

Statement on Signing the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001  
October 11, 2000

Today I have signed into law H.R. 4578, the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001." I want to commend the Congress for agreeing on an acceptable version of this bill that provides critical funding for many priority needs—our national parks, national forests, wildlife refuges, and other public lands; State and local grants for land conservation and preservation; Native American programs; cleaner water; energy security; and the Arts. I am pleased that, unlike earlier versions of the bill, the final bill excludes a large number of highly objectionable provisions that would change our environmental protection and natural resource conservation laws without adequate public and congressional scrutiny.

In particular, I am very pleased that this Congress has agreed to establish a new budget category to provide dedicated and protected funding for the conservation and preservation programs in my Lands Legacy Initiative and other related activities. This agreement will nearly double our investment next year in these programs and move us toward providing communities with the resources they need to protect their most precious lands. By establishing this new budget category and fencing off more than \$10 billion over the next 5 years, we are fulfilling our commitment to make the single largest annual investment in protecting our green and open spaces since Theodore Roosevelt set our Nation on the path of conservation nearly a century ago.

The bill provides a significant increase in funding for key components of my Native American Initiative program, including most of the requested investments in Indian school construction and law enforcement. It also provides the largest funding increase for the Indian Health Service in its history. The bill also helps to protect the environment by increasing funds for the Clean Water Action Plan and promotes the Arts by providing the first funding increase for the National Endowment for the Arts in 9 years. In addition, the increase provided for the National Endowment for the Humanities will enable the NEH to continue to implement its Re-

discovering America through the Humanities initiative.

The bill provides strong support for a number of other national priorities. It expands funding for weatherization of low-income homes, which will help low-income households prepare for the coming winter season. It includes funding for research into energy efficiency to reduce our dependence on oil and address climate change, through initiatives like the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles, which will aid in the development of a new generation of ultra-efficient cars. In addition, the bill provides funding for a Regional Home Heating Reserve for the Northeast. I note that there is also a provision in Title VIII of the bill that violates *INS v. Chadha* because it purports to condition the availability of certain appropriated funds on the provision by congressional committees of a list of specific acquisitions to be undertaken with such funds. As a result, I will treat that provision as being advisory only, and not as legally binding.

In addition, all of the funds in Title V of the bill have been designated by the Congress as emergency requirements. I hereby designate those amounts in Title V, totaling \$87,515,000, as emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended. The Congress has provided other important emergency funds in the bill to assist States that have been ravaged by wildfires in the West. My Administration is reviewing the current situation, and these firefighting funds will be released as needs dictate.

In conclusion, by dedicating future funds for conservation and related programs, investing in Indian schools, assisting energy conservation, and supporting the Arts, this bill represents a major step forward. The American people both expect and deserve nothing less.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

NOTE: H.R. 4578, approved October 11, was assigned Public Law No. 106–291. An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

Remarks at a Rally for Representative Ron Klink in Pittsburgh,  
Pennsylvania  
October 11, 2000

Thank you very much. I always learn something when I come to Pittsburgh. [Laughter] Today I learned, never ask for another pat of butter. [Laughter] And never rent a mule. [Laughter] Let me say, I am delighted to be back in western Pennsylvania, and I'm delighted to be in this State again with Ron Klink and his wife, Linda, and their two fine children and all the people associated with their campaign. And Senator, thank you for your speech, your leadership of the party. Mayor Murphy, thank you for being such a good friend to me in these years we've worked together to help Pittsburgh reach its full potential.

I thank all the candidates who are out here. I think Catherine Baker Knoll is here, and I thank her for being here. Thank you, Catherine. And I want to mention your former mayor, Sophie Masloff, who was a good friend of mine, and State Senator Christine Tartaglione. And thank you, Franco Harris, for being here and for being my friend and supporter all these years.

Now, let me say, I want to thank you for giving some money to Ron Klink. [Laughter] And I'll tell you one thing I'm absolutely sure of. If more people had done what you did today, he would be ahead, not behind, in the polls. Why is that? Because when the American people have enough information and enough time to digest it, they nearly always get it right. Now, do you have any doubt at all that if every voter in Pennsylvania knew what the real records and the real differences between these two candidates are, that Ron Klink would win? Do you have any doubt at all?

*Audience members.* No-o-o!

*The President.* All right. If you have no doubt at all, then he can still win if you get out there and cover the gap between now and election day. That's what I want to tell you. I believe that. And I came out here—I have been calling people all over the country saying, "You ought to send Ron Klink some money. We can win in Pennsylvania."

The people of this State have been very good to me, and I am profoundly grateful. We won a big victory here in '92. In '96 I didn't get

to campaign as much as I wish I had in Pennsylvania because we were trying to win some places we hadn't won in a long time, including Florida, where we did win. But the people of Pennsylvania stayed with me.

I think this is a pretty simple election here. But what I want to tell you is, every one of these races is important. No one in America understands more clearly than I do how important every single House race is, every single Senate race is, and of course, the race for the White House.

You need to go ask people whether we're better off than we were 8 years ago. That's what they used to say the test was. My favorite point in the last Presidential debate—we're going to have another one tonight. We all have our little moments, but my favorite moment was when their nominee said, "Well, I think that Clinton/Gore got a lot more out of the economy than the economy got out of Clinton/Gore. The American people did this with their hard work." Now, when they were in, they took credit when the Sun came up in the morning. You remember that? [Laughter] "It's morning in America. Vote for us." It's morning, right? [Laughter] So they said that. And then the Vice President said, "Yes, the American people and their hard work do deserve credit. But they were working just as hard back in 1992 and getting different results." [Laughter] And I thought, goodbye. That was a good answer.

Now, look, here is the deal. There are differences. They're real, and they have consequences in people's lives. And if every voter in Pennsylvania understands that and what the differences are and what the consequences are, Klink wins. To the extent that there are voters who don't understand it, it's harder for him to win. To the extent there are voters who think there are two perfectly nice moderate guys running and maybe we ought to stick with the moderate guy who's in, it's bad for him.

And this is what they're doing all over the country. They want to blur these differences, you know. I mean, butter wouldn't melt in their mouth today. It's hard to remember the rhetoric they used just a couple of years ago, isn't it?