

Executive Summary

Young People See a Role for Media/Entertainment

- In terms of hate crime prevention, 90% of respondents say it is important for the media to play a role
-
- And, 89% say it is important for entertainment figures to play a role
-
- In terms of impact on the issue, 15% say entertainment figures will have the greatest impact on hate crime prevention (third highest after parents and teachers)
-
-
-

North
Carolina

THE WHITE HOUSE
Washington, DC

late
Cherry

OFFICE OF THE STAFF SECRETARY

Fax Transmittal Sheet

To: Tom FREEDMAN

Fax Number:

6-7431

Telephone Number:

From:

DAVID GOODFRIEND

Subject:

Date:

Number of Pages (including cover sheet):

Message:

please let me know ASAP
if you'd like to add
anything to this.

(If all pages are not received, please call (202) 456-2702.)

The document accompanying this facsimile transmittal sheet is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. This message contains information which may be privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, dissemination, copying or distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this communication, is strictly prohibited.

Confidential Memorandum

To: President Bill Clinton
From: State Senator Rodney Ellis
Garry Mauro
Date: May 4, 1999
Re: The James Byrd, Jr. Act of 1999

cc [signature]
Phil C
[initials]
2 files

We need your help to make sure George W. Bush and Republicans in the Texas Senate do not quietly kill Texas' best chance to pass a meaningful Hate Crimes Act.

Despite years of legislative efforts, Texas has never been able to pass an effective Hate Crimes law. The sticking point has always been the issue of sexual orientation. Because of opposition to the inclusion of homosexuals among the protected groups, we have been unable to enact a specific, precise Hate Crimes statute similar to the Wisconsin law approved by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1993 (*Wisconsin v. Mitchell*). Due to the vagueness of our current Hate Crimes statute, it is rarely enforced.

The tragic murder of James Byrd, Jr. in Jasper, Texas has breathed new life into the effort to strengthen Texas' Hate Crimes statute. HB 938, the James Byrd, Jr. Act of 1999, passed the Texas House last week by a surprising margin of 83-61, including 6 Republicans. This marked the first time the House has ever approved a hate crimes bill that specifically protects homosexuals, along with other groups.

However, as the bill moves from the Democrat-controlled House to the Republican-controlled Senate, there are strong indications Republicans are quietly trying to prevent the bill from reaching the Governor's desk. While over 70% of Texans favor a strong Hate Crimes law, including the protection of homosexuals, a vocal minority in the Republican Party continues to object to the bill. Governor Bush has not taken a position on the bill, and he does not appear to want to. He certainly has not used his position of leadership to help us get the bill passed.

One of James Byrd's killers has already been convicted and sentenced, and two more will stand trial shortly. But bringing these men to justice will not of itself bring justice to Texas. We need to pass the James Byrd, Jr. Act of 1999 to send a message that crimes of hate will not be tolerated in Texas.

You may be asked about this issue when you visit Texas on Friday. We would be grateful for anything you can do to help us put the spotlight on this important legislation.

NAPLAN_S @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SMITH_BD @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
TCSmith @ dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY
WOZNIAK_N @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
cmbeach @ msn.com@INET@LNGTWY
dmilbank @ tnr.com@INET@LNGTWY
john.longbrake @ ms01.do.treas.sprint.com@INET@LNGTWY
john_see @ ed.gov@INET@LNGTWY
julie_green @ ed.gov@INET@LNGTWY
klasky_helaine @ ustr.gov@INET@LNGTWY
meglynn @ ibb.gov@INET@LNGTWY
meglynn @ usia.gov@INET@LNGTWY
msuntum @ who.eop.gov@INET@LNGTWY
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY
skgmd @ umich.edu@INET@LNGTWY
tingen-terri @ dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY
usia01 @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ pub.pub.whitehouse.gov@INET@LNGTWY

Woke
Crimy

----- Forwarded by Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP on 05/13/99 10:28 AM -----



OLCOTT_E @ A1
05/09/99 03:15:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: 1999-5/7 POTUS remarks DNC dinner in Austin, Texas

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Austin, Texas)

For Immediate Release

May 7, 1999

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT DNC DINNER

Private Residence
Austin, Texas

8:38 P.M. CDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. You know, when Roy was doing that riff, you know, before he came I didn't know I needed new furniture, I didn't know I needed new art work, I didn't know I needed -- Mary kept getting redder and redder, and finally she says, he may not know he needs another place to spend the night tonight. (Laughter.) I must say this is a lot better than the last hovel we spent the night in. (Laughter.)

Let me say to all of you, I've had a wonderful time here tonight, seeing so many of my old friends. There are a lot of people here -- the ones Roy mentioned and also Carlos Trujan, Gonzalo Barrientos -- a lot of other people who were with Roy and Gary and Judy and Nancy and Tom, all the rest of us, way back in 1972. And we have remained friends for a long time. And during most of that time, with the odd interruption, sometimes the odd, wonderful interruption like the reign of Governor Richards, the election of Lloyd Doggett, we've been in the minority.

And I want to talk tonight a little bit about -- I want to have kind of a serious conversation tonight about why I really came here, because what Joe said is right -- I'm not running for anything. And I would seize any excuse to come here to Austin, because I had some of the happiest days of my life here and I have a very jealous wife, who wishes she were here today.

But for the next two years, I'm helping the Democratic Party because I believe it's the right thing to do for America. I hear a lot of folks on the other side kind of licking their lips and saying, well, wait until the next election and we'll have Clinton out of the way, maybe it will be better.

What I want to say to you is that I am very grateful that I've had the chance to serve you. And I am profoundly grateful that we have the lowest unemployment in 30 years and the lowest welfare rolls in forever and a day -- they're half the size they were before -- and the lowest crime rate in 25 years.

Roy was saying that we've got 90 percent of our children immunized against serious diseases for the first time in history. The doors of college are virtually open to every American now because of our HOPE tax credit and the student loan changes we've made. We've set aside more land in perpetuity than any administration except for the two Roosevelts, in American history. I'm grateful for all that.

But what I want you to understand is that I'm grateful because I got a chance to implement a set of ideas that now represent the governing philosophy of the Democratic Party. And it is very different from the driving philosophy of the other party. And if the American people like the results that have been achieved, then we need to support those people running for the Congress and the White House who believe in these ideas.

In 1991, when the incumbent President was at 75 percent approval, and I decided to make this race when nobody but my mother and my wife thought I could win, I did it because I was worried about my country and my capital. Because it seemed to me that there was nothing particularly wrong with America that couldn't be fixed if we would just open our eyes and go to work. The unemployment rate was high, inequality was increasing, the social problems were worsening and we had a lot of problems around the world that we didn't seem to have any governing idea of dealing with. But I felt great about America. I just thought we had to change the way Washington worked.

Just go back in your mind to that period and that long period where the other party spent 12 years telling us how terrible the government was, and a lot of our guys were sort of fighting a rear guard action defending it. But most of the ideological battles which took place in Washington were about yesterday instead of about tomorrow. And so I set off on this crazy journey with a lot of you, based on a few simple ideas.

First of all, I asked myself, what is the problem? The problem is that we have not thought about how to take full advantage of this explosion in technology and the globalization of the economy in society, and at the same time figure out how not to leave anybody behind, and make our families and our communities stronger, and maintain our push for peace and prosperity around the world.

We haven't thought about how to make the transition in a way that not only provides vast opportunities for people like those of us in this beautiful setting tonight, but makes America as a nation stronger.

And it seemed to me that what we had to do is to go back to some very basic things -- that we had an obligation to try to have opportunity for every person who was responsible enough to deserve it; that we had to try to build a community made up of every law-abiding citizen without regard to what other differences they had; that we had to commit ourselves to be more involved in the rest of the world, not less involved, because the world is growing smaller and smaller; and that we needed a different sort of government that could be much smaller -- and it is today, by the way; it's the same size it was in 1962 -- that's the size of your federal government today. And I'm proud of that. (Applause.)

But what we need to know -- we made it smaller, but more active, focused not so much on telling people what to do, or maintaining old bureaucracies, but giving people the tools they need to make the most of their own lives. Those were my ideas -- opportunity, responsibility, community, a government that gives

people the tools to make the most of their own lives.

And I thought to myself, there are a whole lot of things people believe that I don't think are true. I believed if we work at it, we could reduce the deficit and still increase our spending in education and health care if we did it right. Well, six years later we've got a huge surplus and we've nearly doubled spending in education and health care.

I believed we could improve the economy and improve the environment -- the air is cleaner and the water is cleaner than it was six years ago. We've reduced chemicals in the atmosphere from chemical plant emissions by 90 percent in the last six years.

I believed that we could help people succeed at work and at home. And I still think that's one of the biggest problems we've got in this country -- people trying to be good parents and trying to meet their obligations at work at the same time.

I believed that we could promote entrepreneurialism and trade around the world and still help people who, because of their education or where they live are at risk of being left behind. Those are the things that I believed. I believed that we can be a force for peace and recognize that there are some times when we have to use our overwhelming military force.

I believed that in welfare we could reduce the welfare rolls, get more people to work, and at the same time help people who were on welfare to do a better job of raising their children. That we didn't have to hurt people in their responsibilities as parents, to say if you're able-bodied you ought to work if you can.

I didn't believe all those choices and all those debates that I kept hearing in Washington. And so we set out to do it and the public responded and the people gave me a chance to serve. And then in '96, another chance. And then in '96 and '98 kept returning more of our people to the Congress so that we're at the point where we can almost reverse the election of '94. I think the election of '94 happened, by the way, because we made the tough decisions as a party, all alone, to reduce the deficit, without a single vote from the other party; and increase our investment in education. We made the tough decision almost all alone to pass a crime bill that put 100,000 police on the street, banned assault weapons and required the Brady Bill's waiting period.

And by the election of '94 -- and we tried to provide more health insurance all alone and didn't have enough votes to do it. And by '94 what happened was people knew what we'd done on the economic plan, but they didn't feel the economy was getting better; they knew what we'd done on the crime bill, but

the NRA convinced a bunch of hunters we were going to take their rifles. By '96 everybody still had their rifles and the crime rate had gone down, and the economy had gone up, and we got reelected. And the Congress is doing better ever since -- our elections.

So now we're poised for this election in 2000. And what I want to say to you is, I appreciate what Roy said about me and it's nice to be introduced by your old friends, they'll lie about you a little now and then. But the truth is you must believe this. This administration has succeeded because we had the right ideas and the right approach, and we're grounded in the right values, and it's what represents the heart and soul of the Democratic Party today. And that's why I'm here. (Applause.)

We've got a lot of big decisions to make. And you have to decide who is going to make them. We have to deal with the aging crisis -- twice as many people over 65 by 2030. I hope to live to be one of them. (Laughter.) I've given the Congress a plan that will save Social Security, save Medicare, provide help for people taking care of their parents and long-term care, allow middle-income people and lower-income people to save for their own retirement for the first time -- and do it in a way that pays down the national debt by 2015 to the lowest point it has been since before World War I. And that's really important to keep the economy going -- because we'll be less dependent on the vagaries of the global financial system.

I've given the Congress a plan that will improve the quality of education by ending social promotion, by providing after-school and summer school programs for our kids, by finishing the work of hooking all our classrooms up to the Internet, by modernizing a lot of these old school buildings and helping the school districts that are having kids in house trailers, by supporting better teaching and by having national academic standards, which I hope our whole party will embrace and help us in this great battle we're in. Because I think you should have local control of the school about how to implement national academic standards.

There's an international standard that all of our children need to meet if we want them to make a good living. And we're about the only advanced country in the world that doesn't have that. As a result, we've got the finest system of higher education in the world; no one believes that our system of elementary and secondary education is uniformly the finest in the world. And, yet, it can be. And all the diversity we have in our schools is a great asset in a global society, but every one of those kids deserves a chance at the brass ring.

I was in the Alexandria school system the other day, across the river from the Capitol and the White House. There are kids from a hundred different racial and ethnic groups there -- nearly a hundred different native languages. Every one of them

can make a contribution to America if he or she gets a world-class education. And to pretend that it ought to be a local option whether they get it is, I think, obscuring what is plainly real here.

So we Democrats stand for more flexibility about how to do things, but for national standards of excellence, based on international standards of what our children need to know. And I think the American people are with us on that.

I could talk about a lot of other issues. I'd just like to mention one or two more. The Vice President is coming down here to South Texas in a couple of weeks -- (applause) -- to our annual empowerment zone conference. Since 1993, we've been trying to figure out ways to get more investment into poor urban neighborhoods and poor rural areas and poor Native American reservations -- because there are still a lot of people that haven't participated in this economic recovery.

And I worry a lot about how we're going to keep America's growth going and our unemployment low without any inflation, especially if we have trouble overseas. One way is to make more markets here at home. And there are lots of places right here in Texas where unemployment is still too high, too many hardworking people still don't have the skills they need, and where if we could attract the right investment in the right way we could have dramatic growth.

So this is going to be a big challenge. If we can't get around now to giving poor rural areas and urban areas that have been left behind the chances they need, we'll never get around to it. Let me just mention one or two other things.

I am very interested in this whole issue of balancing work and family. And I think there's some things we ought to do. I think we ought to raise the minimum wage again, I think we ought to strengthen the Family and Medical Leave law. I think we ought to pass the patients' bill of rights -- (applause) -- I think we ought to pass our child care plan to help lower income people with their child care costs. We have to realize that most parents have to work and every parent ought to have the option to do it, but no parent should have to sacrifice the most important job any woman or man has, which is to raise strong, good kids. (Applause.) There are lot of things out there we have to do. We've got a big job to do in the world. You can see it today with some of the problems we have.

Now, I'd like to close by just asking you to think about three things and giving you examples of what my philosophy is that I think is our party's philosophy. These are the best of times for Americans, but we're all pretty sobered up right now because of three events of the recent days. One are the terrible tornados in Oklahoma and Kansas and, to a lesser extent, but still sad, in Texas and Tennessee. Two, is the heartbreaking

incident in Littleton, Colorado. And, third, is the continuing conflict in Kosovo. Now, let me tell you what they mean to me.

First, the tornados mean that none of us should get too big for our britches -- we're not in control. We have to maintain a certain humility when thinking about all the problems of the world. But as our hearts go out to those people -- I'm going up to Oklahoma City tomorrow to tour the damage and talk about what we can do to help them put their lives back together. -- I'm thinking about what we can do to try to prepare better for the next one. I'm thinking about what we can do if we know we're going to grow and expand in areas that have been tornado alleys, what we ought to do to build houses that will do a better job of withstanding them, or have quicker escapes to places that will be safer. In other words, I think what we always should be thinking about is how can we make it better, how can we deal with what is going to come.

In the case of Littleton, on Monday, Hillary and I and Al and Tipper Gore are going to sponsor a big meeting at the White House with people from the entertainment and Internet communities, people from the gun manufacturers, people from the religious communities, people who work in schools on problems of violence, students, a lot of other segments of our society, coming together to talk about how we can start a national campaign to reduce the likelihood of violence against our children.

Now, I think it is important that you know how I look at this. I think the world's worst thing we can do is to use this awful heartbreak to get into a finger-pointing session. Because the truth is that not a single soul here knows exactly what triggered those kids. And we all know that in any given time there will be people who are more vulnerable than others to whatever influences to which they're exposed to. But I do think we would all admit, if we sort of take our defenses down, that the society in which our children grow up today, number one, throws things at them faster; number two, gives them even more opportunities to be isolated from their parents and from their peers; number three, exposes them at an earlier age and in greater volume and intensity to more violence and the coarsening of human relationships. And, number four, it's way too easy for them to get things like Tech-9 assault pistols. And I think we can all sort of admit that.

And what I'm trying to do is to figure out what we should all do here to launch a genuine grass-roots national campaign where I try to pass the laws I should pass; the gun manufacturers come forward and do what they ought to do to try to protect our kids; the entertainment community makes a contribution; the Internet community makes a contribution -- they've worked hard, by the way, with the Vice President to try to give parents more screening technologies -- and the religious community comes forward, the mental health community comes

forward; the schools provide more adequate counseling services and peer mediation for the kids, and, what some of our schools are doing now, providing a hotline so kids who know what's going on in the school can call and tell somebody without being subject to abuse.

There are lots of things to be done here. But there's also something to be said here for recognizing the incredible pressures that parents and children are under because life is so fast and so crowded. And it is easy for all us, if we're not careful, to wind up being strangers in our own homes. And our children need to understand also that no matter how sold and rooted they are, childhood is a fragile and difficult time. Every school will always have its clicks, every school will always have its groups, but we've got to teach our kids that they can enjoy being in their crowd without looking down on the others; because people who are constantly subject to ridicule and abuse are going to have their lives twisted or distorted in some ways, unless they are really superhuman.

So I'm looking forward to this. And all the cynics who say it can't be done, I would remind you that teen pregnancy's now down five years in a row because of a national grassroots movement -- not because of any law we passed in Washington. Drunk driving's down because of Mothers and Students Against Drunk Driving. We now have 10,000 companies that have voluntarily joined an alliance that we organized a couple years ago to hire people from welfare to work, and they've hired over 400,000 people, without a single law being passed.

We can do this. And I believe we can do it, but only if our political, public life, brings us together, and not drives us apart.

And the last thing I'd like to say is about Kosovo. I know this is a difficult issue. I saw the people with their signs on the way in, saying we ought to end the fighting. Nobody wants to do it more than me. I think those of you who have known me for 30 years know that the most difficult thing that I ever have to do is use a superior position to put pressure on somebody else, particularly if it involves the use of violence. I'm not that sort of person.

But let me tell you, since the end of communism, we have seen the inevitable rise of national aspirations, and ethnic aspirations, especially in Central and Eastern Europe. In one place only -- the former Yugoslavia -- we have seen that turned into a credo that says it is all right to burn the homes, destroy the records, destroy the churches -- the mosques, in this case -- and the museums, and the libraries, and the very lives of families. It's all right to rape the daughters, it's all right to shoot the sons. It's all right to do this.

And for three years we worked, through the United Nations and negotiations, and everything else, to end the war in Bosnia. And finally, we ended the war in Bosnia when NATO bombed, and when the opposition forces started winning some battles on the ground. And we've been able to maintain a peace there.

People don't have to like each other. People may have legitimate grievances. But ethnic cleansing, and killing people wholesale because of their race or religion, is wrong. And the United States is in a position to stand against it, and we ought to. (Applause.)

I know there are a lot of people who disagree with me. They say, well, we don't have any vital national interest. I would argue to you that we do. It's not only a moral, humanitarian issue. We'll be better off if our best allies in the world, in Europe, live in a continent that is whole and democratic, and at peace, and free of this sort of thing.

First of all, they won't be wasting their money tearing each other up. Secondly, they'll be better trading partners. Thirdly, they'll be better partners in helping us solve problems in other parts of the world. And if we can put an end to ethnic cleansing in Europe, then we can put an end to it in Africa, and we can put an end to it wherever else it rears its ugly head.

If we can't solve this problem, it's very difficult to understand how our children are going to live in peace, in a world where every radical terrorist group can get on the Internet and figure out how to build a bomb, or get weapons, or do anything else they want to do. We have got at least to tell people that in the world of the 21st century, it is not okay to kill people just because they're of a different race or ethnicity or religion. (Applause.)

That's why I must say, I want to applaud the Senators who are here, who are trying to pass that hate crimes act in the Legislature, in honor of James Bird. I think it's very important. (Applause.) It makes a statement.

This is the last thing I'll say about this. I've

already talked longer than I meant to, but if you don't remember anything else I say, remember this. It is one thing to say that we all ought to get along together, and quite another to do what is necessary for us to do so in decency and honor.

The differences among us are a part of what makes life more interesting -- and makes this country so successful -- as long as they are contained. When the differences among us are used -- as they are in Kosovo today, as they were in Bosnia



before -- as an instrument of human destruction, they can quickly make life unbearable.

Now, we can't force anybody to like anybody else. Maybe not everybody in this place tonight likes everybody else. But we live according to certain rules, and we do it not only because it is morally right, but because we do better when other people do well. When we do the right thing -- or as Hillary says, when we act like we're in a village -- we all are better off.

So I ask you to think about this. The Democratic Party has stood for community, and for opportunity, and for citizen responsibility. We have refused to accept all these phony choices we were presented with -- between economic growth and the environment, between accountability and help in education, and all the other things. These ideas have led America to a better place. That's why I'm here. I'm glad I was President. I hope I was the instrument of a lot of the good things that have happened in this country. But the most important thing is that we continue in this direction, that we stay on this course, that we embrace these ideas. And that is why it is important to support this party.

I'm very grateful to you. Thank you and God bless you.
(Applause.)

END

9:03 P.M. CDT

Message Sent To:

NAPLAN_S @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SMITH_BD @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
TCSmith @ dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY
WOZNIAK_N @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
cmbeach @ msn.com@INET@LNGTWY
dmilbank @ tnr.com@INET@LNGTWY
john.longbrake @ ms01.do.treas.sprint.com@INET@LNGTWY
john_see @ ed.gov@INET@LNGTWY
julie_green @ ed.gov@INET@LNGTWY
klasky_helaine @ ustr.gov@INET@LNGTWY
meglynn @ ibb.gov@INET@LNGTWY
meglynn @ usia.gov@INET@LNGTWY
msuntum @ who.eop.gov@INET@LNGTWY
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY
skgmd @ umich.edu@INET@LNGTWY
tingen-terri @ dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY
usia01 @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ pub.pub.whitehouse.gov@INET@LNGTWY

*Wife
L. Simon*

----- Forwarded by Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP on 05/13/99 10:28 AM -----



OLCOTT_E @ A1
05/09/99 03:12:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: 1999-5/7 POTUS arrival remarks, austin, texas

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Austin, Texas)

For Immediate Release

May 7, 1999

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT UPON ARRIVAL TO AUSTIN-BERGSTROM INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Austin-Bergstrom International Airport
Austin, Texas

5:38 P.M. CDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. I want you to know, folks, I spent some of the best days of my life in Austin, Texas. (Applause.) And when Lloyd went up to make his remarks, I looked at the Mayor and I said, being Mayor of Austin may be the best elected job in the United States. (Applause.) And he didn't dispute me.

I also want to thank Lloyd Doggett for his leadership on this and so many other projects. We've been friends for many, many years. I was elated when he was elected to the Congress and I can tell you he does a terrific job for all the constituents of this district in Washington, D.C. (Applause.)

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm very, very sorry I had to miss the dedication -- you know why -- the events in Littleton, Colorado, compelled me to cancel. I do want to tell you, on Monday Hillary and Al and Tipper Gore and I are going to have a very distinguished array of people from all over the country to meet in Washington to organize a national campaign against violence involving our children. And I know it will have the support of every person here. (Applause.)

But I want to ask you to think a little bit about the significance of this airport not only in terms of what it means to all of you, but in terms of what it means to the future of America and how we ought to do all of our business. Six years ago, when your air base was closed, you saw that it did not have to be an economic setback. In fact, it could be an enormous opportunity. Austin-Bergstrom International Airport today is a testament to your unwavering commitment and vision.

For years, this airport had the following motto: "Bergstrom Air Force Base: Global Power for America." Today this airport is still a symbol of global power for America. It's a different kind of power. Where military aircraft essential to our victory in the Cold War once landed here, now boxes of software take off for markets around the world, fueling our success in the new global economy. Where once pilots flew reconnaissance missions to survey Cold War enemies, now they fly planes that ferry high-tech visionaries between Silicon Valley and these Silicon hills.

This airport will be your gateway to prosperity in the 21st century. And I especially appreciate something that's already been mentioned, that you pay tribute to some of Texas' finest citizens. I hope every visitor will be inspired by Captain Bergstrom's courage and sacrifice; by my good friend, Jake Pickle's life of service and compassion; by President

Johnson's bold vision and commitment to progress for all Americans together; and by Barbara Jordan's incomparable voice for justice on common ground. (Applause.)

Since I'm here today, I cannot help noting that the work of Lyndon Johnson and Barbara Jordan is being carried on today here in Austin by the state legislators who are trying to pass hate crimes legislation in the name of James

Bird. (Applause.) As you probably saw on the tarmac, I was honored to meet with members of Mr. Bird's family. I know that what happened to him was anathema to every good citizen in Texas, as well as the United States.

And I ask you, as our men and women in uniform today struggle against the killing, the rape, the looting, the uprooting of people, based solely on their ethnic and religious background in Kosovo -- as they did in Bosnia -- as we fight to reconcile people around, from the Middle East to Northern Ireland -- here in America, if we want to do good abroad, we have to be good at home. We have to stand up for what is right. (Applause.)

We have to acknowledge that there are differences among us that we celebrate; there are differences among us that are real differences, and we are compelled to disagree; but underneath it all, as the Founders of our Republic recognized, there is our common humanity and our equal dignity. And we must always stand for it. If we want to be a force against ethnic cleansing and genocide around the world, we have to be a force for harmony and community, here at home in every place in the United States. (Applause.)

And so I close with the point I tried to make at the beginning. I want you to think about what this represents and how you did it. What it represents is a commitment to a common future, where no one is left behind and everybody has a chance. How you did it is by working together, across all the elements of this richly textured community. If you think about it, we could solve all of our problems that way. Thanks for the model.

Good luck, and God bless you. (Applause.)

Wait a minute. (Applause.) I want to do one other thing. I want to thank the Barbara Jordan Elementary Choir -- (applause) -- and the Pflugerville High School Band. Thank you very much. (Applause.) How about a little more music? Let's go. (Applause.)

END

5:45 P.M. CDT

Message Sent To: _____

AT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE LUNCHEON

La Colombe d'Or Restaurant
Houston, Texas

hate
comes

3:00 P.M. CDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Ken. I want to thank you for so many things, but particularly today for the work you have done on this. And I thank Joe Andrew for being willing to leave Indiana, a state no one thought could become a Democratic state, that just elected a new Democratic governor and elected Senator Evan Bayh overwhelmingly, thanks in no small measure to his leadership there. And I look forward to many years of his leadership of the DNC.

I'd like to thank Molly Beth Malcolm for being here, and Steve Zimmerman for providing us this modest little room to have lunch in. (Laughter.) Someone told me that Napoleon was once in this room, but not in Texas. (Laughter.) And Frederick the Great, and all kinds of other people. I don't know if any of them were Democrats, but we are. We may have tripled the number of Democrats who have ever been in this room in the last 300 years, just today at lunch. (Laughter.)

But I am delighted to be here and I thank all of you for coming.

I want to talk a little today -- I know several of you said that I looked tired, and I don't know whether it's just because I'm not young anymore or because I just got back from two days meeting with our troops and refugees from Kosovo in Germany. But this is a rather unusual moment for our country, I think, because things are in some ways the best of times. We just saw today, again last month unemployment rate was 4.3 percent. We had another 234,000 jobs; we're up to 18,400,000 now in the life of this administration. The welfare rolls have been cut nearly in half. We've got a 30-year low in the crime rate. The teen pregnancy rate is going down. Basically, the social indicators are good. Many of the indicators relating to drug use are moving in the right direction.

And I want to say a special word of thanks, by the way -- I think he -- no, he didn't leave -- to Mayor Brown, who in his previous incarnation was a member of our Cabinet and led our nation's efforts to keep our children away from drugs. And I was elated when he was elected mayor and I hope you'll keep him here for a good long time, because I think he'll do a great job for you. And thank you, Mayor, for being here today. (Applause.)

Anyway, you know, we have to feel good about these things. And I do and I feel grateful. But all of us are sobered and saddened by three events of the recent days. And I would like to mention -- although they seem entirely disparate -- one is the terrible tornados that have claimed record numbers of

lives in Oklahoma and Kansas, and related storms here in Texas and over in Tennessee. The second, obviously, is the

heartbreaking tragedy in Littleton, Colorado. I know we were all glad to see the children go back to school this week. And the third is the conflict in Kosovo.

And I would like to try, if I could, today -- it's not exactly your typical party-stump speech at a fundraising luncheon, but just ask you to think we me about how we're -- what lessons we should learn from those three events, and how it relates to what we're trying to do in our administration and with our party.

And I'd like to go back just for a moment to 1992 and late 1991, when I made the decision to seek the presidency. I was in my 5th term as governor. I was having a wonderful time. Our daughter was doing well in school and with her friends and Hillary and I were having more fun with our friends because I was about to get the hang of being governor, having done it for 10 or 11 years. And I really didn't want to do what I did in 1992 -- plus, it seemed like a fool's errand; President Bush was at, like, 75 percent approval in the polls when I made the decision to run. And I knew I was relatively young person and I could wait and that was my kind of personal inclination.

But I was profoundly disturbed by two things: first, by the objective conditions in the United States. There were -- unemployment was high, inequality was increasing, wages hadn't increased in real terms in 20 years, and all the social indicators were going in the wrong direction.

But the second thing that bothered me was that the debate in Washington seemed so divorced from the world on the street in Arkansas where I lived, and from the larger world beyond the borders of the United States -- that it seemed to me that the parties were caught in a gridlock, labeling each other and fighting over turf in Washington that did not deal with what I thought were the two great challenges of our age. One was preparing for the 21st century by trying to take advantage of all the economic changes and the technology and globalization that was going on in a way that enabled people to build stronger families and stronger communities and left no one behind.

And the second was, to find a way to deal with the dizzying array of differences in our own society in a way that respected those differences, but pulled us closer together. And I didn't see much coming out that would do that.

And it seemed to me that there was a way that you could actually strengthen the economy, for example, and improve the environment. There was a way to reward entrepreneurs and still reach out to people who were being left behind and let them go along for the ride in this new economy. There should be a way to reduce the deficit and still increase investment and education and health care. There should be a way to help people succeed at home as parents and succeed at work. There should be a way that we could glorify the individual, as we always have in America, and recognize that fundamentally we'll all do better if we're one community.

And that's basically what the campaign in '92 was all about, and those

words that I said, that I wanted a society that had opportunity for all, and responsibility from all, and a community of all Americans. And that's why I'm here today. You know, I'm not running for office -- and some of the people out on the street are apparently elated about it. (Laughter.) But that's the American way. I'm not running for office. I'm here because, while I am grateful for the role I have been able to play as President, in the 18 million new jobs, and the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years, and having 90 percent of our kids immunized against serious diseases for the first time in history, opening the doors of college to all Americans with the tax

credits and the improved student loan program and the scholarship programs, and all the other things we've done. The air is cleaner, the water is cleaner. We've set aside more land to be protected than any administration in history, except those of the two Roosevelts. I am grateful for all of that.

But this is not a matter of personality. We had ideas that we turned into policies. We changed the role of government. We have a smaller government; there are fewer people working for the federal government now than in any time since John Kennedy was President. And, yet, it's more active. We focus less on telling people what to do and more on giving people the tools to solve their own problems, and creating the conditions in which Americans could thrive in the world. And the ideas matter. And the values, the principles of opportunity and responsibility and community matter. And the Democratic Party, therefore, matters.

These ideas have benefitted every people in every state. They have benefitted Republicans and independents as much as they have benefitted Democrats. They are capable of unifying the country at a time when so many continue to seek to divide it. And they also give us a clue about what we should do.

We've still got big challenges out there. It would be a big mistake for us not to deal with the challenges of Social Security and saving Medicare, and to do it in a way that will enable us now to reduce the debt of this country over the next 15 years to its lowest point since before World War II. Did you ever think you'd hear anybody stand up and talk about doing that?

It would be a great mistake for us not to continue to push for education reform; to put more teachers in the classroom with modern facilities; to finish the job of hooking all our classrooms up to the Internet; to end the practice nationwide of social promotion, but not to label the kids failures; to give them the after-school programs and the summer school programs they need; to have higher standards around the country. It would be a mistake for us not to continue to do this just because times are good here.

It would also be a mistake for us not to continue to try to give opportunity to people who still don't have it. There are still places in Texas, with all the economy booming, that haven't felt this recovery.

Just a few days from now the Vice President is going down to South Texas to have our annual empowerment zone conference. And I'm very proud of the fact that one of the things that we have worked hard to do in the last six years is to leave no one behind; to give tax incentives and other investments to poor

communities to try to induce people to start businesses there and put people to work there. And I'm very proud of the fact that one of the major initiatives before the Congress this year -- my so-called New Markets Initiative -- would give people loan guarantees and tax credits to invest in the poor neighborhoods of America and urban and rural areas like they can get today to invest in poor neighbors overseas.

I think we ought to give people the same incentives to invest in Americans who don't have jobs and opportunity that we give them to invest elsewhere. I don't want to take the others away; I just want our folks to have the same chance.

So there's a lot to do. And it would be a mistake, just because of our prosperity or because people are already talking about the next election, to overlook the fact that we still have a lot of time between now and January of 2001, and to put a great country in idle is a great mistake.

The second thing I'd like to say is I think it is a mistake to forget about our continuing obligations in the face of the problems of the moment. But I think there are lessons in each of these three things that I mentioned that we're all very much preoccupied about now. What is the lesson of the tornadoes? This maybe belongs more in a sermon on Sunday than a political speech, but the lesson is, no matter how well America does, a little humility is always in order. We are not in full control. And we have to be sensitive about this, especially here in this part of the country. We have to do more to try to prepare ourselves for these storms, and we have to do more to try to minimize their impact when they occur.

The Governor of Oklahoma said a couple of days ago when I called him after the tornado that -- we were talking about how Oklahoma and East Texas and Arkansas are at the beginning of basically the Tornado Belt in America -- and he said, you know, the more growth we have, the more expansion of our communities, the more construction we're going to have in these alleys where tornadoes often hit. And we began to talk about that, about construction and safety and prevention.

I say that to point out that there are certain constants that we have to deal with in our society that call on us to be humble, call on us to be prepared and remember we're not in total control.

Now, the second thing I'd like to say about Littleton is that the lesson here is that no matter how prosperous we are economically -- and this was terrible for that community -- I've talked to school officials and local officials there -- we have to understand that there are forces at work in our society that call on us to make an extra effort to protect our children from violence.

I think it is important not to overly politicize this in the sense of finger-pointing. I have said before and I will say again, I think that instead of everyone saying whose responsibility is this, whose fault is this -- I mean, instead of saying whose fault this is, we should say, what can I do to take responsibility for it. What can I do to change it. What can I do to make it better?

Like you, I don't know any more about what happened there than what I can read about it. But I have read voraciously. I have watched the television programs. I have listened to the townhall meetings and the other interviews that people up there have done. And you may know that Hillary and the Vice President and Tipper and I are going to have a big meeting at the White House on the 10th, next Monday. We're going to bring in people to talk about every aspect of this -- including some people who have been very active in anti-violence initiatives around the country.

But I would just like to say I ask you to think about Littleton in the following ways. Number one, no society has any job more important than raising its children well. It is the number one job of every society. And raising our children well depends upon doing our jobs as parents, but also recognizing -- as Hillary said years ago -- it does take a village, and we need to look at the village and see what the village is like now.

And the following things occur to me -- and I don't want to prejudge what we will do on Monday, but I think we need to recognize that without regard to family income, the speed and pressure of modern life increases the chances that children will become isolated, and that vulnerable children, therefore, will be more likely to drift into something that's really bad for them. At any given moment in time there will always be children who are vulnerable to problems.

But if you just think about the speed and pressure and sheer movement of modern life, the speed with which people move around and the hassles that are associated with that, and the speed with which images and news and information of all kinds -- positive, negative -- is crammed into our lives, I think that a lot of what we have to deal with here is giving our children some breaks, some protections, and our families some breaks and protections about that.

The second thing I think is important is that we need to honestly try to challenge the families of this country not to give up on communicating with our kids when they start to drift away from them naturally and move into independence -- it's still important to maintain some kind of knowledge of what's going on in there.

The third thing I'd like to tell you is I think there are things schools can do which will at least minimize youth violence, over and above zero tolerance for guns and other things. I visited a very impressive school in Virginia the other day, in Alexandria, that has a phenomenally diverse student body. They have a very active peer mediation group where the kids try to solve each other's problems. They have comprehensive counseling services. They have access to mental health services for kids who need it.

And I think it's very important -- Tipper Gore is going to have the White House conference on mental health in Washington in the next few days and she had a very courageous article in USA Today, today. If you haven't read it, I urge you to read it. I was really proud of her, talking about the whole issue and how it affected her life and her family's. I think that's very important.

I'll tell you something else this school had -- this school had a 1-800 hotline so that if the children suspected that some other students in school

were maybe going to do something destructive or wrong, they could call the hotline and have certainty that the lead would be followed up on, but that they wouldn't be outed as somebody who was talking about their classmates.

So I think we have to continue to work with the schools, as the Secretary of Education and the Attorney General have done. I think that there are challenges for those who influence our culture, including the entertainment community. When we trivialize or brutalize relationships, or trivialize violence, or particularly in the intimacy of the Internet and the video games, run the risk that kids who are already isolated create a whole alternative reality that at the same time desensitizes them to violence, I think that's a problem.

And I also believe, finally, that there ought to be some more laws that will minimize the chances that the kinds of weapons those kids had will get into the hands of children who will do bad things with them. And I hope we can avoid yet another big fight in Washington between the NRA and others. This should not be the culture war we have going on. It makes common sense, it seems to me, to reinstitute the waiting period of the Brady bill, along with the Insta-check. It ought to apply to people that buy explosives as well as people who buy handguns.

We ought to close the loopholes in the assault weapons ban law. We have an assault weapons ban, but it's got a couple of loopholes in it big enough to drive a truck through. We don't need -- if the law is a good law, then we ought to make it work. We ought to do background checks at gun shows. I've been to gun shows in rural America, I know a lot of people that run them think this is going to be a terrible headache. It's not; the technology is there, we can fix it so we can do it.

But the main thing I want to say is, I do not believe there is any one answer here. I believe there is a responsibility in the entertainment community; I think there's a responsibility in the Internet community; I think there's a responsibility for the gun manufacturers, and law enforcement; I think there is a responsibility in the schools; I think there is a responsibility with the parents. I think a lot of us have something to do.

But what I would like you to think about here, instead of being despondent about the magnitude of the problem is, first of all, look at the courage and character of the overwhelming majority of the people in Littleton that we have seen manifest in so many different ways under such adversity. And secondly, look at the example that Americans are capable of solving their social problems by grass-roots movements.

That's really why the teen pregnancy rate is dropping, because there's a grass-roots effort, a comprehensive effort that is sweeping the whole country. That's why drunk driving went down -- Mothers Against Drunk Driving, Students Against Drunk Driving.

So there is no magic bullet here, and the most important thing is having a magic attitude of not taking any solution off the table because it would require you to do something, but not falling into the easy trap of pointing the

finger at someone else. But the lesson here is that if we want to be a strong and great nation, we must continue to deal with the problems -- and they're not all economic problems. And there is nothing more important than the quality of our children's childhood.

Now, let me close with Kosovo. There are some people who may not understand why we would be so concerned about what happens in a small place a long way away -- where hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people have had their homes burned; the records of their very existence burned; their religious and cultural sites destroyed; sometimes people literally wrapped in bundles and burned alive; lots of children raped -- solely because of their ethnic and religious background. And it is a reprise of what happened just a few years ago in Bosnia.

Why should we care about it? First of all, because it violates our most fundamental values. And if we have the capacity to stop something like that, we ought to.

Secondly, because we have learned the hard way that people, when they behave that way, think that that behavior -- if they get away with it -- they think it's rewarded, and other people will follow their lead. And all over the world today, at the end of the Cold War -- when communism is gone as a competing ideology -- if there is nothing positive to organize people, and pull them together, then one of the things that is most likely to pull them apart is racial, ethnic and religious differences -- used to demonize other people, almost exclusively by people who don't really believe it as much as they are trying to mobilize people to get political power or wealth, or both.

Now, we fought two wars in Europe in the century that's about to end. We want Europe to be united, to be free, to be democratic, to be at peace. If they are, they'll be our friends; they'll be our partners. They'll be better trading partners. They'll also help us solve problems in other parts of the world. There are all kinds of practical reasons we should do this. There are all kinds of practical reasons.

But when you get right down to it, if we are going to say we are grateful that America has emerged from the Cold War as the world's only superpower -- if we're going to be grateful for the good fortune we have enjoyed in the last six years -- we have to be willing to spend a small percentage of our good fortune and a significant percentage of our credibility to be good allies with our European friends who asked us to come and help, and do this.

I also believe in a world where religious differences have bedeviled the Middle East and Northern Ireland and so many other places, it speaks volumes that the United States and our European friends and Canada are willing to stand up for people who are overwhelmingly of the Muslim faith. And so they have rights, too; they are people, too; they are children of God, too; and they deserve the right to have their life, to go home, to be safe, to have the autonomy that they deserve. And that's what we're fighting for in Kosovo.

If you think about -- there's one little baby here, or was here a few minutes ago -- you imagine that the world this baby is going to live in when she gets out of college and goes into the world. Do you want it to be a world where, frankly, more and more people have a lot of economic prosperity we've

enjoyed? I do, because that means we'll do even better if we have more partners who are doing better -- which is characterized by people knowing each other across national lines, sharing economic opportunity, sharing educational opportunity, working together in common cause to deal with the continuing challenges of the world.

Or do we want it to be a world where we feel like we're under siege all the time because everywhere people are falling victim to their most primitive impulses; that they're using modern technology and modern computers to figure out how to get modern weapons to kill somebody because of some ancient hatred? I don't think it's a close question.

And one of the things that I have learned as President is that you cannot draw an easy dividing line between what is a domestic issue and a foreign issue in a world that is getting smaller and smaller and smaller. You can't just do that. You can't say, well, it's great that international trade helps most of us and forget about those that are not helped by trade. You have to give them the education, the skills, the training, the opportunity so that no one will be left behind. That's a domestic and a foreign issue. And, believe me, this is, too.

The greatest thing this country has got going for it today is that we have all different kinds of people that all have their chances. But we have to stand against hatred and for harmony. We have to say, whatever our differences, our

fundamental common humanity is more important than anything else.

I was reading coming down here today that here in the legislature Texas is debating this hate crimes law, names after James Bird. You know, for me as a white Southerner, the thought that a man could be murdered because of his race in 1999 is heartbreaking. But it is a sober reminder that human nature may improve, but we'll always have problems. And it is the country's organization, the country's dominant values, the country's leadership, the country's direction that matters.

I hope that law will pass, and become law here. I hope that Texas will say, we don't want people to be hurt because of their race, because they're gay, because of whatever. And when people are hurt in that way, we stand against it.

But in a larger sense, I hope that we will become a more effectively caring society. I hope we'll find some ways to put on the brakes when the speed's too fast for our children's childhood, and they're hurtling toward isolation, in a destructive way.

And I think we can do that, and still get all the benefits of this modern world that's opened up to us. But it will depend upon the right ideas, and the right values. It is not dependent upon any one person.

I am so grateful that I have been the instrument, as President, of some of the good things that have happened in America. I am more grateful than you know. But what matters is that we have the right values and the right ideas, and when something works, we do not abandon it, we stick with it.

That's why I'm here. That's why I hope you will continue to support our party. Because what we have stood for has made a lot of difference and it will make more difference in the future if you and I do our part.

Thank you and God bless you. (Applause.)

END

3:30 P.M. CDT

Message Sent To: _____

Clinton Presidential Records Digital Records Marker

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

This marker identifies the place of a publication.

Publications have not been scanned in their entirety for the purpose of digitization. To see the full publication please search online or visit the Clinton Presidential Library's Research Room.



BJA Bureau of Justice Assistance

A Policymaker's Guide to Hate Crimes

Monograph

Exploiting Sudan's Agony

FEW GOVERNMENTS are bloodier than Sudan's. The Islamist dictatorship in Khartoum routinely abuses human rights; it condones slavery; it has sought to impose Sharia law on the non-Islamic south, deepening a civil war that has claimed 2 million lives since fighting broke out in 1983. Yet not everybody supports the United States' embargo of Sudan. Last week a European Union delegation was in Khartoum, claiming to have seen "some encouraging action" on human rights. Meanwhile European firms are anxious to join Canadian, Malaysian and Chinese rivals in exploiting Sudan's oil resources.

If it were not for this oil-inspired softness on Sudan, an end to the country's murderous civil war might just be conceivable. Not long ago, both sides seemed exhausted after years of stalemate on the battlefield; and the north appeared to concede that its ambitions to impose Sharia on the south were hopeless. Two sets of peace talks showed modest signs of life; in September Western donors boosted one of these by paying for a permanent secretariat to oversee negotiations in Kenya.

Now, however, peace hopes have been buried by the recent completion of an oil pipeline, promising \$200 million or more a year in revenues. Rather than negotiate, the north declares that it will use its new oil wealth to stock up on military gear and win a victory on the battlefield. The government is bent on ethnic cleansing of territory surround-

ing other, as yet unexploited, oil fields. Once it has control of these, it will purchase yet more tanks and missiles.

Talisman Energy Inc., the Canadian company that operates the new pipeline, has rightly become the target of a divestment campaign: It is listed in New York and Toronto, and a quarter of its stock is owned by Americans. Its Malaysian partner, Petronas, is not listed in the United States; but China National Petroleum, which owns 40 percent of the project, plans a share issue on the New York Stock Exchange with the help of Goldman Sachs. France's Total, whose shares are already traded in New York, hopes to be in on future oil projects in Sudan. So does Sweden's Lundin Oil AB, which is listed on the Nasdaq market.

Divestment campaigns are not enough. Western governments should present a united front in condemning Khartoum, not seize upon minor human-rights concessions as an excuse to warm relations. The Canadian government last month announced that it might punish Talisman for its involvement in Sudan; this triggered an immediate fall in the company's stock price. Europe's governments should warn their oil companies away also.

Over the past 16 years, the West has funneled billions of dollars of aid into Sudan's south, hoping to ward off disease and starvation. It should not now let its oil firms prolong the country's agony.

Assault on the Clean Air Act

IN THE NAME of maintaining reliable electricity supplies, business groups are urging Congress to include in end-of-session legislation language that could weaken enforcement of an entire section of the Clean Air Act. The rider is in response to anti-pollution lawsuits the government filed against a group of midwestern and southern utilities earlier this month. The business groups said in letters last week to the Republican and Democratic leadership of both houses that, without the relief the rider would provide, the lawsuits "could have severe implications for [electric] supply reliability in the near future.... [U]nits covered by the enforcement action could potentially be shut down."

But environmental groups and federal enforcement officials contend that the real-world risk is in the opposite direction. The rider, they say, would have the effect of shutting down enforcement, in that utilities would be immunized against mounting fines and other penalties for the duration of any lawsuit. The lawsuit would become a kind of safe harbor; enforcement would be stood on its head; and the utilities would lose any incentive to settle. It would be to their advantage to drag the lawsuit out.

This is not the kind of question that ought to be settled by the last-minute insertion of unexamined language in a sprawling appropriations bill as Congress is hastening out of town. The charge against the utilities is

serious—that in order to save money they continued to operate old and dirty power plants in violation of the law. The plants were grandfathered under the Clean Air Act, and the companies were allowed to maintain them, but not, in the name of maintenance, to rebuild them—in effect replace them—without the installation of new anti-pollution equipment. That's what they are said to have done, thereby continuing to pollute on the cheap. The midwestern and southern pollution floats to the northeast, and seriously fouls the air of New York and New England. It is hard to persuade rate-payers in one region to accept responsibility for cleaning the air in states hundreds of miles away, but that is part of what the law rightly commands and part of what the Environmental Protection Agency and Justice Department are trying to bring about.

The appropriations bills contain more than two dozen riders poking holes in environmental laws. The president has said he'll stand for none of them. In fact, he'll likely end up beating back some but accepting others, as he has in the past. This one ought not end up in the accepted column. If the utilities and those who support them in and out of Congress want to change the fundamentals of the Clean Air Act, they should enter through the front door, not try to do it obliquely in the fine print of an appropriations bill.

White
Crimes

Hate Crimes Compromise

no disab
regarder

AS CONGRESS struggles to get out of town, a last-minute effort to pass hate crimes legislation is underway. We have long opposed hate crimes laws and share the anxieties about any bill sold as a new federal authority to prosecute bias-motivated violence. One does not have to be a racist or homophobe to worry about needless federalizations of presumptively local offenses or about a criminal regime that would treat two physically identical crimes differently on account of the motive of the perpetrator.

At the same time, the two major bills pending in the Senate—one sponsored by Sens. Ted Kennedy and Arlen Specter and the other by Judiciary Committee Chairman Orrin Hatch—both contain useful ideas. A bill that married the chief virtues of the two proposals would helpfully modify existing criminal civil rights statutes.

Current law permits federal prosecution of violent efforts to interfere with a person's exercise of certain federally protected activities because of that person's race, ethnicity or religion. But this criminal civil rights law does not include sexual orientation as a trigger for federal authority. So while the feds have jurisdiction to prosecute a violent interference with a Jewish or African American student's ability to attend a public university, for example, a gay student killed because someone doesn't want gays at his school would not trigger federal jurisdiction.

The Kennedy-Specter bill would include sexual orientation under this law, which seems like an obvious step. Unfortunately, Kennedy-

Specter also would include disability status—which seems unnecessary—and gender, which opens the can of worms of federal jurisdiction over certain rapes. These should be left out.

The bill also would relax the requirement that the target of the crime be involved in a federally protected activity—the feature that, in earlier versions, gave rise to serious concerns about overly broad federal jurisdiction. The latest version, however, is significantly improved. It would require that a senior Justice Department official certify in each case under the law that state law enforcement was either unable or unwilling to prosecute or had requested federal involvement. This narrows the scope of the proposal to that small group of cases in which someone has been violently targeted because of his identity and can expect no recourse from his state government.

Sen. Hatch's bill also includes a useful idea—that the federal government should be authorized to assist state and local investigations of hate crimes even where there is no jurisdiction for federal prosecution. This provision could potentially affect a wider array of cases than the expanded federal jurisdiction contemplated by the Kennedy-Specter bill. A bill that further narrowed the Kennedy-Specter proposal by removing gender and disability status and added this Hatch provision would be a useful addition to federal criminal civil rights enforcement, not a generalized federal hate crimes statute of the sort that rightly inspires nervousness.

just

State
and

add
S.O.