detect, treat, and prevent disease.

For example, researchers have identified genes that cause Parkinson's, diabetes, and certain kinds of cancer -- they are designed precision therapies that will block the harmful effect of these genes for good. Researchers already are using this new technique to target and destroy cells that cause breast cancer. Soon, we may be able to use it to prevent the onset of Alzheimer's. Scientists are also working on an artificial retina to help many blind people to see -- and listen to this -- microchips that would actually directly stimulate damaged spinal cords in a way that could allow people now paralyzed to stand up and walk. (Applause.)

These kinds of innovations are also propelling our remarkable prosperity. Information technology only includes 8 percent of our employment, but now it counts for a third of our economic growth -- along with jobs that pay, by the way, about 80 percent above the private sector average. Again, we ought to keep in mind, government-funded research brought supercomputers, the Internet, and communications satellites into being. Soon researchers will bring us devices that can translate foreign languages as fast as you can talk; materials 10 times stronger than steel at a fraction of the weight; and -- this is unbelievable to me -- molecular computers the size of a tear drop with the power of today's fastest supercomputers.

To accelerate the march of discovery across all these disciplines in science and technology, I ask you to support my recommendation of an unprecedented \$3 billion in the 21st Century Research Fund, the largest increase in civilian research in a

generation. We owe it to our future. (Applause.)

Now, these new breakthroughs have to be used in ways that reflect our values. First and foremost, we have to safeguard our citizens' privacy. Last year, we proposed to protect every citizen's medical record. This year, we will finalize those rules. We've also taken the first steps to protect the privacy of bank and credit card records and other financial statements. Soon I will send legislation to you to finish that job. We must also act to prevent any genetic discrimination whatever by employers or insurers. I hope you will support that. (Applause.)

These steps will allow us to lead toward the far frontiers of science and technology. They will enhance our health, the environment, the economy in ways we can't even imagine today. But we all know that at a time when science, technology and the forces of globalization are bringing so many changes into all our lives, it's more important than ever that we strengthen the bonds that root us in our local communities and in our national community.

No tie binds different people together like citizen service. There's a new spirit of service in America -- a movement we've tried to support with AmeriCorps, expanded Peace Corps, unprecedented new partnerships with businesses, foundations, community groups. Partnerships, for example, like the one that enlisted 12,000 companies which have now moved 650,000 of our fellow citizens from welfare to work. Partnerships to battle drug abuse, AIDS, teach young people to read, save America's treasures, strengthen the arts, fight teen pregnancy, prevent violence among young people, promote racial healing. The American people are working together.

But we should do more to help Americans help each other. First, we should help faith-based organizations to do more to fight poverty and drug abuse, and help people get back on the right track, with initiatives like Second Chance Homes that do so much to help unwed teen mothers. Second, we should support Americans who tithe and contribute to charities, but don't earn enough to claim a tax deduction for it. (Applause.) Tonight, I propose new tax incentives that would allow low- and middle-income citizens who don't itemize to get that deduction. It's nothing but fair, and it will get more people to give. (Applause.)

We should do more to help new immigrants to fully participate in our community. That's why I recommend spending more to teach them civics and English. And since everybody in our community counts, we've got to make sure everyone is counted in this year's census. (Applause.)

Within 10 years -- just 10 years -- there will be no majority race in our largest state of California. In a little more than 50 years, there will be no majority race in America. In a more interconnected world, this diversity can be our greatest strength. Just look around this chamber. Look around. We have members in this Congress from virtually every racial, ethnic, and religious background. And I think you would agree that America is stronger because of it. (Applause.)

You also have to agree that all those differences you just clapped for all too often spark hatred and division even here at home. Just in the last couple of years, we've seen a man dragged to death in Texas just because he was black. We saw a young man murdered in Wyoming just because he was gay. Last year, we saw the shootings of African Americans, Asian Americans, and Jewish children just because of who they were. This is not the American way, and we must draw the line. (Applause.)

I ask you to draw that line by passing without delay the Hate Crimes Prevention Act and the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. (Applause.) And I ask you to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. (Applause.)

Finally tonight, I propose the largest-ever investment in our civil rights laws for enforcement, because no American should be subjected to discrimination in finding a home, getting a job, going to school, or securing a loan. Protections in law should be protections in fact. (Applause.)

Last February, because I thought this was so important, I created the White House Office of One America to promote racial reconciliation. That's what one of my personal heroes, Hank Aaron, has done all his life. From his days as our all-time home run king to his recent acts of healing, he has always brought people together. We should follow his example, and we're honored to have him with us tonight. Stand up, Hank Aaron. (Applause.)

I just want to say one more thing about this, and I want every one of you to think about this the next time you get mad at one of your colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This fall, at the White House, Hillary had one of her millennium dinners, and we had this very distinguished scientist there, who is an expert in this whole work in the human genome. And he said that we are all, regardless of race, genetically 99.9 percent the same.

Now, you may find that uncomfortable when you look around here. (Laughter.) But it is worth remembering. We can laugh about this, but you think about it. Modern science has confirmed what ancient faiths has always taught: the most important fact of life is our common humanity. Therefore, we should do more than just tolerate our diversity -- we should honor it and celebrate it. (Applause.)

My fellow Americans, every time I prepare for the State of the Union, I approach it with hope and expectation and excitement for our nation. But tonight is very special, because we stand on the mountain top of a new millennium. Behind us we can look back and see the great expanse of American achievement; and before us we can see even greater, grander frontiers of possibility. We should, all of us, be filled with gratitude and humility for our present progress and prosperity. We should be filled with awe and joy at what lies over the horizon. And we should be filled with absolute determination to make the most of it.

You know, when the framers finished crafting our Constitution in Philadelphia, Benjamin Franklin stood in Independence Hall and he reflected on the carving of the sun that was on the back of a chair he saw. The sun was low on the horizon. So he said this -- he said, "I've often wondered whether that sun was rising or setting. Today," Franklin said, "I have the happiness to know it's a rising sun." Today, because each succeeding generation of Americans has kept the fire of freedom burning brightly, lighting those frontiers of possibility, we all still bask in the glow and the warmth of Mr. Franklin's rising sun.

After 224 years, the American revolution continues. We remain a new nation. And as long as our dreams outweigh our memories, America will be forever young. That is our destiny. And this is our moment.

Thank you, God bless you, and God bless America. (Applause.)

END

11:08 P.M. EST

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

004. memo	To President Clinton from Samuel Berger. Subject: Communications plan for your trip to South Asia (9 pages)	02/25/2000	P5
-----------	---	------------	----

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Speechwriting (Paul Orzulak)
OA/Box Number: 4022

FOLDER TITLE:

[Miscellaneous Materials and Dartmouth] [1]

2008-0702-F
jm218

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 29, 2000

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM

Davos, Switzerland

6:36 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. President Schaeuble, I think that it is an indication of the importance of the topic and the importance of the World Economic Forum that you have so many leaders from around the world here today. I see, just scanning the audience, the President of Colombia, the President of South Africa, Chairman Arafat, the Prime Ministers of Spain and Turkey and a number of other leaders.

We have here with me today the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Energy and our Trade Ambassador. There's no one home in Washington to take care of things. (Laughter.) We have a large delegation from the United States Congress here; leaders from all over the world and business; public life; the leader of the American Union Movement, John Sweeney, whom I know has spoken to you.

So I think that maybe the presence of all these distinguished people in the crowd is evidence of the importance of our being here and shows, in my mind, one of the things we need to determine to do as a people.

The World Economic Forum has been at it, as you pointed out, for 30 years now. The thing that I have appreciated most about your deliberations is your consistent focus on the future. For example, you spotted the networking of society before the Internet was out of its infancy. Both Vice President Gore and my wife, Hillary, have spoken here; and I am glad, even though I am late, to finally get in on the act. (Laughter.)

Your theme, "New Beginnings, Making a Difference," it seems to me, is the right theme. What I want to ask all of you to think about today is, what does making a difference and new beginnings mean in an era of globalization? What are the opportunities? What are the obligations? What are the hazards? What new beginnings will make a positive difference? And, perhaps the most difficult question of all: do we have the institutional and organized mechanisms to make them?

As we know, in many ways the global economy was almost as integrated as it is today 100 years ago. But after World War I, leaders in the United States and Europe made what all now recognize were false and shortsighted choices. Instead of partnership, they chose protectionism and isolationism. And for decades, globalization went in reverse -- with utterly disastrous consequences.

After the second war, the leaders were given a second chance. This time it was clear that what was at stake was not simply the return of prosperity, but the defense of freedom. They chose the path of economic

and political partnership, and set the stage for 50 years of growth across the globe. No one can seriously argue that the world would be a better place today if they had reverted to the old isolationism.

So today, at the start of a new century, the entire world, not simply Europe and the United States, and the wealthiest nations of Asia, the entire world finds itself at a crossroads. Globalization is revolutionizing the way we work, the way we live and, perhaps most important, the way we relate to each other across national boundaries. It is tearing down doors and building up networks between nations and individuals, between economies and cultures.

The obvious consequence is that we are growing ever more interdependent, driven to be part of every vital network, understanding we cannot build our own future without helping others to build theirs. Today, we know that because of scientific and technological advance, we can change the equation between energy use and economic growth. We can shatter the limits that time and space pose to doing business and getting an education.

But, the openness and mobility, the flexible networking and sophisticated communications technologies that have made globalization what it is -- so totally consuming, all these factors have also made us more vulnerable to some of our oldest problems.

Terrorism, narco-traffickers and organized criminals, they can use all this new technology, too, and take advantage of the openness of societies and borders. They present all of us with new security challenges in the new century. The spread of disease; ethnic, racial, tribal, religious conflicts, rooted in the fear of others who are different -- they seem to find ways to spread in this globalized era. And the grinding poverty of more than a billion people who live on less than a dollar a day and live for a year on less than what it costs to stay in a nice hotel at night -- they, too, are part of the globalized world. A few of us live on the cutting edge of the new economy; too many of us live on the bare edge of survival, without the means to move up.

Those who wish to roll back the forces of globalization because they fear its disruptive consequences I believe are plainly wrong. Fifty years of experience shows that greater economic integration and political cooperation are positive forces. Those who believe globalization is only about market economics, however, are wrong, too.

All these new networks must lead to new arrangements that work for all; that work to spur growth, lift lives, raise standards, both around the world and within nation.

Now, leaders from business, government and civil society, therefore, must come together to build a future that can unite, not divide, us. We must recognize first that globalization has made us all more free and more interdependent. Those of us who are more fortunate must be more responsible and work harder to be good neighbors and good partners. The United States has a special responsibility in that regard, because we have been so fortunate in our history and so very fortunate over the last decade.

I came here today in the hope that by working together we can actually find a way to create the conditions and provide the tools to give people on every continent the ability to solve their own problems, and in so doing, to strengthen their own lives and our global economy in the new century.

I would like to make just a few points. First, I think we have got

to reaffirm unambiguously that open markets and rules-based trade are the best engine we know of to lift living standards, reduce environmental destruction and build shared prosperity. This is true whether you're in Detroit, Davos, Dacca or Dakar. Worldwide, open markets do create jobs. They do raise incomes. They do spark innovation and spread new technology -- they do, coupled with the explosion of international communications through the Internet, which is the fastest-growing network in history.

For example, when I became President seven years ago, there were only 50 pages on the Worldwide Web. Today, there are over 50 million -- in seven years. Trade broadens the frontiers of possibility for all of those who have access to its benefits and the tools to claim them.

As I said a couple of days ago in my State of the Union Address, for me there is only one direction forward on trade, and that is to go on with what we're doing, recognizing that this is a new and very different world, that the idea that we would be better off with less trade, with less rule-based trade by turning away from our attempts to find international ways within which we can work together, I think is dead wrong.

Now, having said that, what does that mean? Well, for me, it meant that when, first, our neighbors in Mexico and then our friends in Asia were in turmoil and crisis, the United States had to keep our markets open, even though it led to record trade deficits. For me, it means it's very important to get China into the World Trade Organization, to ensure that China's markets are open to us, even as we have our markets open to China -- and to advance peace and stability in Asia, and increase the possibility of positive change in China.

The changes in our markets are only beginning. You know, people have been trading goods across borders as long as there have been borders. But communications technology and the Internet are expanding trade in unprecedented ways many of you understand better than I. Today, everything from data processing to security monitoring to stockbrokering and advanced degrees can be bought and sold all over the world. E-commerce creates enormous potential for growth anywhere, and it will continue to do so, if we can resist the temptation to put up barriers to this important part of our new economy.

Trade is especially important, of course, for developing nations. Listen to this -- this is something that I think people from the developing nations who oppose the WTO should think about: from the 1970s to the early '90s, developing countries that chose growth through trade grew at least twice as fast as those who chose not to open to the world. The most open countries had growth that was six times as fast.

Think about what Japan, or the nations of Southeastern Europe, were like 50 years ago. They were poor, largely rural societies. Today, they are prosperous global leaders, in no small measure because of trade. Look at South Korea, Mexico or Thailand, which built their growth on openness -- even after the recent traumas of financial crises, their national incomes are still more than double the 1970 levels, when they were more closed. And their gains in literacy, education and life expectancy are truly extraordinary, far outpacing countries that chose not to open to the world.

Certainly, many of the people who have questioned the wisdom of open trade are genuinely concerned about the fate of the poor and the disadvantaged, and well they should be. But they should ask themselves, what will happen to a Bangladeshi textile worker or a migrant from the Mexican countryside without the prospect of jobs and industry that can sell to foreign, as well as domestic, consumers? What happens to

farmers in Uruguay or Zimbabwe, in Australia, Europe, the United States, if protectionism makes it impossible to market products beyond their borders?

How can working conditions be improved and poverty be reduced in developing countries if they are denied these and other opportunities to grow, the things that come with participation in the world economy. No, trade must not be a race to the bottom -- whether we're talking about child labor, basic working conditions or environmental protection. But turning away from trade would keep part of our global community forever on the bottom. That is not the right response.

Now, that means, it seems to me, that we must face another challenge. The second point I want to make is that developing countries will only reap the benefits of integration in the world economy if the industrialized countries are able to garner enough domestic support for policies that are often controversial at home. It is easier for us to gather here, in vigorous agreement -- and I'm glad you brought Mr. Sweeney over so we could have an occasional voice of occasional disagreement.

But most of us here agree with everything I just said. Why? Well, we have seen and personally felt the benefits of globalization. But convincing our publics to go along, to go for greater integration in a rule-based system which might require them to change further, and might require some of them, unlike most of us, to change what they do for a living, remain a challenge.

How shall we meet it? In the United States, we must overcome resistance to our ground-breaking trade agreements with Africa and the Caribbean Basin; even though, if they both pass, their impact on our economy will be very small, while their impact on the African nations that participate and those in the Caribbean will be very large, indeed. I am determined to pass both measures this year, and I think we'll succeed, but it's an indication of what kinds of problems every country faces.

Indeed, you probably have noted this, but one of the most ironic, and to me, disappointing consequences of our unprecedented prosperity, which has given us over 20 million new jobs in my country in the last seven years, is that it seems to me that protectionist sentiment or antitrade sentiment, at least, is greater now than it was seven years ago when I took office, in the United States Congress. I want to talk a little about that today and how it relates to what's going on in other countries. But we all have an obligation to work through that nation by nation.

Part of what countries have to do is to be able to point to what other countries are doing and to say, well, look what they're doing, we ought to do this. We ought to do our part. That means we are significantly affected in the United States by the policies of Europe, Japan and other wealthier countries. I think for its part, Europe should put its agricultural subsidies on the table. If even one-third of the world's subsidies and tariffs in agriculture were eliminated, the poorest developing countries that could export would gain more than \$4 billion in economic benefits every single year.

We can also, I must say, do better in the developed countries if we are able to make a more forceful case for the value of imports. None of us do this enough, and I must say, I haven't done this enough. We all go around talking about -- every time we talk about trade agreements in our countries, we always talk about how many jobs will be created at home because we're opening markets abroad. And we make ourselves vulnerable to people who say, but it may not reduce the trade deficit,

and look how big it is.

So I just want to say, I wish everyone here would look at yourselves and ask yourselves if you are wearing anything made in a country other than the country where you live.

There are benefits to imports. We don't just do a favor to developing countries, or to our trading partners in developed countries, when we import products and services from them. We benefit from those products. Imports stretch family budgets; they promote the well-being of working families, by making their dollars go further; they bring new technology and ideas; they, by opening markets, dampen inflation and spur innovation.

In a few days, we will have the longest economic expansion in the history of the United States. I am convinced one of the reasons that it will happen is that we have kept our markets open, even in tough times, so that there has always been pressure to keep inflation down as we continue to generate jobs and growth. I am convinced of it. And those of us in wealthier countries need to make the case that even when we have trade deficits, if we're growing jobs and we're gaining ground, and the jobs are growing in areas that pay better wages, we are getting the benefits of imports. I think all people in public life have been insufficiently willing to say that. And we must do more.

The third point I would like to make is that we simply cannot expect trade alone to carry the burden of lifting nations out of poverty. It will not happen. Trade is essential to growth in developing countries, but it is not sufficient for growth in developing countries. Sustained growth requires investment in human capital, education, health care, technology, infrastructure. Particularly in an economy that runs more and more on brainpower, no investment pays off faster than education. The international community has set 2015 as a target for giving every child access to basic education. I'm asking our Congress for more funding to help nations get more children out of work and into school. I hope others in the public and private sectors will join us.

Each year in the developing world, we see millions of lives lost and billions of dollars lost -- dollars that could be spent in many more productive ways to killer diseases like AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. Last year in Africa, AIDS killed more people, ten times more, than all the wars did. We have the technology to find vaccines for those diseases. We have medications that can lengthen and improve the quality of life.

But let's face a fact. The pharmaceutical industry has no incentive to develop products for customers who are too poor to buy them. I have proposed a tax credit to say to our private industry: if you will develop these vaccines, we'll help to pay for them. I hope the World Bank, other nations and the corporate world will help us in meeting this challenge. If we could get the vaccines out to the people who need them in time, we could save millions and millions of lives, and free up billions of dollars to be invested in building those lives, those societies, into strong, productive partners -- not just for trade, but for peace. (Applause.)

We can also help countries help themselves by lifting their crippling burden of debt, so they'll have more to invest in their people and their future. The Cologne debt initiative commits us to reducing the foreign debt of the world's poorest and most indebted nations by as much as 70 percent. Last fall, I pledged that the United States would forgive 100 percent of the debts those countries owe to us. This year, I will work to fund our share of the multilateral debt relief. I am

pleased that so many others have made similar pledges, and look forward to the first countries benefiting from this initiative very soon. If we keep working on this, expanding it, and we all pay our fair share, we can turn a vicious cycle of debt and poverty into a virtuous cycle of development and trade.

The last point I'd like to make on this is, I think the developed countries who want an open trading system that has the trust and confidence of developing countries should also contribute to indigenous trade, which may not be directly related -- excuse me, indigenous economic development, which may not be directly related to trade. Just for example, the United States Agency for International Development each year funds about 2 million micro-enterprise loans in poor communities in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

I will never forget going to small villages in Senegal and Uganda, and seeing people who had gotten their first business loan -- sometimes as small as \$50 -- show me their businesses, show me the people they were doing business with in their villages, who has also gotten such loans. I'll never forget the man in Senegal who was this designated village accountant, making me wait outside his front door while he went into his house to bring me back all of the accounts he had carefully kept for the last month, to prove that the money we were investing was being spent wisely.

Does this have any direct impact on international trade? Of course not. Did it make that society stronger? Did it make the economy stronger? Did it increase the stability and long-term prospects of the nation? Of course it did. So I believe we should all be thinking about more we can do on the indigenous economic development issues.

The President of Colombia is here. I've asked the Congress to pass a very ambitious program to try to help Colombia deal with the narco-traffickers and the guerrillas and all the problems that he faces -- perhaps the oldest democracy in Latin America. But one part of it is for economic development. It is one thing to tell people they should stop growing crops that can be turned into drugs that can kill our children, and quite another to tell people, if you do this, by the way, here's a way to support your children.

And so I think that we can never lose sight of the fact that if we want to build an integrated economy with more and more trade, we have to build an economy from the grass-roots up in places that want to have a balanced, stable society.

The fourth point I would make is that developed and developing countries alike must ensure that the benefits of trade flow widely to workers and families within our nations. Industrialized nations must see that the poor and those hard hit by changes are not left behind. And all nations need to ensure that workers have access to lifelong learning benefits, they can move between jobs without being unemployed for too long and without having their standard of living dropped.

We have to work with corporate leaders to spur investment also in the people and places that have been left behind. We have to find a new markets within our own nation. For example, I will tell you something that might surprise many of you. The national unemployment rate in the United States is 4.1 percent. On many of our Native American Indian reservations the unemployment rate is about 70 percent. In isolated rural areas in America, the unemployment rate is sometimes two, three, four times as high as the national average.

So we have not figured out how to solve this. When you have these eyesores in a country, when the development is not even, they can easily

become the symbol with which those who do not want us to open our markets more and build a more integrated world, can use to defeat our larger designs, even if they're right.

And as I said to the American people in Congress a couple of nights ago, we in the United States, I think, have a terrifically heavy responsibility to reach out to our poor communities, because we've never had an expansion this long; and if we can't help our people now, we will never get around to it. I am convinced that even though this has nothing directly to do with trade, if we succeed, we will build more support for a more integrated, global economy.

Leaders of developing nations have their responsibilities as well -- to narrow the gap between rich and poor, by ensuring that government institutions are open and accountable, honest and effective, so they can get foreign investment, have widely-shared growth, uproot corruption and solve social problems. There is a limit to what wealthy nations can do for people who will not take the necessary steps to make their own societies work. Even in this heyday of global free enterprise, many people suffer not because their governments are too strong, but because their governments are too weak.

Fifth, since globalization is about more than economics, our interdependence requires us to find ways to meet the challenges of advancing our values without promoting protectionism or undermining open trade. I know that the words "labor and environment" are heard with suspicion in the developing world when they are uttered by people from the developed world. I understand that these words are code for rich-country protectionism.

So let me be as clear as possible on this. We shouldn't do anything to stunt the economic growth and development of any developing nation. I have never asked any developing nation, and never will, to give up a more prosperous future. But in today's world, developing countries can achieve growth without making some of the mistakes most developed countries made on worker protection and the environment as we were on our path to industrialization. Why is that? Why can they get richer without doing the same things we did? And since, when countries get richer, they lift labor standards and clean up the environment, why do we care? I think there are two answers to that.

First, the reason they can do it is that the new economy has produced scientific and technological advances that absolutely disprove the old ideas about growth. It is actually now possible to grow an economy faster, for example, with a sensible environmental policy, and by keeping your kids in school instead of at work, so that you build more brainpower, to have more rapid, more long-term, more balanced growth.

Secondly, we all have an interest, particularly in the environmental issue, because of global warming, because of greenhouse gas emissions, and because it takes somewhere between 50 and 100 years for those emissions to go away out of our larger atmosphere. So if there is a way for us to find a path of development that improves, rather than aggravates, the difficulties we have with climate change today by reducing rather than increasing greenhouse gases, we are all obligated to do it.

That is why, after the Kyoto Protocols, I recommended to all the advanced nations that we engage in emissions trading and vigorous investment of new technologies in developing countries, with an absolute commitment to them that we would not ask them to slow their economic growth.

We will see, within the next few years, automobiles on the streets all over the world that routinely get somewhere between 70 and 90 miles a gallon. In South America, many countries run on ethanol instead of gasoline. The big problem is that the conversion is not very good; it takes about seven gallons of gasoline to make eight gallons of ethanol. Within a matter of a couple of years, scientists almost certainly will unlock the chemical block that will enable us to produce eight gallons of fuel from farm products or grasses, or even farm waste, like rice hulls, for one gallon of gasoline. When that happens, you will see people driving cars that effectively are getting 400 or 500 miles to the gallon of gasoline.

These things are before us. All these technologies should be disseminated as widely as possible, as quickly as possible, so that no nation gives up any growth to be a responsible environmental partner in the world.

And on the human development side I will say again, the globalized economy prizes human development above all else. It is in the long-term and the short-term interests of developing countries not to abuse their workers, and to keep their children in school.

Now, do we have all the answers to this? No, partly because the circumstances and the possibility, even for trade engagement, from nation to nation vary so much; but partly because we don't have more forums like this within which we can seek common understandings on worker rights, the environment and other contentious issues.

We have suggested that the Committee on Trade and the Environment be invited to examine the environmental applications of WTO negotiations in sessions where developing countries form the majority. We cannot improve cooperation and mutual understanding unless we talk about it. That is our motivation -- that is our only motivation -- in seeking to open a discussion about the connections between labor and trade and development, in the form of a new WTO working group.

And I will say this again: the consequence of running away from an open dialogue on a profoundly important issue will be -- it won't be more trade, it'll be more protection. The consequence of opening up a dialogue and dealing honestly with these issues will show that in the new economy, we can have more growth and more trade, with better treatment for people in the workplace and more sensible environmental policies. I believe that; you have to decide if you believe that.

My experience in life -- and I'm not as young as I used to be -- let me just say, at Thanksgiving a six-year-old daughter of a friend of mine asked me how old I was. She looked up at me and she said, how old are you, anyway? And I said, I'm 53. She said, that's a lot. (Laughter.)

Well, it looks younger every day to me. But I have lived long enough to know this: in the words of that slogan that people my daughter's age always use, denial is not just a river in Egypt. (Laughter.) And the more we hunker down and refuse to devote time systematically to discussing these issues and letting people express their honest opinion, the more we are going to fuel the fires of protectionism, not put them out. We have to make some institutional accommodation to the fact that this is a part of the debate surrounding globalization.

Now, I feel the same way about labor standards. And there is a win-win situation here. Let me just give you one example. We had a pilot program through our Agency for International Development, working with the garment industry in Bangladesh to take children out of

factories and put them back in schools. The program got kids to learn, and actually boosted garment exports, and gave jobs to adults who would otherwise not have had them.

We can do more of this if we lower the rhetoric and focus more on results. Common ground means asking workers in developed countries to think about the future of workers in Asia, Africa, or Latin America. It means governments finding the courage to rise above short-term political interest. It means corporations taking responsibility for the effects of their actions, whether they're in an African delta or a New York high-rise. It means a new, more active idea of corporate responsibility, stepping up to the plate to pay for vaccines or educate a new generation of workers in another country as a part of the globalization economic strategy.

Finally, let me say that the lessons from our history are clear: we still -- we must support the rules-based system we have, the WTO, even as we seek to reform and strengthen it.

I think those who heard a wake-up call on the streets of Seattle got the right message. But those who say that we should freeze or disband the WTO are dead wrong. Since World War II, there have been eight separate rounds of multilateral trade negotiations -- hundreds of trade agreements signed. What's happened? Global trade has increased fifteen-fold, contributing to the most rapid, sustained and, yes, widely shared growth ever recorded.

There is no substitute for the confidence and credibility the WTO lends to the process of expanding trade based on rules. There's no substitute for the temporary relief WTO offers national economy, especially against unfair trade and abrupt surges in imports. And there is no substitute for WTO's authority in resolving disputes which commands the respect of all member nations. If we expect public support for the WTO, though -- I'll get back to my main point -- we've got to get out of denial of what's happening now.

If we expect the public to support the WTO the way I do -- and I think almost all of you do -- we have to let the public see what we're doing. We have to make more documents available, faster, we have to open dispute panel hearings to the public, we have to allow organizations and individuals to panel their views in a formal way. And we all have to play by the rules and abide by the WTO decisions, whether we win or whether we lose.

Let me be clear: I do not agree with those who say we should halt the work of the WTO, or postpone a new trade round. But I do not agree with those who view with contempt the new forces seeking to be heard in the global dialogue. Globalization is empowering people with information, everywhere.

One of the most interesting things I did on my trip to China was visit an Internet cafe. The more people know, the more opinions they're going to have; the more democracy spreads -- and keep in mind, more than half the world now lives under governments of their own choosing -- the more people are going to believe that they should be the masters of their own fate. They will not be denied access. Trade can no longer be the private province of politicians, CEOs, and trade experts. It is too much a part of the fabric of global interdependence.

I think we have to keep working to strengthen the WTO -- to make sure that the international trade rules are as modern as the market itself; to enable commerce to flourish in all sectors of the economy, from agriculture

to the Internet. I will keep working for a consensus for a new round -- to promote development, to expand opportunity, and to boost living standards all around the world. We will show flexibility, and I ask our trading partners to do the same.

But I would like to just close by trying to put this dilemma that you've all been discussing, and that was writ large in the streets of Seattle, in some context. Now, keep in mind, arguably a lot of the demonstrators in Seattle have conflicting objectives themselves, because of the interests that they represented. The thing they had in common was, they felt that they had no voice in a world that is changing very rapidly. So I want to make two observations in closing.

Number one, we should stop denying that there is in many places an increase in inequality, and we should instead start explaining why it has happened and what we can do about it. Every time a national economy has seen a major change in paradigm, in the beginning of the new economy those that are well-positioned reap great gains; those that are uprooted but not well-positioned tend to suffer an increase in inequality.

In the United States, when our economy, the center of our economy moved from farm to factory 100 years ago -- and many people left the farm and came to live in our cities; and many people from your countries came to our shores and were living in unbelievably cramped conditions in tenement houses in New York City and elsewhere, working long hours, breathing dirty air. There was a big increase in inequality, even though there was an increase in wealth, in the beginning. Why? Because some people were well-positioned to take advantage of the new economy, and some people weren't.

But then political and social organizations began to develop the institutions which would intermediate these inequalities. And the economy itself began to mature and disperse the benefits more broadly, and inequality went down. When we saw, beginning about 20 years ago in most advanced economies, a shift from the industrial economy to the digital economy, in many places there was an increase in inequality. In our country, we had a 25-year increase in inequality, which seems to have halted and been reversed only in the last two to three years.

So a part of this is the change in the paradigm of the global economy which puts a huge, huge, huge premium on education, skills and access to information technology, which is even more burdensome to developing economies seeking to come to grips with these challenges.

Now, having said that, it should be obvious to all that the last thing in the world we want to do is to make the global economy less integrated, because that will only slow the transition to the digital economy in the poorest countries or in the poorest neighborhoods of the wealthy countries.

The answer is to look what happened in the transition from the agricultural economy to the industrial economy, develop a 21st century version of that, and get it done much, much faster -- not to run to the past, but not to deny the present.

The second point I'd like to make is this. We have a well-developed WTO for dealing with the trade issues. We don't have very well-developed institutions for dealing with the social issues, the environmental issues, the labor issues, and no forum within which they can all be integrated. That's why people are in the streets; they don't have anyplace to come in and say, okay, here's what I think and here's the contribution I have, here's the beef I have, how are we going to work all this out.

That's why you're all here talking about it. That's why you've got a record crowd here. And we all know this intuitively. So I think if I could offer any advice, there are -- there's thousands of times more experience and knowledge about all these things in this room than I have in my head. But I do understand a little bit about human nature, and a little bit about the emerging process of freedom and democracy. We have got to find ways for these matters to be dealt with that the people who care about them believe are legitimate. And we cannot pretend that globalization is just about economics and it's over here, and all these other things are very nice, and we will be very happy to see somebody over here somewhere talk about them.

You don't live your life that way. You don't wake up in the morning and sort of put all these barriers in your head and -- you know, it's all integrated. It's like I say, we've got the Chairman of the Palestinian Authority here, we're working very hard to find a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. We can't find that peace if we say, well, here's what we're going to do on these difficult issues and, oh, by the way, there's economics, but it's over here and it doesn't have anything to do with it. We have to put all these things together.

So I ask you, help us to find a way, first, to explain to the skeptics and the opponents of what we believe in why there is some increase in inequality as a result of an economic change that is basically wonderful, and has the potential -- if we make the changes we should -- to open possibilities for poor people all over the world that would have been undreamed of even 10 years ago. And, second, find a way to let the dissenters have their say, and turn them into constructive partners. If you do that, we will continue to integrate the world economically, and in terms of political cooperation.

We have got a chance to build a 21st century world that walks away not only from the modern horrors of terrorists and bio and chemical terrorism and technology, but away from ancient racial, religious and tribal hatred. Growth is at the center of that chance. It gives people hope every day. But the economics must be blended with the other legitimate human concerns. We can do it -- not by going back to the past, but by going together into the future.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, I can tell you, and the applause has shown you what support you have for your plea for an open, rules-based trading system and for globalization. But at the same time, what we take home and what suddenly will influence our discussions very much over the next days, I think we have -- and we are all aware here in this hall -- that we have to change our attitudes, and that we have to create this human and social dimension to globalization. It's in our own interest, and your speech, I think, will be reminded and will be translated into the necessary action.

Now, Mr. President, just two questions. The first one: In your reference to free trade and the WTO, you didn't mention China. And my question is --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I did.

Q You mentioned it --

THE PRESIDENT: I did, but I don't have -- I speak with an accent, so -- (laughter) --

Q No, no. (Laughter and applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: I did, but I --

Q The question which I would like to raise is, will you actually rally the support in your country and internationally, to get China integrated into the WTO?

THE PRESIDENT: I think so. In the United States, in the Congress, there are basically two blocks of people who oppose China's accession to the WTO. There are those who believe we should not do it because even though -- everyone has to recognize, if you look at our trade deficit with China, everyone recognizes it's huge -- by far, the biggest part of our trade deficit. Everyone recognizes that we have kept our markets open to China, and that if we had greater access to Chinese markets, it would be a good thing for us. So no one could seriously argue that the openings from agriculture and for other opportunities are massive, and that it would mean more to the United States than any other country since we buy -- we're about 22 percent of the world's economy and every year we buy between 33 and 40 percent of all China's exports, and we have a major, major trade deficit.

On the economic argument, the people who are against it say, yes, that may be true, but if you put China in the WTO, it's basically a protectionist country and then America will never get any real action on labor and environmental standards and all that because China will thwart every reform we want. That's what people say.

Then, there is another group of people that don't want to vote for it because of the actions the Chinese have taken to try to preserve stability at the expense of freedom. They believe that even if China's economy has grown more open, political crackdowns, crackdowns against the Falun Gong and others have gotten more intense, more open, and that it puts the lie to the argument that integrating China into the international system will lead to a more open, more democratic, more cooperative China. Those are basically the two arguments that will be made.

Those both raise serious issues, but I think it would be a mistake of monumental proportion for the United States not to support China's entry into the WTO. (Applause.) I believe that because, again, my experience is that you're almost 100 percent of the time better off having an old adversary that might be a friend working with you, even when you have more disagreements and you have to stay up a little later at night to reach agreement, than being out there wondering on the outside wondering what you're doing and being absolutely sure whatever it is it's not good for them.

So I believe that having them in the WTO will not only pad the economic benefits for the United States and other countries I mentioned, but will increase the likelihood of positive change in China and, therefore, stability throughout Asia.

Let me say, you know, China and Russia both are still going through big transitions. The Russian economy is coming back a little better than most people think it is. No one knows what China and Russia will be like 10 years from now for sure, and you can't control it, unless you're Chinese or Russian; but you can control what you do. And I don't know about you, but 10 years from now, whatever happens, I want to know that I did everything I could to increase the chance that they would make good choices, to become good, constructive neighbors and good, constructive partners in the global community.

You know, we don't agree with the Russian policy in Chechnya, but we've gotten rid of 5,000 nuclear weapons, and we got our soldiers working together in the Balkans. So I think the argument -- we've got

to try to have these big countries integrated, for the same reason we have to keep trying to work with India and with Pakistan to resolve those difficulties and get them fully integrated.

At every turn, we have to ask ourselves -- we cannot control what other people do, we can only control what we do. But when all is said and done, if it works out well or it works out poorly, we want to know that we have done everything we possibly could to give people a chance to make good decisions. And that's what drives me, and that's why we're going to do everything we possibly can -- under the leadership of Secretary Daley, who's going to coordinate our efforts to implement the agreement that our trade ambassador, Charlene Barshefsky, negotiated -- we're going to try everything we can to get China permanent trading status so we can support their entering the WTO. And my guess is that we'll do it. But it's going to be a big fight, and you can watch it with interest, and I hope with support. Thank you. (Applause.)

Q Mr. President, you mentioned debt relief in your speech, and you also mentioned it in your State of the Union message. Do you think the G-7 are really doing enough in this respect?

THE PRESIDENT: No, I don't. But if we do -- I'm trying to focus on doing what we promised to do. And again, let me tell you what the debate is. We had an intense effort, in the last session of Congress, to pass what the Congress was finally, at the end of the session, good enough to do, and do on a bipartisan basis -- I want to give credit to the Republicans, as well as the Democrats, who voted for this -- to support our forgiving 100 percent of our bilateral debt for the poorest countries. And we're going to have another intense debate to support our contributions to the multilateral debt reduction effort, which is even more important.

The debate at home -- basically, the people who are against this are old-fashioned conservatives who think when people borrow money they ought to pay it back, and if you forgive their debt, well, then, no one else will ever loan them money, because they'll think they'll have to forgive their debt, too. There's something to that, by the way. There's something to that. In other words, when we get into negotiations of whether debt should be rescheduled or totally forgiven, there are many times -- when I have confidence in the leader of a country, and I know they're going in the right direction, I would almost always rather forgive it -- assuming I could get the support in Congress to do so.

But we do have to be sensitive to the way the world investor community views all these things, so that when all is said in done, countries that genuinely will have to continue to borrow money can get the money they need. But with that caveat, I favor doing more, and more than the Cologne debt initiative. But my experience is, we do these things on a step-by-step basis. We already have broadened the Cologne debt initiative, and we're going to broaden it again. And I think if we get the Cologne debt initiative done and it works, and people see that it works, then we can do more.

But it is really, it is quite pointless, it seems to me, to keep these poor countries trapped in debt. They're having to make debt service payments, which means that they can't educate their children, they can't deal with their health care problems, they can't grow their economy, and therefore they can't make any money to pay their debts off anyway. I mean, it's a totally self-defeating policy we've got now.

So I would like to see us do as much as possible, but at the same time, I want to remind you of another point I made. A lot of countries suffer not because they have governments that are too strong, they

suffer because they have governments that are too weak. So we have to keep trying to build the governance capacity for countries so when they get their debt relief, then they can go forward and succeed. So I don't think you should forget about that, either.

All of us have a real obligation to try to help build capacity so our friends, when they get the relief, can make the most of it.

Q Mr. President, to conclude our session, you have in front of you the 1,000 most influential business leaders. What would be your single, most important wish towards them, at this moment?

THE PRESIDENT: My most important wish is that the global business community could adopt a shared vision for the next 10 to 20 years about what you want the world to look like, and then go about trying to create it in ways that actually enhance your business, but do so in a way that helps other people as well.

I think the factor about globalization that tends to be under-appreciated is, it will only work if we understand it genuinely means interdependence. It means interdependence, which means we can, none of us who are fortunate can any longer help ourselves unless we are prepared to help our neighbors. And we need a more unifying, more inclusive vision. Once you know where you're going, it's a lot easier to decide what steps to take to get there. If you don't know where you're going, you can work like crazy and you would be walking in the wrong direction.

That's why I think this forum is so important. You need to decide. The business community needs to decide. You may not agree with anything I said up here today. But you have to decide whether you really agree that the WTO is not just the province for you and me and the trade experts. You have to decide whether you really agree that globalization is about more than markets alone. You have to decide whether you really agree that free markets, even in an age of free markets, you need confident, strong, efficient government. You have to decide whether you really agree that it would be a good thing to get the debt off these countries' shoulders if you knew and could require that the money saved would go into educating children and not building weapons of destruction.

Because if you decide those things, you can influence not only the decisions of your own government, but how all these international bodies, including the WTO, work. So the reason I came all the way over here on precious little sleep, which probably undermined my ability to communicate today, is that collectively, you can change the world. And what you are doing here is a mirror image of what people are doing all over the world. This is a new network.

But don't leave the little guys out. You know, I come from a little town in Arkansas. I was born in a town of 6,000 people, in a state that's had an income just about half the national average. I've got a cousin who lives in Arkansas -- he's a small businessman, he works for a small business -- who, two or three times a week, plays chess on the Internet with a guy in Australia.

Now, they've got to work out the times. How they do that, I don't know. (Laughter.) But the point I want to make to you is, he thinks he knows as much about his life and his interests and how he relates to the Internet and the world, as I do. He thinks he knows just as much about his interests as his President does, who happens to be his cousin.

So we need these networks. And you are in an unbelievably unique position. So my one wish for you -- you might think I'd say China or

this or that and the other; it's nothing specific -- develop a shared vision. When good people, with great energy, have shared vision, all the rest works out.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

7:40 A.M. EST