


Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, June 12, 2000
Volume 36—Number 23
Pages 1271–1329

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- Clinical trials—1310
- Emergency supplemental appropriations legislation—1307
- Germany, Conference on Progressive Governance for the 21st Century in Berlin—1274
- Japan
 - Departure for Tokyo—1310
 - Memorial service for Keizo Obuchi in Tokyo, remarks following—1313
- Patients' Bill of Rights—1310
- Radio address—1273
- Russia, state Duma in Moscow—1295
- Ukraine
 - People of Ukraine in Kiev—1304
 - Ukraine-U.S. joint statement, signing in Kiev—1303

Communications to Congress

- Belarus, letter transmitting report on normal trade relations status—1273
- China, letter transmitting report on normal trade relations status—1273
- Estate tax legislation, letter—1315
- National Science Board, message transmitting report—1315
- Patients' Bill of Rights, letter—1315
- Vietnam, letter transmitting report on normal trade relations status—1272

Communications to Federal Agencies

- Belarus, memorandum on normal trade relations status—1272

Communications to Federal Agencies—Continued

- China, memorandum on normal trade relations status—1273
- Clinical trials, memorandum on increasing participation of Medicare beneficiaries—1311
- Hanford Reach National Monument, memorandum—1324
- Vietnam, memorandum on normal trade relations status—1272

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchanges with reporters
 - Air Force One—1303
 - Colonnade—1306
 - Roosevelt Room—1307
 - Rose Garden—1316
 - South Lawn—1310
- Interview with Aleksei Venediktov of Ekho Moskvy Radio in Moscow—1288
- News conference with President Putin of Russia in Moscow, June 4 (No. 191)—1284

Joint Statements

- Russia-U.S.
 - Cooperation to combat global warming—1277
 - Funding procedures—1283
 - Management and disposition of excess weapon-grade plutonium and related cooperation—1278

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

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

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

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

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

Contents—Continued

Joint Statements—Continued

- Memorandum of agreement on establishment of a joint center for early warning systems data exchange and missile launch notifications—1280
- Principles of strategic stability—1279
- Privileges and immunities—1284

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

- Argentina, President De La Rúa—1274
- Brazil, President Cardoso—1274
- Chile, President Frei—1274
- Germany, Chancellor Schroeder—1274
- Jordan, King Abdullah II—1306
- Mexico, President Zedillo—1316
- Russia, President Putin—1284
- Ukraine
 - Minister of Foreign Affairs Tarasyuk—1304
 - President Kuchma—1303
 - Prime Minister Yushchenko—1303

Proclamations

- Establishment of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument—1317
- Establishment of the Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument—1319

Proclamations—Continued

- Establishment of the Hanford Reach National Monument—1322
- Establishment of the Ironwood Forest National Monument—1325
- Gay and Lesbian Pride Month—1271

Statements by the President

- Congressional action on the “Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act”—1314
- Entertainment and media industry’s parental media guide website—1314
- Indonesia, earthquake—1309
- Senate vote on the Patients’ Bill of Rights—1314
- Ukraine-U.S. commercial space launch agreement, termination—1304

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—1329
- Checklist of White House press releases—1328
- Digest of other White House announcements—1326
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—1328

Week Ending Friday, June 9, 2000

Proclamation 7316—Gay and Lesbian Pride Month, 2000

June 2, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Gay and lesbian Americans have made important and lasting contributions to our Nation in every field of endeavor. Too often, however, gays and lesbians face prejudice and discrimination; too many have had to hide or deny their sexual orientation in order to keep their jobs or to live safely in their communities.

In recent years, we have made some progress righting these wrongs. Since the Stonewall uprising in New York City more than 30 years ago, the gay and lesbian rights movement has united gays and lesbians, their families and friends, and all those committed to justice and equality in a crusade to outlaw discriminatory laws and practices and to protect gays and lesbians from prejudice and persecution.

I am proud of the part that my Administration has played to achieve these goals. Today, more openly gay and lesbian individuals serve in senior posts throughout the Federal Government than during any other Administration. To build on our progress, in 1998 I issued an Executive Order to prohibit discrimination in the Federal civilian workforce based on sexual orientation, and my Administration continues to fight for the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which would outlaw discrimination in the workplace based on sexual orientation.

Yet many challenges still lie before us. As we have learned from recent tragedies, prejudice against gays and lesbians can still erupt into acts of hatred and violence. I continue to call upon the Congress to pass meaningful hate crimes legislation to strengthen the Department of Justice's ability to pro-

secute hate crimes committed due to the victim's sexual orientation.

With each passing year the American people become more receptive to diversity and more open to those who are different from themselves. Our Nation is at last realizing that gays and lesbians must no longer be "strangers among friends," as the civil rights pioneer David Mixner once noted. Rather, we must finally recognize these Americans for what they are: our colleagues and neighbors, daughters and sons, sisters and brothers, friends and partners.

This June, recognizing the joys and sorrows that the gay and lesbian movement has witnessed and the work that remains to be done, we observe Gay and Lesbian Pride Month and celebrate the progress we have made in creating a society more inclusive and accepting of gays and lesbians. I hope that in this new millennium we will continue to break down the walls of fear and prejudice and work to build a bridge to understanding and tolerance, until gays and lesbians are afforded the same rights and responsibilities as all Americans.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim June 2000 as Gay and Lesbian Pride Month. I encourage all Americans to observe this month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities that celebrate our diversity and recognize the gay and lesbian Americans whose many and varied contributions have enriched our national life.

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:25 a.m., June 5, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on June 6. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Memorandum on Normal Trade Relations Status for Vietnam

June 2, 2000

Presidential Determination No. 2000–21

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Determination Under Subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as Amended: Continuation of Waiver Authority for Vietnam

Pursuant to subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the “Act”), 19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1), I determine that the further extension of the waiver authority granted by subsection 402(c) of the Act will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act. I further determine that the continuation of the waiver applicable to Vietnam will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act.

You are authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., June 7, 2000]

NOTE: This memorandum was published in the *Federal Register* on June 8. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Normal Trade Relations Status for Vietnam

June 2, 2000

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

I hereby transmit the document referred to in subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the “Act”), with respect to a further 12-month extension of the authority to waive subsections (a) and (b) of

section 402 of the Act. This document constitutes my recommendation to continue in effect this waiver authority for a further 12-month period, and includes my reasons for determining that continuation of the waiver authority and the waiver currently in effect for Vietnam will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

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

Memorandum on Normal Trade Relations Status for Belarus

June 2, 2000

Presidential Determination No. 2000–22

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Determination Under Subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as Amended: Continuation of Waiver Authority for Belarus

Pursuant to the authority vested in me under the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, Public Law 93–618, 88 Stat. 1978 (the “Act”), I have determined, pursuant to subsection 402 (d)(1) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1), that the further extension of the waiver authority granted by subsection 402(c) of the Act will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act. I further determine that continuation of the waiver applicable to the Republic of Belarus will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act.

You are authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., June 7, 2000]

NOTE: This memorandum was published in the *Federal Register* on June 8. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders
Transmitting a Report on Normal
Trade Relations Status for Belarus**
June 2, 2000

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

I hereby transmit a report including my reasons for determining that continuation of the waiver currently in effect for the Republic of Belarus under subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, (the "Act") will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

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

**Memorandum on Normal Trade
Relations Status for China**
June 2, 2000

Presidential Determination No. 2000-23

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Determination Under Subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as Amended: Continuation of Waiver Authority for the People's Republic of China

Pursuant to the authority vested in me under the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, Public Law 93-618, 88 Stat. 1978 (the "Act"), I have determined, pursuant to section 402(d)(1) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1), that the further extension of the waiver authority granted by section 402(c) of the Act will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act. I further determine that continuation of the waiver applicable to the People's Republic of China will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act.

You are authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., June 7, 2000]

NOTE: This memorandum was published in the *Federal Register* on June 8. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders
Transmitting a Report on Normal
Trade Relations Status for China**
June 2, 2000

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

I hereby transmit a report including my reasons for determining that continuation of the waiver currently in effect for the People's Republic of China under subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, (the "Act") will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Act.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

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

The President's Radio Address
June 3, 2000

Good morning. Earlier this week, I attended a summit with European leaders to focus on the opportunities and challenges of the new economy. One of those changes, clearly, is bridging the digital divide and helping all our people make the most of technology's promise. Today I want to talk with you about new steps our administration is taking to help America's students and teachers do just that.

I'm proud of the progress we've made over the last 7 years to expand access to technology in our schools. In 1994 only 35 percent of our schools had any Internet connection; today, 95 percent do. In 1994 only 3 percent of our classrooms were actually connected to the Internet. Today, thanks in large part to the E-rate program championed by Vice President Gore, 95 percent of our schools, as I said, are wired, but now 63 percent of our classrooms have an Internet connection. That's a very big step. But there's

more to do, and it's about more than computers and connections.

Access is important, but it's only a means to an end. The ultimate purpose of computers in the classroom is to boost student performance and help children learn. That can only happen if teachers have the best training to make the most of this technology.

Today, two out of three teachers with access to a computer say they don't feel well-prepared to use it in class. We owe it to America's children to help their teachers become as comfortable with a computer as they are with a chalkboard. And we must start early. With rising student enrollment and teacher retirements, America will need more than 2 million new teachers over the next 10 years. We have to make sure every one of them can use a computer to help students meet high standards. We're taking steps to do that.

Earlier this year, the deans of over 200 colleges of education committed to work with our administration to meet this goal. Today I'm announcing \$128 million in new, 3-year technology grants to help tomorrow's teachers prepare 21st century students. We're awarding 122 grants to teacher colleges and other partners in every region of the country. These resources will train new teachers to use technology to improve student achievement.

A grant to Western Michigan University, for example, will be used to build partnerships with business leaders and local school districts to help future teachers use technology in the classroom. San Diego State University is receiving a grant to develop advanced technologies to improve student reading and teach educators throughout California.

Combined with past grants, today's awards will help train as many as 600,000 new teachers nationwide. My budget for the coming year doubles our investment in quality technology training to reach a million teachers by 2004.

Unfortunately, so far, Congress has failed to provide the resources to meet that target. The House budget would deny hundreds of thousands of future teachers the training they need to use technology to help students meet challenging academic standards. Their budg-

et also denies the funding I requested to create up to a thousand new community technology centers to help young people and adults gain critical technology skills.

In too many ways, the education budget making its way through Congress simply doesn't make the grade. It invests too little in our schools and demands too little from them. In order to pay for large and irresponsible tax breaks, it fails to address some of our schools most pressing needs, from increasing accountability to building and modernizing schools to improving teacher quality and reducing class size.

In this time of unprecedented prosperity, there is no reason to shortchange our children and our schools. So I ask Congress again to pass a budget that reflects our values and puts education first, a budget that strengthens accountability and helps turn around low performing schools, reduces class size and increases after-school opportunities, closes the digital divide and opens doors to help disadvantaged children gear up for college, rebuilds crumbling schools and boosts teacher quality.

If Congress sends me a budget that fails that test, I'll have to veto it. But I hope Congress will work with me to pass balanced, responsible budget increases to invest in our children and their future. Instead of widening the divide in technology and education, we can widen the circle of opportunity for every American. And now is the time to get this done.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 3 p.m. on June 2 in the Presidential Suite at the Intercon Hotel in Berlin, Germany, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on June 3. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 2 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session at the Conference on Progressive Governance for the 21st Century in Berlin, Germany *June 3, 2000*

President Clinton. Thank you very much. First of all, I would like to, I think, speak for all of us in thanking Chancellor Schroeder

for this remarkable meeting and the communique which is coming out of our meeting. It's, I think, a fair statement of the way we view the 21st century world and what our responsibilities and opportunities are in it.

There is a consensus among us that we face, in the globalized information society, great opportunities and great challenges; that we want economic growth and social justice; that the countries around this table, because of their size differences, their continental differences, their developmental differences, face particular challenges; but that there are things we can do to help each other and to help our own people.

We talked specifically about economic empowerment, about education, about closing the digital divide, about the importance of reducing income inequality as a result of the globalization. We talked about the importance of a global initiative to reduce disease and poverty. We talked about climate change, and we talked a good deal about the importance of reaffirming our common humanity in the midst of the racial and ethnic and religious tensions that still dominate too much of the world's conflicts and are present, to some degree, in every one of our countries.

We did agree, as the Chancellor said, to set up a network of our people to work together to identify specific challenges and come up with specific responses to them, so that we can now move from the more theoretical level of our discussions to concrete suggestions that will be helpful and could actually improve the lives of the people we represent.

And finally, let me say we agreed that those of us who are members will emphasize a lot of these concerns at the coming G-8 meeting in Okinawa, where we expect to see a real emphasis on, in particular, on three things we talked about today: on spreading educational opportunities in the developing world; on closing the digital divide; and on a major effort by the developed countries to increase our response to disease, particularly to HIV/AIDS, TB, and malaria.

So this was a very good meeting. And Chancellor, again I thank you, and I, for one, learned a lot, and I think it was very much worth the effort that you made to put it on.

[At this point, Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder of Germany began the question-and-answer session of the conference. A participant asked if and when another meeting was scheduled and if the group would stay together regardless of election results. The Chancellor stated that the group was indissoluble and has scheduled another meeting in July.]

Q. Mr. President, yesterday the Chancellor called you a true European. As a true European, can you tell us where you think Europe should be moving? Should Europe be moving to become a United States of Europe; should it becoming a kind of federal state? Is that what it should be doing, or should it be a rather looser confederation of nation-states? *[Laughter]*

President Clinton. Well, I'm also a true democrat, which means I believe people should make their own decisions—*[laughter]*—about their lives.

Let me say, as I said yesterday in Aachen, I have strongly supported the cause of European union. I think that what has been done so far is a plus. I think that more members will be added to the Union, and I think that is a good thing. You already have a common currency and a forum for resolving common concerns.

Whether the Union will grow tighter, as well as larger, I can't say. That's a decision you have to make. And my guess is that now that you have a framework that's plainly working economically and politically, that those decisions will be made over a longer period of time and that for the next few years you'll be at least as concerned about how many other countries should be let in. But it's entirely a decision for Europe to make. The United States will support you whatever you do as long as we continue to share values and work together and deal with the kind of questions we're discussing today.

Q. To President Clinton, how do you view the situation in Latin America? And I'd like to know how you can see the principles you're advocating here coming about in Latin American countries with the difficulties facing democracy there at the moment.

Thank you.

President Clinton. Well, first, I think that all the people here who are not from Latin America should know that every country but

one is a democracy; that there has been an enormous amount of economic and political reform in Latin America in the last decade; but that because of the rise of narcotraffickers and terrorist activities in Colombia and in other countries, democracy is under great strain in Latin America.

And my belief is that we should do everything we can to support the elected governments and democratic tendencies. We should make sure that we do whatever we can to see that the economies work for ordinary citizens, that there is a face on Latin America's part of the global economy, and that we try to strengthen those governments that are under particular stress, which is why I've done what I could to persuade our Congress to help Colombia and the other countries in the Andean regions to deal with the combined impacts of the narcotraffickers and the civil wars in the region.

Perhaps the Latin American Presidents here might have a better insight. But I think the fact that we have the Presidents of Brazil, Argentina, and Chile here, I think, has been a big addition to the quality of our discussions because of the particular challenges facing Latin America at this time.

[President Fernando Cardoso of Brazil and President Fernando De La Rúa of Argentina commented on democracy in Latin America.]

Q. Mr. President, you said that globalization should be given a new human face. What was striking was that the term "Third Way" wasn't used at this conference; progressive governance was the motto of this conference. Is this a turning point for future meetings of the center-left?

President Clinton. I hope not, because I believe that, to me, it does reflect the Third Way. But, you know, that term, "the Third Way," is fairly closely identified with our administration and with what Prime Minister Blair has done in Great Britain. And I think this idea of progressive governance is perhaps less of a political slogan and more of a description of what it is we're all trying to do.

But essentially, I think what unites us is, we believe in the positive possibilities of a globalized information economy. And we know we have to have responsible economic

policies to make the private markets work, but we don't believe that's enough. We don't believe you can have social justice and deal with all these other challenges we face unless you have effective, progressive governance that makes the most of the new economy and deals with its rough edges and difficulties as well. I think that's so—I think, in that sense, progressive governance describes what we're trying to do. We don't believe in just laissez-faire economics, but we don't believe that government alone can solve these problems or ignore the importance of economic performance. So what we want is progressive governance to deal with the opportunities and challenges that are out there.

I think it is a fair description of what we're about, and it is perhaps more inclusive of all the countries here represented than the Third Way. I like the Third Way because it's sort of easy to remember. *[Laughter]* But I think that far more important than the labels are the substance, and I think that's what has really bound us together here today is the substance of what we're about.

[Chancellor Schroeder commented that the absence of Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom was due to the birth of his child rather than to differences of substance.]

The President. Progressive governance and the Third Way are pro-family. *[Laughter]*

Chancellor Schroeder. One last question, please.

Q. Mr. Clinton, I'd like to ask you, what is your view of how the Internet should be used as a tool for strengthening democracy and for the education of the developing countries and strengthening democracy in countries like China or other countries where this is a problem, instead of being used as a tool to spread destructive information? How should you enforce that tool? And what is the role for countries that are far ahead in this area, like Sweden and the United States, for example?

President Clinton. Well, first, I think that we should recognize what an enormous potential the Internet has for bridging economic, educational, and social divides, not only in the developing world but in the poorest areas of developed countries, because it

collapses time and space and allows access to information that was previously unthinkable for people in difficult situations.

Prime Minister Chretien talked about how he had all the Eskimo villages in northern Canada connected to the Internet. That has enormous health implications, enormous educational implications, and my guess is, economic implications.

So to specifically answer your question, I'll give you just three examples of things I think we ought to be emphasizing. I believe we ought to try to have Internet connections with printers in all the poorest villages where we're trying to get children into schools and give them modern education, because—for example, the entire Encyclopedia Britannica is now on the Internet. And if you have a printer and a computer in a poor village, you don't have to be able to afford textbooks anymore, and it's a far more efficient way for government to spread universal information. So that's one example that's an education example.

For an economic example, I think that all over the world we see economic empowerment initiatives. In Latin America, for example, there has been a lot of work to get native crafts—and also in African villages—out. I think there ought to be a systematic effort to use E-commerce to market these things all over the world and increase the incomes of poor people in villages dramatically by the use of E-commerce.

The third thing, a political usage. In India, where I just visited, in several of the villages in several of the States in India, they're now providing government services over the Internet. In some places, they're more advanced than we are in the United States. I was in Hyderabad, where you can get 18 government services over the Internet, including a driver's license, so no one ever waits in line for it anymore. If anyone did that in America, they could be elected for life. [*Laughter*]

So I think that—but far more important is, I saw a poor woman in a village who just had a baby go into the only public building in this village, to the village computer, where there was someone there who helped her operate it. And she called up the health department and got instructions, with very good software, very good visuals, about how she

should care for this baby for the first 6 months. And I reviewed it—it's just as good as anything she could get in the wealthiest community in America from the finest obstetrician—so that we're going to keep more babies alive because of the Internet.

So those are three examples of things that I think we should be focused on. And those of us in the wealthier countries should be providing the money and the technical support for countries to do more of this, because it will move more people more quickly out of poverty, I think, than anything that's ever been out there, if we do it right.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:10 p.m. in the Cabinet Room at the Chancellery. In his remarks, he referred to President Eduardo Frei of Chile; and Prime Minister Jean Chretien of Canada. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of Chancellor Schroeder and Presidents Cardoso and De La Rúa. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Joint Statement on Cooperation To Combat Global Warming

June 4, 2000

President of the United States Clinton and President of the Russian Federation Putin reaffirm the commitment of the United States and the Russian Federation to cooperate in taking action to reduce the serious risks of global warming. They take note of the significant contributions to environmental protection made by the U.S.-Russian Joint Commission on Economic and Technical Cooperation under the co-chairmanship of Vice President Gore and the Prime Minister of the Russian Federation.

The Presidents declare their conviction that national and global economic growth can be achieved while continuing to protect the global climate. They note with approval the close cooperation of the two countries in multilateral negotiations to elaborate upon elements of the Kyoto Protocol to the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change. The Presidents stress the importance of fully

developing the Protocol's flexibility mechanisms, including international emissions trading and joint implementation, which are essential to achieving countries' greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction commitments under the Protocol. They believe transparent rules for these mechanisms must be developed.

The Presidents further note the potential of the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms to promote investment in all areas where it is possible to limit or reduce GHG emissions. They reaffirm the opposition of the U.S. and Russian governments to proposals that limit the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms by placing quantitative restrictions on the transfer of Parties' assigned amounts. The Presidents reiterate the commitment of their governments to work for agreement on these and other issues at the Sixth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties taking place in The Hague in November of this year.

Building upon previous joint accomplishments, the U.S. and Russia plan to continue their cooperation on the problem of global climate change.

President Clinton declares the intention of the Government of the United States of America to continue cooperation with Russia in the measurement and reporting of GHG emissions, the development of market-based tools for managing those emissions, and the identification of specific opportunities in Russia to further reduce or sequester those emissions.

President Putin, noting the significant contributions made by the Russian Federation to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, declares the intention of the Russian Federation to expand and strengthen the mutually-beneficial U.S.-Russian cooperation in the area of the fight against global warming, paying special attention to the activities of the Joint Russian-American Climate Policy Working Group.

Through these actions, Presidents Clinton and Putin express their conviction that effective steps can be taken by political leaders, and by leaders in scientific, business, and other circles, to protect the planet that we share from the threat of global warming.

Moscow
June 4, 2000

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

Joint Statement Concerning Management and Disposition of Excess Weapon-Grade Plutonium and Related Cooperation

June 4, 2000

The Presidents of the United States and the Russian Federation announced today completion of the bilateral Agreement for the management and disposition of weapon-grade plutonium withdrawn from their respective nuclear weapon programs and declared excess to defense purposes. This Agreement will ensure that this plutonium will be changed into forms unusable for nuclear weapons by consumption as fuel in nuclear reactors or by immobilization rendering it suitable for geologic disposal.

Based on the 1998 Summit Joint Statement of Principles for Management and Disposition of Plutonium, this Agreement charts the course and sets the conditions for such activities. It reconfirms our determination to take steps necessary to ensure that it is never again used for nuclear weapons or any other military purpose and is managed and disposed in a way that is safe, secure, ecologically sound, transparent and irreversible. It reaffirms our commitment to nuclear disarmament.

This Agreement will ensure that the management and disposition activities are monitored and, thus, transparent for the international community. It provides for International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) verification once appropriate agreements with the IAEA are concluded.

This Agreement builds on the approaches to such plutonium management and disposition agreed at the 1996 G-8 Moscow Nuclear Safety and Security Summit. We reaffirm our intentions to continue to work closely with other countries, in particular other G-8 leaders, who have provided strong support over past years for initiation and implementation of these programs. In this regard, we hope that significant progress will be made as well at the G-8 Summit this July in Okinawa.

This Agreement will enable new cooperation to go forward between the United States and the Russian Federation. We note that the United States Congress has appropriated 200 million USD for this cooperation and the U.S. Administration intends to seek additional appropriations.

This Agreement will soon be signed by Vice President Gore and Prime Minister Kasyanov.

Moscow
June 4, 2000

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement, which was formally entitled, "Joint Statement Concerning Management and Disposition of Weapon-Grade Plutonium Designated as No Longer Required for Defense Purposes and Related Cooperation."

Joint Statement on Principles of Strategic Stability

June 4, 2000

1. The Presidents of the United States of America and the Russian Federation agree on the need to maintain strategic nuclear stability. Agreements between them help accomplish this objective.

2. They are dedicated to the cause of strengthening strategic stability and international security. They agree that capability for deterrence has been and remains a key aspect of stability and predictability in the international security environment.

3. The Presidents, welcoming the ratification of START-II Treaty and related documents by the Russian Federation, look forward to the completion of the ratification process in the United States.

4. They announce that discussions will intensify on further reductions in the strategic forces of the United States and Russia within the framework of a future START-III Treaty, and on ABM issues, in accordance with the Moscow Statement of 1998 and Cologne Statement of 1999 by the Presidents.

5. They agree on the essential contribution of the ABM Treaty to reductions in offensive forces, and reaffirm their commitment to that Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability.

6. They agree that the international community faces a dangerous and growing threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, including missiles and missile technologies, and stress their desire to reverse that process, including through existing and possible new international legal mechanisms. They agree that this new threat represents a potentially significant change in the strategic situation and international security environment.

7. They agree that this emerging threat to security should be addressed and resolved through mutual cooperation and mutual respect of each other's security interests.

8. They recall the existing provision of the ABM Treaty to consider possible changes in the strategic situation that have a bearing on the provisions of the Treaty, and, as appropriate, to consider possible proposals for further increasing the viability of the Treaty.

9. The Presidents reaffirm their commitment to continuing efforts to strengthen the ABM Treaty and to enhance its viability and effectiveness in the future, taking into account any changes in the international security environment.

10. In reinforcing the effectiveness of the ABM Treaty under present and prospective conditions the United States of America and the Russian Federation attach great importance to enhancing the viability of the Treaty through measures to promote greater cooperation, openness, and trust between the sides.

11. The United States of America and the Russian Federation note the importance of the consultative process and reaffirm their determination to continue consultations in the future to promote the objectives and implementation of the provisions of the ABM Treaty.

12. The key provisions recorded in our agreements and statements, including at the highest level, create a basis for both countries' activities regarding strategic arms under present-day conditions.

13. Such an approach creates confidence that the further strengthening of strategic stability and further reductions in nuclear forces will be based on a foundation that has been tested over decades and advances both countries' interests and security.

14. The Presidents have directed the development of concrete measures that would allow both sides to take necessary steps to preserve strategic stability in the face of new threats, and called on their Ministers and experts to prepare a report for review by the Presidents.

15. They agree that issues of strategic offensive arms cannot be considered in isolation from issues of strategic defensive arms and vice versa—an interrelationship that is reflected in the ABM Treaty and aims to ensure equally the security of the two countries.

16. The United States of America and the Russian Federation intend to base their activities in the area of strategic offensive and defensive arms on the principles set forth in this document.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement, which was formally entitled, "Joint Statement by the Presidents of the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Principles of Strategic Stability."

Russia-United States Memorandum of Agreement on Establishment of a Joint Center for Early Warning Systems Data Exchange and Missile Launch Notifications

June 4, 2000

The United States of America and the Russian Federation, hereinafter referred to as the Parties, Guided by the Joint Statement of the Presidents of the United States of America and the Russian Federation on the Exchange of Information on Missile Launches and Early Warning of September 2, 1998,

Taking into account the need to minimize the consequences of a false missile attack warning and to prevent the possibility of a missile launch caused by such false warning,

Have agreed as follows:

Article 1

1. In order to set up an uninterrupted exchange of information on launches of ballistic missiles and space launch vehicles from the early warning systems of the United States of America and the Russian Federation,

hereinafter, the warning systems of the Parties, as well as to provide for the possible implementation of a multilateral regime for the exchange of notifications of launches of ballistic missiles and space launch vehicles, the Parties shall establish, in Moscow, a joint center for the exchange of data from early warning systems and notifications of missile launches, hereinafter, the Joint Data Exchange Center (JDEC).

2. Each Party shall appoint its representative and deputy representatives, hereinafter, respectively, the JDEC Heads and Deputy Heads, who shall have equal rights in managing the activities of the JDEC.

3. The JDEC Heads shall jointly carry out the daily management of JDEC activities, and shall be jointly responsible for the performance of the tasks assigned to the JDEC.

4. Operations of the JDEC shall be jointly carried out by specially trained operational personnel of the Parties.

Article 2

The JDEC shall provide for the:

a. implementation of an exchange of information on launches of ballistic missiles and space launch vehicles detected by the warning systems of the Parties;

b. efficient resolution of possible ambiguous situations related to information from the warning systems of the Parties;

c. creation of the conditions for the preparation and maintenance of a unified database for a multilateral regime for the exchange of notifications of launches of ballistic missiles and space launch vehicles.

Article 3

1. Information shall be exchanged on the following types of objects detected by the warning systems of the Parties in accordance with Appendices 1 and 2 to this Memorandum, which define the types of objects on which information shall be exchanged and the implementation phases of the information exchange:

a. all launches of ICBMs and SLBMs of the United States of America and the Russian Federation;

b. launches of ballistic missiles, that are not ICBMs or SLBMs, of the United States of America and the Russian Federation;

c. launches of ballistic missiles of third states that could pose a direct threat to the Parties or that could create an ambiguous situation and lead to possible misinterpretation;
d. launches of space launch vehicles.

2. Each Party, at its discretion, in support of the objectives of this Memorandum or Article 3 of the Agreement on Measures to Reduce the Risk of Outbreak of Nuclear War Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of September 30, 1971, may also provide information on other launches and objects, including de-orbiting spacecraft, and geophysical experiments and other work in near-earth space that are capable of disrupting the normal operation of equipment of the warning systems of the Parties.

Article 4

1. The sources for obtaining information exchanged pursuant to paragraph 1 of Article 3 of this Memorandum shall be the equipment of the space- and ground-based warning systems of the Parties. When exchanging information, the sources of the data shall not be specified.

2. Each Party shall provide processed launch information in a time frame that is near real time, if possible.

Article 5

Whenever available, the following information shall be exchanged in accordance with the formats set forth in Appendix 3 to this Memorandum:

- a. when a launch of a ballistic missile is detected—the time of launch, generic missile class, geographic area of the launch, geographic area of payload impact, estimated time of payload impact and launch azimuth;
- b. when a launch of a space launch vehicle is detected—the time of launch, generic missile class, geographic area of the launch and launch azimuth.

Article 6

The Parties hereby establish a Joint Commission for purposes of overseeing the activities of the JDEC and coordinating the implementation of this Memorandum. The regulations of the Joint Commission are set forth in Appendix 4 to this Memorandum.

Article 7

The Parties shall jointly provide for the:
a. drafting, agreement and updating of documents establishing JDEC operating procedures, including implementation of JDEC joint duty shifts;

b. training of personnel for the performance of the tasks assigned to the JDEC at locations agreed by the Parties;

c. designation of primary and backup communications channels to ensure uninterrupted JDEC operations;

d. confidentiality of the information exchanged between the JDEC and the warning systems of the Parties.

Article 8

1. The Parties intend that the JDEC shall commence operations 365 days after this Memorandum enters into force.

2. Upon commencement of operations, an operational test period lasting up to 100 days shall precede commencement of Phase I of JDEC operations. During this period, the Parties shall test data exchange procedures, equipment and software and shall correct shortcomings that they find. The operational test period shall conclude and Phase I of JDEC operations shall commence upon agreement of the Joint Commission. Acknowledging that the decision of the Joint Commission to transition to subsequent phases is the determining factor, the Parties intend to implement the transition to subsequent phases as soon as practicable.

3. The Executive Agents of the Parties for implementing this Memorandum shall be the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation.

4. The JDEC shall consist of the facilities, equipment and individual components listed in Appendix 5 to this Memorandum.

5. The staff and categories of personnel servicing the JDEC are set forth in Appendix 6 to this Memorandum.

6. The working languages of the JDEC shall be English and Russian.

Article 9

1. Funding for establishing the JDEC and funding for its operation shall be shared equally by the Parties.

2. Determination of the application of customs duties and fees, payments, taxes and other charges to the establishment and operation of the JDEC shall be agreed by the Parties once the JDEC architecture has been defined, consistent with the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article and taking into account the provisions of the laws of the Parties.

Article 10

Each Party shall provide its own transportation to and from the JDEC for its personnel listed in Appendix 6 to this Memorandum.

Article 11

Each Party shall provide its own medical services, including medical insurance, for its personnel working at the JDEC listed in Appendix 6 to this Memorandum.

Article 12

1. Each Party shall provide for the delivery of equipment to outfit the JDEC. The list of this equipment and procedures for its assembly, installation and adjustment shall be agreed by the Parties. The assembly, installation and adjustment of this equipment shall be supervised by the JDEC Heads. Maintenance of JDEC equipment shall be performed by specially trained personnel of the Parties under the supervision of and in accordance with the decisions of the JDEC Heads.

2. JDEC communications shall be organized in accordance with procedures agreed by the Parties.

3. The certification of hardware and software installed in the JDEC shall be carried out as agreed by the Parties, taking into account the technical standards of the United States of America and the laws of the Russian Federation.

4. Each Party shall retain ownership of any equipment, software or other materials that it provides for use in the JDEC.

5. Each Party shall not transfer any equipment, software or other materials, hereinafter, materials, received from the other Party pursuant to this Memorandum to any third state or legal or natural person without the written agreement of the Party that provided these materials. Each Party shall use

materials received from the other Party only for the purposes of this Memorandum and shall take all reasonable measures within its power to ensure the safekeeping and security of such materials.

Article 13

1. Information provided by either Party pursuant to this Memorandum shall be considered to be of a confidential and sensitive nature. This information may not be disclosed or transmitted in any form to a third state or any legal or natural person without the written agreement of the Party that provided the information. This information shall be used only for the purposes of this Memorandum.

2. Each Party shall itself determine the necessary measures for the appropriate handling of the information and its required protection in accordance with its own laws and regulations. Each Party shall ensure the required protection for information exchanged between the JDEC and that Party.

3. The Parties shall agree in the Joint Commission on procedures for handling and exchanging information within the JDEC that ensures the information's required protection.

4. In accordance with paragraph 13 of Appendix 4 to this Memorandum, issues relating to compliance with the provisions of this Article shall be considered by the Parties in the Joint Commission.

Article 14

1. Each Party shall facilitate the entry into and exit from its territory by military and civilian personnel of the other Party engaged in implementing this Memorandum.

2. Upon request from the United States of America, the Russian Federation shall issue the necessary documents required for customs formalities and entry into and exit from the Russian Federation by citizens of the United States of America working at the JDEC and for members of their families. Citizens of the United States of America being sent to work at the JDEC shall be subject to the visa requirements of the Russian Federation.

3. Any issues relating to the provisions of this Article shall be resolved through diplomatic channels. The relevant documents shall be requested ahead of time; as a rule, at least 20 days in advance.

Article 15

The Parties shall work out in the Joint Commission agreements on liability for damages that may arise as the result of activities with respect to the implementation of this Memorandum. Except for pre-construction design work, construction work at the JDEC shall not begin before entry into force of these agreements.

Article 16

Neither Party shall display its state symbols on the exterior of the walled perimeter of the JDEC. All signage on the exterior of this perimeter shall be in Russian. All signage within this perimeter shall be in English and Russian.

Article 17

Amendments to this Memorandum shall enter into force upon agreement by the Parties in the Joint Commission.

Article 18

This Memorandum, including its associated appendices, shall not infringe upon the rights and obligations of the Parties under other treaties or agreements.

Article 19

1. This Memorandum, including its associated appendices, all of which form integral parts thereof, shall enter into force on the date of its signature and shall remain in force for ten years.

2. Upon agreement by the Parties, this Memorandum may be extended for successive five-year periods.

3. Either Party, upon six months written notice to the other Party, may terminate this Memorandum.

DONE at Moscow on June 4, 2000, in two copies, each in the English and the Russian languages, both texts being equally authentic.

NOTE: The text released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included appendices to this joint statement, which was formally entitled, "Memo-

randum of Agreement Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on the Establishment of a Joint Center for the Exchange of Data From Early Warning Systems and Notifications of Missile Launches." An original was not available for verification of the content of this memorandum of agreement.

Russia-United States Joint Statement on Funding Procedures

June 4, 2000

In connection with the Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on the Establishment of a Joint Center for the Exchange of Data from Early Warning Systems and Notifications of Missile Launches, the Parties have agreed that:

- fulfillment of any financial obligations of the United States of America or the Russian Federation is subject to the availability of funds for such purpose;
- transfer for the purpose of this Memorandum by the United States of America or the Russian Federation of any technology or equipment pursuant to this Memorandum is subject to the export laws and regulations of the United States of America or the Russian Federation, respectively; and
- fulfillment of any financial obligations by the United States of America or the Russian Federation regarding any renovation or improvement of the Joint Data Exchange Center (JDEC) building and grounds or equipping the JDEC with hardware and software is subject to authorization, when required, by the Congress of the United States of America or the Government of the Russian Federation, respectively.

NOTE: The joint statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary in conjunction with the joint statement formally entitled, "Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on the Establishment of a Joint Center for the Exchange of Data From Early Warning Systems and Notifications of Missile Launches." An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

Russia-United States Joint Statement on Privileges and Immunities

June 4, 2000

In connection with the signature of the Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on the Establishment of a Joint Center for the Exchange of Data From Early Warning Systems and Notifications of Missile Launches, the Parties agree that U.S. citizens working at the JDEC that are placed on the list of administrative and technical personnel of the Embassy of the United States of America in the Russian Federation shall be accorded the corresponding privileges and immunities.

NOTE: The joint statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary in conjunction with the joint statement formally entitled, "Memorandum of Agreement Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on the Establishment of a Joint Center for the Exchange of Data From Early Warning Systems and Notifications of Missile Launches." An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

The President's News Conference With President Vladimir Putin of Russia in Moscow

June 4, 2000

President Putin. Good day, ladies and gentlemen. I will allow myself to begin summing up our 2 days of work with our guests and partners, with the President of the United States, Mr. Bill Clinton, and members of his team. For 2 days now, we worked very intensively. And I have to say right off the bat that both in terms of the spirit and the quality of our talks, as well as the results, the Russian side cannot but express its satisfaction.

We discussed issues of interest in our opinion not only to the United States and the Russian Federation but to the other countries, as well, on global matters—all of mankind's interest really lies here. We discussed in great detail everything that had been done in this very important—issues of interest to both of our sides, and that which have been

in the last several years. We agree that we're going to be acting in this direction jointly in the future.

We discussed the issues of new global threats, threats such as terrorism, narcotics, crime. We talked about issues which, to our mind, have a certain solution; in the estimation of our American colleagues, maybe have a different kind of a solution. We exchanged ideas and opinions on issues to which we had different solutions in the past. These talks were very candid, very open, and very topical.

As you know, with my colleague, with the President of the United States, I signed several documents, including statements on security. And many things are determined and defined there, and much is said in these documents. The result I think can be summed up by saying that we not only confirmed the high level of our relations, but we also expressed the trend of the development of our relations between our two countries for the near future.

I wanted to stress here, ladies and gentlemen, the following, that over the last period of time, say a year or even more, the relations between our two countries have been of a varied kind. At one time, we had relations increasing and improving, then they would be falling. But that high level, which was reached over the last 8 years by the efforts of the Russian leadership and of the administration of President Clinton, allowed us to always find a way out of these crises with honor, not only to reestablish good relations but also to solve problems where we had disagreements. And we really cherish this. I am pleased to note here that in these very tough questions, we observed not only a desire to speak but also to find joint and mutually beneficial solutions.

We discussed also topics that had to do with bilateral economic interests. Here I wanted to say that the Russian Federation, in the face of your humble servant and the Chairman of the Government, the Prime Minister, Mr. Kasyanov, the leading ministers of the Government who participated and took part in these talks and negotiations not only informed and described to our American guests what's happening economically in Russia today but also discussed with

our partners joint actions, joint activities, both of a bilateral nature as well as within the framework of international financial institutions.

I wanted to stress here as well that the Russian Federation aims not only to go through its transformation, about which many people have so much spoken, but very decisively to do so in a practical way. I mean moving ahead on the tax code and moving ahead on production sharing. Here we have some issues which we have not yet been able to resolve between us and the state Duma, but I think these are rather technical issues. I think, together with the Deputies in the state Duma, we're going to be trying to find solutions and finally get this legislation.

We spoke about the upcoming international events, the Okinawa summit, the Millennium summit in the United Nations in New York, the Brunei meeting. In this way, Mr. Clinton and myself, we have reached an accord on further joint progress along a whole series of issues, which not only we discussed today and yesterday and which we will still have an opportunity to discuss some more tomorrow, to move ahead on these issues at the events that I have listed.

On behalf of the leadership of the Russian Federation, I want to thank the American delegation not only for accepting our invitation and coming to Russia but for a very constructive and businesslike discussion in an attempt to find solutions.

Thank you so much for your attention.

President Clinton. I would like to first thank President Putin and the Russian delegation for making us feel welcome and for these talks.

I have come to Moscow at an important time. Russia, after all, has a new President, new government, new Duma. Its economy is showing encouraging signs of growth. This gives Russia a pivotal opportunity to build on the strong record of engagement between our two countries. It is also an opportunity for the United States.

I welcome President Putin's interest in building a Russia that enjoys the enduring strength of a stable democracy. President Yeltsin led Russia to freedom. Under President Putin, Russia has the chance to build

prosperity and strength, while safeguarding that freedom and the rule of law.

We've had good discussions both last night and today on a range of common interests, including nonproliferation and arms control. We expressed our differences with clarity and candor. And I, for one, appreciate that. The importance of this relationship to ourselves and the world demands that we take every opportunity we can to find common ground and that, where we cannot find it, we express our differences with clarity and candor.

I congratulated President Putin on the key role he played in the Duma's ratification of START II and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The United States ratified START II first, and I hope we will now follow Russia in ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. I also look forward to the ratification of the START II protocols by our Senate so that we can get about the business of further reducing the number of nuclear missiles that we have.

I am very pleased today we agreed on two other major steps to reduce the nuclear danger. We reached an important agreement each to destroy 34 tons of military-grade plutonium, enough to make thousands of warheads. This raw weapon material that will now never fall into the wrong hands.

We also agreed to establish a joint data exchange center in Moscow to share early warning information on missile and space launches. This is terribly important. It is the first permanent U.S.-Russia military operation ever.

In this new center, Russian and American military officials will be working side by side, 24 hours a day, to monitor missile warning information. It is a milestone in enhancing strategic stability, and I welcome it.

The President and I also discussed our common commitment to prevent the proliferation of missile technology and our determination to exert firm control over exports of sensitive technology and strictly enforce export control laws and regulations.

We discussed our common interest in commercial space cooperation, including the successful joint venture that launches commercial satellites. We agreed that our teams

would soon meet to discuss future cooperation in the commercial space area, with the aim of moving toward eliminating existing constraints on commercial space launches.

We also had a thorough discussion of our work on the START III treaty and the issue of national missile defense. We have agreed to a statement of principles, which I urge you to read carefully. It makes clear that there is an emerging ballistic missile threat that must be addressed, though we have not yet agreed on how best to do so.

We have acknowledged that the ABM Treaty foresees the possibility of changes in the strategic environment that might require it to be updated. We have reaffirmed our commitment to pursue further reduction in offensive arms in parallel with our discussions on defense systems, underscoring the importance of the doctrines of strategic stability and mutual deterrence as the foundation for this work.

We've asked our experts to keep working to narrow the differences and to develop a series of cooperative measures to address the missile threat. And we have agreed that we will continue to discuss it in our next meeting.

We spent a large share of our time discussing economics. I'm encouraged by the economic plan President Putin has outlined and by the current recovery. I look forward to Russia's continuing to implement proposed reforms that will actually make the recovery last, reforms such as tax reform, anti-money-laundering legislation, strong property rights protections.

I look forward to Russia's successful negotiations with the IMF. This is a good economic team with a very good opportunity to increase investment in Russia, both the return of money that Russians have placed outside the country and new investments from other countries.

Later this month, our former Ambassador to Moscow, Bob Strauss, will come to Russia with a delegation of investors, including some of America's best-known chief executive officers, to discuss opportunities in Russia and the steps Russia is taking to improve its investment climate. I think this will be only the beginning of a very successful effort at

economic reform, if the intentions that President Putin outlined become reality.

The President and I also discussed another area where we disagree, Chechnya. I have restated the opposition that I have to a policy which is well-known. Essentially, I believe a policy that causes so many civilian casualties without a political solution ultimately cannot succeed. I also urged President Putin to move forward with transparent and impartial investigations of the stories of human rights violations and to authorize a speedy return of the OSCE to the region.

Finally, I stressed to President Putin the importance the United States places on protecting religious freedom and the rights of an independent media. I strongly agree with what President Putin himself has said, that Russia has no future if it suppresses civic freedoms and the press.

We agreed to advance our technical cooperation on climate change. We believe it's essential to complete work on the Kyoto Protocol, including market mechanisms, to protect the environment, promote clean energy, and reduce costs. I think Russia has a great economic opportunity here as well as a great environmental one.

And on these issues, the President and I are asking the U.S.-Russia binational commission, under the leadership of Vice President Gore and Prime Minister Kasyanov, to carry forward the work.

I was encouraged by our discussion, pleased with our agreements, pleased with the candor and clarity of our disagreements. I am eager for more progress. I'm also looking forward to the chance to talk to the Russian people tonight in a radio talk show, and tomorrow, as I have the opportunity to speak to the Duma and the Federation Council.

Again Mr. President, I thank you for this and especially for these two agreements, and I look forward to our continued work together.

Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. The question to the President of Russia. What is the priority you give to Russian-American relations in the world, and a world that, as we see, is changing and forming in a different way?

Thank you.

President Putin. The history of relations of the former Soviet Union and the United States of America, and now Russian Federation and the United States—its history, as I've said, has many dramatic as well as many positive elements. We were allies. There was a period of time when we suffered through confrontation between our two sides. One would hope that the very worst in our relations is far, far behind us.

For today, the United States is one of our main partners. And as far as Russia is concerned, it will never make the choice regarding the United States in order to start once again confrontation. Never. We are for co-operation. We are for coming to agreement on problems that might arise.

And naturally, problems like this exist and have existed and probably will exist. That is not important. What's important is that the approach to finding a solution is only one—it's unique—it cannot be aimed at destroying everything positive that has been achieved in the recent past but also looking into the future. And this kind of chance and this intention among the leadership of Russia, as well as I understand it, among the leadership of the United States, the President of the United States, we are going to follow these principles, these kinds of tendencies.

Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty

Q. Mr. President, do you see the chance that the United States would exercise its option to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty if it is not possible to negotiate changes to permit a national missile defense? And was this possibility raised in your discussions with President Putin?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I have not made a decision on the national missile defense stage one. It is premature. The statement of principles that we have agreed to I thought reflected an attempt to bring our positions closer together. I do not believe the decision before me is a threat to strategic stability and mutual deterrence. The Russian side disagrees. But we had a lot of agreement here.

And again, let me say, I urge you all to read that. I do not want the United States to withdraw from the ABM regime because, I think, it has contributed to a more stable,

more peaceful world. It has already been amended once, and its framers understood that circumstances might change and threats might arise which were outside the context of U.S.-now Russian relations. We acknowledge that there is a threat. It needs to be met, and we're trying to bridge our differences. And I think that's where we ought to leave it.

START Treaties

Q. President Clinton, Mr. President, what do you feel about Russia's continuation of reducing within START III the number of warheads down to 1,500 warheads?

Thank you.

President Clinton. I missed the translation. Would you give it to me again?

Q. What would be the attitude of the United States, Mr. President, on the Russian position of coming down to 1,500 warheads within START III?

President Clinton. Well, we had previously agreed to a range of 2,000 to 2,500 on START III. If we were to come down below that, it would require us to change our strategic plan. And we believe it would be much better if we were going to do that, if we could also know that we were defending ourselves against a new threat, which we believe is real. So we will continue to discuss all these things.

Let me say, I am certain—I am eager to get down to the START II levels, and I am eager to go below the START II levels, but I also want to try to solve the new threat, as well. And I will do whatever I can to achieve both objectives.

Clinton/Putin Relationship

Q. This is for both Presidents. Now that you have met together as Presidents, how would you describe each other's personalities and leadership qualities? And how do you see them affecting relations between the two countries? And in particular, President Clinton, are you any more or less assured about the future of democracy in Russia following your meetings today?

President Clinton. You want to go first?

President Putin. As you know, this is not our first meeting, between myself and President Clinton. President Clinton, now for almost 8 years, heads one of the most powerful countries in the world. He's a very experienced politician. In my mind, we've established now not only good business ties but also personal relations. For me, President Clinton is a person who is a very comfortable and pleasant partner in negotiations.

I think that if everyone behaves the way President Clinton has behaved, not trying to find dead ends and problems but to seek ways of moving ahead, I think, between us in the future our relations really will be successful. Take a look at the ABM Treaty. There are a lot of problems there. We've written down in our statement, about which Mr. Clinton just spoke, a basis, a principle of basis for maintaining the ABM Treaty as a major key point in the whole strategic balance and for maintaining security.

Now, the starting point for the possibility of seeing new threats arrive, we have a commonality. We're against having a cure which is worse than the disease. We understand that there are ways and a basis that we can build upon in order to solve even this issue, an issue which seems to be one of the most difficult to solve.

So I repeat, we know that today, in the United States, there is a campaign ongoing. We're familiar with the programs of the two main candidates. And if these programs are implemented, and there it says, for instance, the necessity to positively improve relations between Russia and the United States, the time that Mr. Clinton is going to pass on to the next President, no matter who gets to be President, we're willing to go forward on either one of these approaches.

Thank you.

President Clinton. Well, let me say first, I think President Putin has an enormous opportunity and a great challenge. If you want to know what my personal assessment is, I think he is fully capable of building a prosperous, strong Russia, while preserving freedom and pluralism and the rule of law. It's a big challenge. I think he is fully capable of doing it.

And I want to use the time I have remaining as President not only to further the inter-

ests of the United States in meeting our national security threat but also to further our interest in having a good, stable relationship with a Russia that is strong and prosperous and free, respecting pluralism and the rule of law. That's what I'm trying to do. I think he is fully capable of achieving that. And I'm encouraged by the first 2 days of our really serious work.

NOTE: The President's 191st news conference began at 6:55 p.m. in St. George's Hall in the Kremlin. In his remarks, he referred to former President Boris Yeltsin and current Prime Minister Mikhail Kasyanov of Russia. President Putin and some reporters spoke in Russian, and their remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Interview With Aleksei Venediktov of Ekho Moskv Radio in Moscow

June 4, 2000

Mr. Venediktov. Good evening. Today we have a guest, the President of the United States of America. Good evening, Mr. President.

The President. Good evening.

Russia-U.S. Relations

Mr. Venediktov. Right off the bat, I'd like to say that today we've already had a press conference, which our listeners could see you, and so for that reason, my questions will not be political in nature. Mostly listeners will be asking their questions.

My first question is as follows, Mr. President. The latest public opinion poll in Russia by the Institute of—[inaudible]—had found that 11 percent of Russians see an enemy in the United States. Another 11 percent of Russians do not know how to answer this question. And 78 percent of Russians believe that Russia is more of a friend, rather than an enemy. I would ask you, since just the ordinary people say this, as to the other 22 percent who feel that Russia is either an enemy or do not know how to answer the question, what would you be able to say directly to those people who are now listening to you and watching you?

The President. Well, first I would say the 78 percent are right. And I would say that the United States has tried to be a friend

to Russia and to democracy, prosperity, and strength in Russia.

I have worked hard to help support Russian democracy, Russian economic reform, and a large role for Russia in the world. I supported Russia coming into the G-8, to the Asian-Pacific economic leaders group; having a special partnership with NATO; working on the ground, our troops, Russian troops, side by side in the Balkans. And I intend to support Russia's effort to get a program going with the International Monetary Fund, with the World Bank. I believe the world needs a strong and prosperous and democratic Russia that respects the rule of law and the differences among its people. And that's what I've worked for.

So I have tried to be a good friend. And I think America wants friendly relations. The American people basically like the Russian people, and they feel better when they think we have good relations and that we have a good future together.

Mr. Venediktov. I believe, Mr. President, you are mistaken, because right in front of me is a Gallup poll from the United States, March of the year 2000, and the "positive" attitude towards Russia, or "mostly positive," is only 40 percent of the American population; and "mostly negative" or "very negative" is 59 percent answers of the Americans who were polled. How could you explain to the Russians now why Americans, a significant part of the citizens, are negative towards United States? * Is it fear? Is it unhappiness? Are they angry, or what?

The President. I think it overwhelmingly is the opinion of the American people, and most people in the West, about the situation in Chechnya and the highly publicized other differences we have. But I think if you ask the American people another question, "Would you like to see a good American relationship with a strong, prosperous, democratic Russia?"—they would say yes. And if you talk to the American people that have actually known Russians and you ask them, "Do you like the Russian people?" overwhelmingly, they would say yes.

*White House correction.

Joint Anti-Ballistic Missile System

Mr. Venediktov. I am finished with asking my questions, Mr. President. Now let's go to the questions that ordinary people have asked. Some questions came over the Internet—[inaudible]—from St. Petersburg—[inaudible]—from Moscow—and they basically all ask the same question. "Why don't you want, together with Mr. Putin, together with Russia, to create a joint system of national anti-ballistic missile system? Why have not you accepted this proposal of?"—these questions came before the press conference, but it does increase the fear among those people, doesn't it?

The President. Well, let me explain the issue here. And I don't want to take too long on any questions, because we want to answer as many as possible, but this is very important.

First of all, I have no objection to working with Russia on a joint missile defense that would intercept a missile directed at Russia or the United States from a hostile power in the Middle East or anywhere else, in the so-called boost phase. I have no objection to doing that. I think we should work together on it. The problem is, we think it will take 10 years or more to develop; the technology is not yet available.

Now, by contrast, we expect to face this threat in the United States within 5 years, and we think the other technology for the limited national missile defense will be available within that time. So that's why I haven't agreed to scrap what seems to be a clear way of defending our country for an unclear way. But I think it's important that the Russian people and the American people understand the exact nature of the dispute here.

Mr. Venediktov. But it frightens Russians, obviously.

The President. Yes, I understand. But I think they won't be frightened if they understand the exact nature of the difference, even if we can't resolve the difference.

The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972 enshrined a theory of our security—that is, Russian security and American security—based on strategic stability and mutual deterrence. That is, we would never have so many defensive weapons, and we wouldn't have national missile defenses that could interfere

with our offensive weapons, so that neither of us would ever launch nuclear missiles at each other because of that. Okay.

Now, we recognized that things might change and threats might come from other places, even way back then. So there was a possibility of amending the missile defense treaty. Now, we recognize—just today President Putin and I signed a statement of principles that said, “Okay, there is a new threat; the treaty may be able to be amended, but we disagree right now on how to meet the threat.” That’s what we said.

The narrow issue is this: If the U.S. has a missile defense that can stop a couple of missiles from North Korea, does it have the potential to upset what has kept us safe all these years, which is mutual deterrence and stability? We say, no; they say, the Russians say, it might. So we’re trying to work through that.

But the point is, neither side believes the other side is trying to hurt them directly. There is an honest difference of opinion here. And we closed some of the gaps in our two positions, and we promise to keep working on it.

Believe me, I did not want to scrap the ABM Treaty or the theory of mutual deterrence or strategic stability. Both President Putin and I want to reduce the number of offensive missiles but keep the theory that has kept us safe all these years.

Mr. Venediktov. I think it’s time to listen to some phone calls. I would like to say to Mr. President that now the Ekho program also is carrying out electronic voting, and at the end of our discussion, we’d like to comment you on what we get. The question that people are voting on is as follows: Will the situation under President Putin improve towards the United States or will it get worse or you don’t know? So by the end of the program here we’ll get some results.

U.S. Economic Issues

Hello, this is the first call. Please, what is your question to President Clinton? “Do you think financial crisis is possible in the United States? Thank you. I guess the Russian crisis does not bother you, is not a concern to you. What about America? Is there

an economic crisis possible in the United States?”

The President. Well, first of all, the Russian condition does concern me. I think when the Russian economy is healthier, the American economy will be healthier. And I intend to support the economic reform program that the President and the Prime Minister have outlined.

I think a financial crisis is unlikely in the United States, as long as we have a good economic program, as long as we keep our budget in surplus, as long as we’re continuing to open our markets and compete with other countries, and as long as we’re investing in our people. If we have good policies and we work hard, I think a big financial crisis is unlikely.

Political Satire

Mr. Venediktov. The next phone call. “Have you ever seen the puppets program? Have you seen your own puppet? And how do you relate to the fact that there is a program such as this that lampoons Presidents?”

The President. I haven’t seen it. Perhaps I can get it on tape and watch it; I would like to see it. But it doesn’t bother me. I have been lampooned in America a lot. There is almost nothing anybody can say to make fun of me that hasn’t been said already. And as long as it’s said in good spirit and good humor, I don’t mind. I think we need people to make fun of us so we don’t take ourselves too seriously. And if it’s not said in good spirits, then you just have to ignore it and go to work every day.

Freedom of the Press

Mr. Venediktov. Okay, in that case, I have a question, Mr. President. It seems to me, despite the first amendment of the Constitution, any President of the United States, or Argentina or Russia, any other country, has a desire to kind of squash the press, which is not—that follows you all the time, looks for dirty stories, is always trying to hound you. Have you ever had a desire to shake a journalist real strong? And if you’ve had such feelings, how did you manage to control them? This is the main question. Of course, it refers to just about any—it could be asked for any President, any leader.

The President. Well, of course, from time to time you read something that you believe is either untrue or unfair, or maybe you're afraid it is true, and you just wish it weren't printed. And you can get angry. But I think the important thing—in our country, for example, if you're a public figure, it's almost impossible to even win a lawsuit against somebody who's deliberately lying about you, because we have bent over backwards in favor of the freedom of the press.

Now, why do we do that? Because we think that democracy is more stable and people are more free when the press is free. And we trust the people to understand if the press is either false or unfair. In other words—particularly in this electronic age, when someone says something about me that's not true, I can go on a program like this, and I can say, here's what they say; here's the truth. I can go on television. I can give a speech.

So what we believe is that even though—if you have a really free press that much freedom can carry with it irresponsibility, you still have more stability in society by letting people be free, by letting the debates unfold, and by trusting that the citizens, the voters, in the end, will get it right.

And we've had this first amendment for over 200 years now. And the press has become more and more and more free. The meaning of it has been broadened. And our country has gotten stronger and stronger. It can become personally painful if someone says something that maybe they shouldn't say, but the society is stronger with a free press. And if you trust the people, then you must believe that if something is said you don't agree with, you go out and disagree. You tell the people your side, and you trust them to make the right decision. That's what I believe gives you the strongest society.

Mr. Venediktov. Have you spoken to President Putin about freedom of the press in Russia?

The President. Yes, we had a discussion about it, and I said in my press conference today—I quoted his statement. President Putin said that without civil society and free press, the Russian democracy couldn't go on. And I think that's a wise statement.

I also believe, though, that this is something that has to be debated and fought for

and struggled for. For example, in the beginning of our democracy, around 1800, we had the same Constitution we have today. But there were—people could bring lawsuits against people who printed things in the newspapers, and often win in ways that intimidated them. So we had to keep changing the law to try to preserve the right for totally innocent private citizens to bring suit against people who might use the press to hurt them deliberately and to lie about them deliberately, while still allowing a very broad range for political debate and dispute and dissent.

So we've been working on this a long time. But the trend has always been for more freedom of the press, particularly where public issues and public officials are concerned. And I think it's fair to say that no one in modern history in our country has had either more negative press or more painful press than I have, but I still think on balance as long as you get to answer, the people have a chance to get it right, and you get more stability, because an open press also ensures that all these issues are fully debated and that all sides are fully heard.

So I believe it's an instrument of stability. And if you think it's not free enough here, then what I would urge you to do is to look at the example of America. Read the 200-year history of our country and just work on the issues as they come up. Just keep pushing for more—a broader and broader and broader interpretation of freedom of the press. But as I said, we've been working on it a long time. But it's served us well.

Mr. Venediktov. But you don't necessarily have to expel journalists. To tell you the truth, I have read the memoirs of your former Press Secretary, Mr. Stephanopoulos. You get upset, not do nothing, answer, or just let it go past you. Or you could ask the tax police, for example, to check on the business of CNN, or you could—

The President. Yes, but I never did that. I would never do that. And, first of all, it's now clearly illegal for a President to do that. It's not lawful. If you're mad at somebody, I think the thing to do is to express your anger, blow off steam, and go on about your business. Or even better, control your anger and think of a way to make sure the public

has the impression you believe is the right one.

[At this point, the program paused for station identification.]

International Monetary Fund

Mr. Venediktov. You're live on the air, hello? What is your question? "I'd like to ask what kind of influence does the President have on the International Monetary Fund, and why is it not giving us credits? It seems that we have an economic uprise in our economy, and we're not getting any credits from the International Monetary Fund. I'd like to get an answer to this question. Why?"

The President. Well, first of all, the President can have some influence over the International Monetary Fund, but he doesn't run it. All the various contributors to the Fund have some influence. I have focused a lot on trying to reform the IMF, to make sure that its policies and practices meet the real needs of countries for the 21st century.

Secondly, I do support Russia getting a program with the IMF and getting financial help from the IMF—your new President, Mr. Putin, and your new Prime Minister have come up with a very good plan, and when they go before the IMF and ask for financial support, the United States will support them. They're putting the plan together now; they're going to make the presentation. I expect to support it.

Next Administration

Mr. Venediktov. Mr. President, I'd like to check to see how ready you are to quick questions, quick answers, we got over the Internet from Russia, all of Russia. These are private questions. You're a sports person, you know sports—are you ready to answer them?

The President. I'll do my best.

Mr. Venediktov. Mr. President, what kind of slogan would you put on the wall of the Oval Room for the next President?

The President. What should the next President's slogan be? Making the most of our prosperity, meeting the big challenges of the 21st century.

President's Spending Money

Mr. Venediktov. How long has it been since you've held money in your hands, cash?

The President. About an hour.

Mr. Venediktov. What did you buy?

The President. Oh, I didn't buy anything, but I got my—I'm going to dinner after I leave you, and so I brought my money with me. But I try to go out and shop every—buy something every few months, anyway, just so I keep in touch with people. And I talk to people in bookstores, or I go buy something for my wife or my daughter, just to see what things cost and see what people are doing. I think it's important that Presidents not get too isolated.

Mr. Venediktov. A favorite question that we always ask on our radio station programs, Mr. President, do you remember how you made your first dollar, earned your first dollar, and how did you spend it?

The President. Well, I remember how I made it; I don't remember how I spent it. The first thing I did to earn money was cutting lawns and cutting hedges and taking care of the yards of the people who lived in my neighborhood. And I was probably about 9 or 10 years old when I did that.

In my lifetime, I probably had earned money doing 20 or 25 different things. I've built houses. I've cleared land. I've worked in a grocery store. I had a news comic book business. Obviously, I was a musician. I made money as a musician. I've been a teacher. I've done a lot of different things in my life.

Personal Transportation

Mr. Venediktov. This is a question from the city of—[inaudible]. "Mr. President, do you know how to drive a car, an airplane, a submarine, tank?" Maybe President Putin has inspired this question.

The President. Yes, to the car, although I haven't driven one in a while. And, no, to the airplane. I have taken off and landed a small plane—25 years ago my wife gave me airplane lessons—but I never pursued it. I never got my pilot's license. And I have never—the submarine—I've ridden in a tank, but I've never driven a tank or guided a submarine.

President's Family

Mr. Venediktov. Going back to the telephone questions, here's another question

from the Internet. "What do you value in this life most of all?"

The President. My family, in this life.

Post-Cold-War Russia

Mr. Venediktov. There will be other questions about your wife and your daughter. And now back to the telephones. Your question, please? Hello? You're live on the air. The question is as follows: In 1995 Mr. President spoke at a meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And he very highly praised the role of the United States in the ideological efforts to make the Soviet Union fall apart. And the question was said about disassembling Russia, the falling apart of the military complex, and creating regimes in these republics, which we need, as he said. And so the question: How can you comment on that statement that you made at that time?

The President. Well, first of all, I wish I had exactly the words before me. But if I said that I thought the United States and its allies in the cold war, by staying strong, hastened the end of communism and the end of the Soviet Union and the liberation of all these various states and the rise of democracy—I believed that then; I still believe that.

But that does not mean that I think Russia should be weak. I want Russia to be strong. I have worked for 8 years for a strong Russia. I want Russia to be strong and prosperous. But I also want it to be democratic, to respect the differences of its people—religious, ethnic, and otherwise—and to be governed by the rule of law.

But I do not want a weak Russia. I want Russia to be strong. And I also want Russia, as I said just a couple of days ago in Germany, to have the ability to be fully part of all major international institutions and have its full say there.

Russia's World Status

Mr. Venediktov. And in this connection, there is a question. "Mr. President, could you frankly say for the United States today, is Russia a country of the Third World, a developing nation?"

The President. No. No. Russia was badly hurt by the recent economic crisis and by some problems in the transition from a command-and-control Communist economy to a

market economy. You know the problems as well as I do. But it is a country with a vast and impressive array of science and technology achievements, incredibly well-educated people, and the capacity, I believe, to see a big growth in per capita income very quickly.

So it's not fair to say that Russia is a developing or Third World country. It is fair to say, I think, that the incomes of the Russian people are far below where they should be and far below where they will be if the new government implements serious economic reforms and investors from around the world have confidence that their money will be treated in an appropriate way. I think you will see a large growth in jobs and incomes here, because your people are immensely talented. I think you've got good years ahead of you.

Mr. Venediktov. Since we don't have much time left, I would like to once again ask a quick-style question and expect that you could answer quickly. These, like I said, are private questions, private nature, from our listeners. Here's a question from one of our listeners—[inaudible]—who does the Soviet program, they're continuing a live broadcast of this show—maybe you remember, he set up an interview with you—

The President. Yes, he did.

First Lady's Political Future

Mr. Venediktov. "Some say the political career of Hillary Clinton will be so successful that she will become the President of the United States of America. Who knows? Are you ready to return to the White House as a husband of the President, being sort of the First Mister? How do you look at it?" [Laughter]

The President. Well, let me say, first of all, I'm very proud of my wife for running for the Senate. She's running hard, and I think she'll win. And she's promised to serve her full term. Now, when she finishes that service, if she wants to continue in public life, I'll support her any way I can.

But I expect that the Vice President, Al Gore, will be elected President. And I expect he'll run for reelection. And after that, who knows what will happen? But I'll say that I'm

very proud of my wife, and I'm going to support her political career any way I can. And I'm going to try to be a good citizen in any way that I can, both of my country and of the world, when I leave office.

Chelsea Clinton

Mr. Venediktov. Mr. President, are you happy with your daughter, how she's studying, how she relates to her relatives, to her parents?

The President. Well, I think when you become the parent of a young man or a young woman, you're always happy when they still want to be around you and spend some time with you. So I'm very happy with her. I'm very proud of her, and I love her very much.

Mr. Venediktov. A Moscow student asks you to convey his greetings to her, and says that the growing generation will correct your mistakes—he and she will improve the mistakes of their parents.

The President. I certainly hope so. I certainly hope so. That's what's supposed to happen in life.

President's View of Russia

Mr. Venediktov. And the last question—I'm asking this one. It's a poll, and I would like for you to comment on the results. Just before your visit, there were questions raised about you—not just about America but you, yourself. What do you think about Russia? That was a question to the Russians. I think the public have come up with very interesting results. One-third, exactly, feels that you, personally—you, not America but you, personally—feel that you're a positively disposed towards America. One-third, exactly, thinks that you are ill-disposed. And one-third thinks that they cannot answer this question. I would like Mr. President, by the end of our discussion agree to say something to the people who have doubts in you.

The President. Well, I think that I made it clear that I'm positively disposed toward Russia, but I understand why a third would question that. That is—why would you question that? Well, because we had differences between the United States and Russia over Bosnia, Kosovo, Chechnya.

Mr. Venediktov. By the way, there were many questions on Kosovo.

The President. Yes, yes.

Mr. Venediktov. Do you agree with the fact that there was a mistake made?

The President. So we had differences. But I would like to ask you to consider on the other side—I led the way in supporting Russia's entry into the G-8 organization, the prestigious international organization, into the Asian-Pacific leaders organization, into the special partnership agreement with NATO. I have supported every effort to help Russia economically. I have been here five times. No American President has ever been here five times to Moscow. I wouldn't be surprised if no American President ever comes here five times again.

I first came to this city in 1969 when I was 23 years old. And I have been favorably disposed toward Russia and the Russian people ever since—notwithstanding our disagreements, even during the cold war.

And one of the things that I have always tried to do is to help support a free, prosperous, strong Russia that is fully integrated into the international institutions and the Western institutions, so that tomorrow and in all of the tomorrows to come, you will be a great nation. But greatness will be defined not by the dominance of your neighbors but by the dominance of the achievement of your people and the power of your partnerships with other countries. That's what I want, and I've worked very hard for it.

But I am extremely favorably disposed toward the people of Russia. And I am extremely optimistic about the future partnerships between the United States and Russia.

Mr. Venediktov. I thank you, Mr. President, for coming here. Of course, many questions have been left unasked. And I hope that after you return, after your term of office has ended, return back to Russia, perhaps even before that, you will be able to come back to the studio again, because I have many other questions. If you would allow, I would give all these questions to your staff and maybe some of them would interest you.

The President. Yes, do.

President Vladimir Putin of Russia

Mr. Venediktov. The last one. There were 5,000 of them that came in. You see the results. Forty-eight percent of the viewers—[inaudible]—believe that the relations between the United States and Russia will improve under Putin. Forty-two percent believe that they will get worse. And the rest don't know. What do you think about this last poll that we just made?

The President. Well, I think that it reflects, first of all, the fact that he's just in office, so people can't know for sure. Secondly, you've got almost 49 percent saying they will, which shows that people appreciate the fact that he's a strong and able man who has been gracious to me in this first meeting of ours in Russia. And then the 42 percent, I think, are focused on the differences we've had and the problems that have been publicized.

The truth is, you can't know for sure. But I think that based on the meeting I had, we've got a better than even chance that our relationship will improve. The relationship between the United States and Russia is profoundly important. It will tend always to be characterized by the disagreements, because they will always get more press coverage, because they will always be more current. But if there is a strong underlying commitment to democracy, to freedom, to mutual prosperity, mutual respect, I think that over time they will get better even if there are disagreements. That's what I believe, and that's what I've worked for.

President's Return to Ekho Moskvyy

Mr. Venediktov. Thank you very much, Mr. President. We will be waiting for your return, so that you could answer——

The President. I'd like to come back.

Mr. Venediktov. ——by being in the studio some of the other questions, maybe as a businessman or a lawyer. Thank you very much.

The President. I'd love to come back, because I saw on your wall that the only way I get to sign my picture is if I come twice, you see. So I'd like to come back. And I want to thank all the people who called or who E-mailed in their questions. And I hope you

will give me all the questions, and maybe I can write you something about them, too.

NOTE: The interview began at 7:50 p.m. in Ekho Moskvyy Studios and was broadcast live. In his remarks, the President referred to Prime Minister Mikhail Kasyanov of Russia. Mr. Venediktov spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A portion of this interview could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

Remarks to the Russian State Duma in Moscow

June 5, 2000

First of all, I thank you for that introduction. And even though it is still in the morning, I am delighted to be here with the Members of the state Duma and the Federation Council.

It is important to me to have this opportunity because the prospects for virtually every important initiative President Putin and I have discussed over the last 2 days will obviously depend upon your advice and your consent, and because through you I can speak to the citizens of Russia directly, those whom you represent.

I have made five trips to Russia in my years as President. I have worked with President Yeltsin and now with President Putin. I have met with the leadership of the Duma on more than one occasion. I have spoken with Russia's religious leaders, with the media, with educators, scientists, and students. I have listened to Russian people tell me about their vision of the future, and I have tried to be quite open about my own vision of the future. I have come here at moments of extraordinary optimism about Russia's march toward prosperity and freedom, and I've been here at moments of great difficulty for you.

I believed very strongly from the first time I came here that Russia's future fundamentally is in the hands of the Russian people. It cannot be determined by others, and it should not be. But Russia's future is very important to others, because it is among the most important journeys the world will witness in my lifetime. A great deal of the 21st century will be strongly influenced by the success of the Russian people in building a

modern, strong, democratic nation that is part of the life of the rest of the world. And so, many people across the world have sought to support your efforts, sharing with you a sense of pride when democracy is advanced and sharing your disappointment when difficulties arose.

It is obviously not for me to tell the Russian people how to interpret the last few years. I know your progress has come with unfilled expectations and unexpected difficulties. I know there have been moments, especially during the financial crisis in 1998, when some wondered if the new Russia would end up as a grand social experiment gone wrong.

But when we look at Russia today, we do not see an experiment gone wrong. We see an economy that is growing, producing goods and services people want. We see a nation of enterprising citizens who are beginning, despite all of the obstacles, to bring good jobs and a normal life to their communities. We see a society with 65,000 nongovernmental organizations, like Eco-Juris, which is helping citizens defend their rights in court, like Vozrozhdenie, which is aiding families with disabled children, like the local chambers of commerce that have sprung up all across Russia.

We see a country of people taking responsibility for their future—people like those of Gadzhiyevo on the Arctic Circle who organized a referendum to protect the environment of their town. We see a country transforming its system of higher education to meet the demands of the modern world, with institutions like the new Law Factory at Novgorod University and the New Economic School in Moscow.

We see a country preserving its magnificent literary heritage, as the Pushkin Library is doing in its efforts to replenish the shelves of libraries all across Russia. We see a country entering the information age, with cutting-edge software companies, with Internet centers at universities from Kazan to Ufa to Yakutsk, with a whole generation of young people more connected to the outside world than any past generation could have imagined.

We see Russian citizens with no illusions about the road ahead, yet voting in extraor-

dinary numbers against a return to the past. We see a Russia that has just completed a democratic transfer of executive power for the first time in a thousand years.

I would not presume to tell the people you represent how to weigh the gains of freedom against the pain of economic hardship, corruption, crime. I know the people of Russia do not yet have the Russia they were promised in 1991. But I believe you, and they, now have a realistic chance to build that kind of Russia for yourselves in far greater measure than a decade ago, because of the democratic foundations that have been laid and the choices that have been made.

The world faces a very different Russia than it did in 1991. Like all countries, Russia also faces a very different world. Its defining feature is globalization, the tearing down of boundaries between people, nations, and cultures, so that what happens anywhere can have an impact everywhere.

During the 1990's, the volume of international trade almost doubled. Links among businesses, universities, advocacy groups, charities, and churches have multiplied across physical space and cyberspace. In the developing world some of the poorest villages are beginning to be connected to the information superhighway in ways that are opening up unbelievable opportunities for education and for development.

The Russian people did more than just about anyone else to make possible this new world of globalization by ending the divisions of the cold war. Now Russia, America, and all nations are subject to new rules of the global economy. One of those rules, to adapt a phrase from your history, is that it's no longer possible to build prosperity in one country alone. To prosper, our economies must be competitive in a global marketplace; and to compete, the most important resource we must develop is our own people, giving them the tools and freedom to reach their full potential.

This is the challenge we have tried to meet in America over the last few years. Indeed, the changes we have seen in the global economy pose hard questions that both our nations still must answer. A fundamental question is, how do we define our strength and

vitality as a nation today, and what role should government play in building it?

Some people actually believe that government is no longer relevant at all to people's lives in a globalized, interconnected world. Since all of us hold government positions, I presume we disagree. But I believe experience shows that government, while it must be less bureaucratic and more oriented toward the markets and while it should focus on empowering people by investing in education and training rather than simply accruing power for itself, it is still very important.

Above all, a strong state should use its strength to reinforce the rule of law, protect the powerless against the powerful, defend democratic freedoms, including freedom of expression, religion, and the press, and do whatever is possible to give everyone a chance to develop his or her innate abilities.

This is true, I believe, for any society seeking to advance in the modern world. For any society in any part of the world that is increasingly small and tied together, the answer to law without order is not order without law.

Another fundamental question is, how shall countries define their strength in relation to the rest of the world today? Shall we define it as the power to dominate our neighbors or the confidence to be a good neighbor? Shall we define it by what we are against or simply in terms of what others are for? Do we join with others in common endeavors to advance common interests, or do we try to bend others to our will?

This federal assembly's ratification of START II and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty suggests you are answering these questions in a way that will make for both a stronger Russia and a better world, defining your strength in terms of the achievements of your people and the power of your partnerships and your role in world affairs.

A related question for both Russia and America is, how should we define our relationship today? Clearly, Russia has entered a phase when what it needs most is outside investment, not aid. What Americans must ask is not so much what can we do for Russia, but what can we do with Russia to advance our common interests and lift people in both nations?

To build that kind of relationship, we Americans have to overcome the temptation to think that we have all the answers. We have to resist the feeling that if only you would see things our way, troubles would go away. Russia will not, and indeed should not, choose a course simply because others wish you to do so. You will choose what your interests clearly demand and what your people democratically embrace.

I think one problem we have is that many Russians still suspect that America does not wish you well. Thus, you tend to see our relationship in what we call zero-sum terms, assuming that every assertion of American power must diminish Russia, and every assertion of Russian strength must threaten America. That is not true. The United States wants a strong Russia, a Russia strong enough to protect its territorial integrity while respecting that of its neighbors, strong enough to meet threats to its security, to help maintain strategic stability, to join with others to meet common goals, to give its people their chance to live their dreams.

Of course, our interests are not identical, and we will have our inevitable disagreements. But on many issues that matter to our people, our interests coincide. And we have an obligation, it seems to me, to focus on the goals we can and should advance together in our mutual interest and to manage our differences in a responsible and respectful way.

What can we do together in the years to come? Well, one thing we ought to do is to build a normal economic relationship, based on trade and investment between our countries and contact between our people. We have never had a better opportunity, and I hope you will do what you can to seize it.

This is the time, when Russia's economy is growing and oil prices are high, when I hope Russia will create a more diversified economy. The economies that will build power in the 21st century will be built not just on resources from the soil, which are limited, but on the genius and initiative of individual citizens, which are unlimited.

This is a time when I hope you will finish putting in place the institutions of a modern economy, with laws that protect property, that ensure openness and accountability, that

establish an efficient, equitable tax code. Such an economy would keep Russian capital in Russia and bring foreign capital to Russia, both necessary for the kind of investment you deserve, to create jobs for your people and new businesses for your future.

This is a time to win the fight against crime and corruption so that investment will not choose safer shores. That is why I hope you will soon pass a strong law against money laundering that meets international standards.

This is also the time I hope Russia will make an all-out effort to take the needed steps to join the World Trade Organization. Membership in the WTO reinforces economic reform. It will give you better access to foreign markets. It will ensure that your trading partners treat you fairly. Russia should not be the only major industrialized country standing outside this global trading system. You should be inside this system, with China, Brazil, Japan, members of the European Union, and the United States, helping to shape those rules for the benefit of all.

We will support you. But you must know, too, that the decision to join the WTO requires difficult choices that only you can make. I think it is very important. Again I will say, I think you should be part of making the rules of the road for the 21st century economy, in no small measure because I know you believe in the importance of the social contract, and you understand that we cannot have a world economy unless we also have some rules that people in the world respect regarding the living standards of people—the conditions in which our children are raised, whether they have access to education, and whether we do what should be done together to protect the global environment.

A second goal of our partnership should be to meet threats to our security together. The same advances that are bringing the world together are also making the tools of destruction deadlier, cheaper, and more available. As you well know, because of this openness of borders, because of the openness of the Internet, and because of the advances of technology, we are all more vulnerable to terrorism, to organized crime, to the

spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons—which themselves may some day be transferred, soon, in smaller and smaller quantities, across more and more borders, by unscrupulous illegal groups working together. In such a world, to protect our security we must have more cooperation, not more competition, among likeminded nation-states.

Since 1991, we have already cooperated to cut our own nuclear arsenals by 40 percent; in removing nuclear weapons from Belarus, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan; in fighting illicit trafficking in deadly technology. Together, we extended the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, banned chemical weapons, agreed to end nuclear testing, urged India and Pakistan to back away from nuclear confrontation.

Yesterday President Putin and I announced two more important steps. Each of us will destroy 34 tons of weapons-grade plutonium, enough to build thousands of nuclear weapons. And we will establish a system to give each other early warning of missile tests and space launches to avoid any miscalculation, with a joint center here that will operate out of Moscow 24 hours a day, 7 days a week—the first permanent, joint United States-Russian military cooperation ever. I am proud of this record, and I hope you are, too.

We will continue to reduce our nuclear arsenals by negotiating a START III treaty and to secure the weapons and materials that remain. But we must be realistic. Despite our best efforts, the possibility exists that nuclear and other deadly weapons will fall into dangerous hands, into hands that could threaten us both—rogue states, terrorists, organized criminal groups.

The technology required to launch missiles capable of delivering them over long distances, unfortunately, is still spreading across the world. The question is not whether this threat is emerging; it is. The question is, what is the best way to deal with it? It is my strong preference that any response to strengthen the strategic stability and arms control regime that has served our two nations so well for decades now—if we can pursue that goal together, we will all be more secure.

Now, as all of you know well, soon I will be required to decide whether the United States should deploy a limited national defense system designed to protect the American people against the most imminent of these threats. I will consider, as I have repeatedly said, many factors, including the nature of threat, the cost of meeting it, the effectiveness of the available technology, and the impact of this decision on our overall security, including our relationship with Russia and other nations, and the need to preserve the ABM Treaty.

The system we are contemplating would not undermine Russia's deterrent or the principles of mutual deterrence and strategic stability. That is not a question just of our intent but of the technical capabilities of the system. But I ask you to think about this, to debate it—as I know you will—to determine for yourselves what the capacity of what we have proposed is—because I learned on my trip to Russia that the biggest debate is not whether we intend to do something that will undermine mutual deterrence—I think most people who have worked with us, not just me and others, over the years know that we find any future apart from cooperation with you in the nuclear area inconceivable. The real question is a debate over what the impact of this will be, because of the capacity of the technology involved.

And I believe that is a question of fact which people of good will ought to be able to determine. And I believe we ought to be able to reach an agreement about how we should proceed at each step along the way here, in a way that preserves mutual deterrence, preserves strategic stability, and preserves the ABM Treaty. That is my goal. And if we can reach an agreement about how we're going forward, then it is something we ought to take in good faith to the Chinese, to the Japanese, to others who are interested in this, to try to make sure that this makes a safer world, not a more unstable world.

I think we've made some progress, and I would urge all of you who are interested in this to carefully read the Statement of Principles to which President Putin and I agreed yesterday.

Let me say that this whole debate on missile defense and the nature of the threat re-

flects a larger and, I think, more basic truth. As we and other nation-states look out on the world today, increasingly we find that the fundamental threat to our security is not the threat that we pose to each other, but instead, threats we face in common—threats from terrorist and rogue states, from biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons which may be able to be produced in increasingly smaller and more sophisticated ways; public health threats, like AIDS and tuberculosis, which are now claiming millions of lives around the world, and which literally are on the verge of ruining economies and threatening the survival of some nations. The world needs our leadership in this fight, as well. And when President Putin and I go to the G-8 meeting in July, I hope we can support a global strategy against infectious disease.

There is a global security threat caused by environmental pollution and global warming. We must meet it with strong institutions at home and with leadership abroad.

Fortunately, one of the benefits of the globalized information age is that it is now possible to grow an economy without destroying the environment. Thanks to incredible advances in science and technology over the last 10 years, a whole new aspect in economic growth has opened up. It only remains to see whether we are wise enough to work together to do this, because the United States does not have the right to ask any nation—not Russia, not China, not India—to give up future economic growth to combat the problem of climate change. What we do have is the opportunity to persuade every nation, including people in our own country who don't yet believe it, that we can grow together in the 21st century and actually reduce greenhouse gases at the same time.

I think a big part of making that transition benefits Russia, because of your great stores of natural gas. And so I hope we will be working closely together on this in the years ahead.

In the Kyoto climate change treaty, we committed ourselves to tie market forces to the fight against global warming. And today, on this World Environment Day, I'm pleased that President Putin and I have agreed to deepen our own cooperation on climate change.

This is a huge problem. If we don't deal with this within just a few years, you will have island nations flooded; you will have the agricultural balance of most countries completely changed; you will have a dramatic increase in the number of severe, unmanageable weather events. And the good news is that we can now deal with this problem—again I say, and strengthen our economic growth, not weaken it.

A third challenge that demands our engagement is the need to build a world that is less divided along ethnic, racial, and religious lines. It is truly ironic, I think, that we can go anywhere in the world and have the same kinds of conversations about the nature of the global information society. Not long ago, I was in India in a poor village, meeting with a women's milk cooperative. And the thing they wanted me to see was that they had computerized all their records. And then I met with the local village council, and the thing they wanted me to see in this remote village, in a nation with a per capita income of only \$450 a year, was that all the information that the federal and state government had that any citizen could ever want was on a computer in the public building in this little village. And I watched a mother that had just given birth to a baby come into this little public building and call up the information about how to care for the child and then print it out on her computer so that she took home with her information every bit as good as a well-to-do American mother could get from her doctor about how to care for a child in the first 6 months.

It is truly ironic that at a time when we're living in this sort of world with all these modern potentials, that we are grappling with our oldest problems of human society—our tendency to fear and then to hate people who are different from us. We see it from Northern Ireland to the Middle East to the tribal conflicts of Africa to the Balkans and many other places on this Earth.

Russia and America should be concerned about this because the stability of both of our societies depends upon people of very different ethnic, racial, and religious groups learning to live together under a common framework of rules. And history teaches us

that harmony that lasts among such different people cannot be maintained by force alone.

I know when trying to come to grips with these problems, these old problems of the modern world, the United States and Russia have faced some of our greatest difficulties in the last few years. I know you disagreed with what I did in Kosovo, and you know that I disagreed with what you did in Chechnya. I have always said that the Russian people and every other people have a right to combat terrorism and to preserve the integrity of their nations. I still believe it, and I reaffirmed that today. My question in Chechnya was an honest one and the question of a friend, and that is whether any war can be won that requires large numbers of civilian casualties and has no political component bringing about a solution.

Let me say, in Kosovo my position was whether we could ever preserve a democratic and free Europe unless southeastern Europe were a part of it, and whether any people could ever say that everyone is entitled to live in peace if 800,000 people were driven out of a place they had lived in for centuries solely because of their religion.

None of these questions will be easy, but I think we ought to ask ourselves whether we are trying to resolve them. I remember going to Kosovo after the conflict, after Russians and Americans had agreed to serve there together as we have served in Bosnia effectively together, and sitting down with all the people who represented the conflict around the table. They would hardly speak to each other. They were still angry; they were still thinking about their family members that had been dislocated and killed.

So I said to them that I had just been involved in negotiating the end of the conflict in Northern Ireland, and that I was very close to the Irish conflict because all of my relatives came from a little village in Ireland that was right on the border between the North and the South, and therefore had lived through all these years of conflict between the Catholics and the Protestants.

And I said, now here's the deal we've got. The deal is majority rule, minority rights, guaranteed participation in decisionmaking, shared economic and other benefits. Majority

rule; minority rights; guaranteed participation in decisionmaking; shared economic and other benefits. I said, now, it's a good deal, but what I would like to tell you is that if they had ever stopped fighting, they could have gotten this deal years ago.

And so I told the people of Kosovo, I said, "You know, everybody around this table has got a legitimate grievance. People on all sides, you can tell some story that is true and is legitimately true. Now, you can make up your mind to bear this legitimate grievance with a grudge for 20 or 30 years. And 20 or 30 years from now, somebody else will be sitting in these chairs, and they will make a deal—majority rule, minority rights, shared decision-making, shared economic and other benefits. You can make the deal now, or you can wait."

Those of us who are in a position of strong and stable societies, we have to say this to people. We have to get people—not just the people who have been wronged; everybody has got a legitimate grievance in these cauldrons of ethnic and racial and religious turmoil. But it's something we have to think about. And as we see a success story, it's something I think we ought to look for other opportunities to advance.

Real peace in life comes not when you give up the feelings you have that are wrong, but when you give up the feelings you have that are right, in terms of having been wronged in the past. That's how people finally come together and go on. And those of us who lead big countries should take that position and try to work through it.

Let me say, finally, a final security goal that I have, related to all the others, is to help Europe build a community that is democratic, at peace, and without divisions—one that includes Russia and strengthens our ability to advance our common interest. We have never had that kind of Europe before in all of history, so building it will require changing old patterns of thinking. I was in Germany a couple of days ago in the historic old town of Aachen, where Charlemagne had his European empire in the late 8th and early 9th centuries, to talk about that.

There are, I know, people who resist the idea that Russia should be part of Europe and who insist that Russia is fundamentally

different from the other nations that are building a united Europe. Of course, there are historical and cultural arguments that support that position. And it's a good thing that you are different and that we are different; it makes life more interesting. But the differences between Russia and France, for example, may not be any greater than those between Sweden and Spain, or England and Greece, or even between America and Europe. Integration within Europe and then the transatlantic alliance came about because people who are different came together, not because people who are the same came together.

Estrangement between Russia and the West, which lasted too long, was not because of our inherent differences but because we made choices in how we defined our interests and our belief systems. We now have the power to choose a different and a better future. We can do that by integrating our economies, making common cause against common threats, promoting ethnic and religious tolerance and human rights. We can do it by making sure that none of the institutions of European and transatlantic unity, not any of them, are closed to Russia.

You can decide whether you want to be a part of these institutions. It should be entirely your decision. And we can have the right kind of constructive partnership, whatever decision we make, as long as you know that no doors to Europe's future are closed to you, and you can then feel free to decide how best to pursue your own interests. If you choose not to pursue full membership in these institutions, then we must make sure that their Eastern borders become gateways for Russia instead of barriers to travel, trade, and security cooperation.

We also should work with others to help those in Europe who still fear violence and are afraid they will not have a stable, secure future. I am proud that together we have made the OSCE into an effective champion of human rights in Europe. I am pleased that President Putin and I recommitted ourselves yesterday to helping find a settlement to the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. I am proud we have together adapted the Conventional

Forces in Europe Treaty, to reduce conventional arms in Europe and eliminate the division of the continent into military blocs. I believe it is a hopeful thing that despite our different outlook on the war in the former Yugoslavia, that our armed forces have worked there together in both Bosnia and Kosovo to keep the peace.

We may still disagree about Kosovo, but now that the war is over, let me say one other thing about Yugoslavia. I believe the people of Serbia deserve to live in a normal country with the same freedoms the people of Russia and America enjoy, with relationships with their neighbors, including Russia, that will not constantly be interrupted by vast flows of innocent people being forced out of their country or threatened with their very lives.

The struggle in Belgrade now is not between Serbia and NATO. It is between the Serbian people and their leaders. The Serbian people are asking the world to back democracy and freedom. Our response to their request does not have to be identical, but Russia and America should both be on the side of the people of Serbia.

In the relationship we are building, we should try to stand abroad for the values each of us has been building at home. I know the kind of relationship that we would both like cannot be built overnight. Russia's history, like America's, teaches us well that there are no shortcuts to great achievements. But we have laid strong foundations. It has helped a great deal that so many Members of our Congress have visited you here, and that a number of Duma committee chairmen visited our Congress last month, that members of the Federation Council have been invited to come to Washington.

I want to urge you, as many of you as can, to visit our country, and invite Members of our Congress to visit you. Let them understand how the world looks from your perspective. Let them see how you do your jobs. Tell them what you're worried about and where you disagree with us. And give us a chance to build that base of common experience and mutual trust that is so important to our future together. All of you are always welcome to come and work with us in the United States. We have to find a mutual understanding.

I also would say that the most important Russian-American relationship still should be the relationship between our peoples, the student exchanges, the business partnerships, the collaboration among universities and foundations and hospitals, the sister-city links, the growing family ties. Many of the Russians and Americans involved in these exchanges are very young. They don't even have any adult memories of the cold war. They don't carry the burdens and baggage of the past, just the universal, normal desire to build a good future with those who share their hopes and dreams. We should do everything we can to increase these exchanges, as well.

And finally, we must have a sense of responsibility for the future. We are not destined to be adversaries, but it is not guaranteed that we will be allies. For us, there is no fate waiting to be revealed, only a future waiting to be created by the actions we take, the choices we make, and the genuine views we have of one another and of our own future.

I leave you today looking to the future with the realistic hope that we will choose wisely; that we will continue to build a relationship of mutual respect and mutual endeavor; that we will tell each other the truth with clarity and candor as we see it, always striving to find common ground, always remembering that the world we seek to bring into being can come only if America and Russia are on the same side of history.

I believe we will do this, not because I know everything always turns out well but because I know our partnership, our relationship, is fundamentally the right course for both nations. We have to learn to identify and manage our disagreements because the relationship is profoundly important to the future.

The governments our people elect will do what they think is right for their own people. But they know that one thing that is right is continuing to strengthen the relationship between Russia and the United States. Our children will see the result, a result that is more prosperous and free and at peace than the world has ever known. That is what I believe we can do.

I don't believe any American President has ever come to Russia five times before. I came twice before that, once when I was a very young man and our relations were very different than they are now. All my life, I have wanted the people of my country and the people of your country to be friends and allies, to lead the world away from war toward the dreams of children. I have done my best to do that.

I hope you will believe that that is the best course for both our countries and for our children's future.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:10 a.m. in Plenary Hall at the Duma. In his remarks, he referred to President Vladimir Putin and former President Boris Yeltsin of Russia. The President also referred to OSCE, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Exchange With Reporters Aboard Air Force One

June 5, 2000

Sightseeing

The President. Did you guys go see Lenin?

Q. We tried; we couldn't get in.

The President. I'll tell you something, if you've never been to Kiev and you have time while we're there—if you don't all have to cover me all the time, when we're just having meetings and stuff—you should go to the monastery, all these beautiful buildings where they have all the historical treasures of Ukraine, all these—these metal artifacts going back over a thousand years, fabulous stuff—2,000, 3,000 years.

And underground—they have this underground network of tunnels that the priests still run. And the tunnels are perfectly preserved atmospherically, and there are mummies there where the priests have been buried for 500, 600, 700 years, and they're like that, and you can see the skin on their hands, just like Lenin, except not treated. No, no, they were just buried there. It is the most astonishing thing.

Remember how that Peruvian—wasn't it a Peruvian girl—looked when they found her after 500 years in the ice?

Q. Yes.

The President. That's the way the atmosphere is. And you're walking through these tunnels, and you just come up and there's a little grave. They just cut a thing into the tunnel and they lay the priests there. I mean, there they are. It is the most astonishing thing. Who did it? Weren't you amazed? Weren't they all buried 500, 600, 700 years ago?

Q. Yes.

The President. And you hold the little candle down there. And the atmosphere is stunning. But like a group of you, if you can whatever, swap off—because a lot of this stuff is just meetings until we do the rally. There's no press conference or anything. As many of you as can be spared—there is nothing like it anywhere else in the world that I'm aware of.

Q. Would you write a note for our bosses?
[Laughter]

Former President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

The President. Yes, I'll give you an excused absence. But no kidding, if there is any way any of you can go, you should go. It is a truly extraordinary thing. It's amazing. Yeltsin looked good today.

Q. Did he?

The President. Yes. He's in good spirits, happy. He's got a beautiful place.

Q. Which spirits, exactly?

The President. No spirits. [Laughter] He and his wife and his daughter were there. We all just had a nice visit. It was like old times. But he's in good shape.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:17 p.m. en route from Moscow, Russia, to Kiev, Ukraine. In his remarks, the President referred to former President Yeltsin's wife, Naina, and his daughter, Tatyana Dyachenko. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on Signing a Ukraine- United States Joint Statement in Kiev, Ukraine

June 5, 2000

Thank you very much. Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, leaders of the government, leaders and Members of the Rada, leaders

of the court, distinguished citizens. I am delighted to be back in Ukraine, and delighted to be again with President Kuchma to work on our strategic partnership, because the success of Ukraine as a free and prosperous nation is very important to the United States.

Of course, succeeding in the future requires learning from the past. I am very proud and moved to be here today—this is World Environment Day—for this historic announcement by President Kuchma that the final reactor at the Chernobyl nuclear powerplant will be shut down and the entire plant closed forever on December the 15th. This is a hopeful moment. It is also a moment when we remember those who suffered as a result of the accident there.

The President and I agreed that we can grow our economies and protect the environment and public health at the same time, and so we must. I am pleased to announce that the United States will pledge \$78 million for the Chernobyl Shelter Fund to contain radiation from the destroyed reactor, and another \$2 million to expand efforts to improve safety at Ukraine's other nuclear powerplants.

The President and I also discussed his plan for economic reform. He and his team have an economic plan that can put Ukraine on a path towards sustainable growth and much higher living standards. President Kuchma has moved to give his people their own land, to reduce government bureaucracy, to promote entrepreneurship. He has taken recent steps to enhance Ukraine's protection of intellectual property rights and the rule of law. And these things improve the climate for investment in Ukraine and will attract more investment dollars from the United States and other places across the world.

In that spirit, I am pleased to announce a new 5-year, \$25-million business development program for small- and medium-sized businesses in Ukraine to help them participate in the growing economy.

Finally, I want to take another important step today. Because of Ukraine's strong efforts to prevent missile proliferation, I am announcing our decision to eliminate commercial space quotas and open the door to expanded U.S. cooperation with Ukraine's space program. This decision will have a posi-

tive, long-term impact on Ukraine's economic prospects, creating more high-tech jobs and positioning Ukraine to be a leader in a cutting-edge area of 21st century commerce. It will also enhance the ability of American companies to compete in space. This represents the kind of high-level partnership our countries can look forward to as we enter the new century together.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. It's been a good day.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:20 p.m. in the White Room at Mariinskiy Palace. In his remarks, he referred to President Leonid Kuchma and Prime Minister Viktor Yushchenko of Ukraine.

Statement on Termination of the Ukraine-United States Commercial Space Launch Agreement

June 5, 2000

I am pleased to announce that today the United States has terminated the commercial space launch trade agreement with Ukraine. This decision eliminates launch quotas and gives U.S. firms greater opportunity to enter into commercial space launch joint ventures with Ukrainian partners without limit and reflects Ukraine's steadfast commitment to international nonproliferation norms.

Remarks to the People of Ukraine in Kiev

June 5, 2000

I believe we should give a round of applause to Natalia and Kateryna. They were fabulous. Didn't they give a good—[*ap- plause*]*—*they are a great representative of the young people of Ukraine. Let me also thank the representatives of your government who came here with me today—Deputy Head of Presidential Administration Rohovyi, Foreign Minister Tarasyuk. I'd like to thank Mayor Omelchenko and Patriarch Filaret and all the distinguished representatives of the Ukraine Government who have joined me and the Secretary of Energy and my National Security Adviser and our two Ambassadors for a good day of meetings.

I thank all of you for coming out here on this beautiful day. I am honored to be in Kiev again, to come to the cradle of Ukrainian culture, to pay respects to Ukraine's ancient and glorious past, and to tell you, America will stand by you as you fight for a free and prosperous future.

Here in this historic and beautiful square, you can see for a thousand years: before me, the magnificent Saint Sophia's Cathedral, built by Prince Yaroslav in the 11th century; and behind me, the beautiful and reborn Saint Michael's Monastery, built by his grandson, with a stunning cathedral built since the last time I was here; between them, statues of Saints Olga and Andrew, Cyril and Methodius, all proof of your extraordinary artistic and cultural accomplishments.

Sadly, the people who created and cherished these treasures suffered deeply. I am honored to have laid a wreath of flowers at the memorial to the millions who perished in the forced famine of the 1930's. Ukraine has endured oppressors who carved up your lands, banned your books, starved your children, purged your writers, enslaved your workers, plundered your art, stole your rich soil, and forbade you even to talk about the tragedy of the famine.

Today, the oppressors are gone. Stalin is gone. The Nazis are gone. The Soviet Union is gone. Russia is working to build a new society. But you, the people of Ukraine, you are still here, stronger than ever. You are reclaiming your land, uniting your people, restoring your culture, and raising your children in freedom and democracy. You are fulfilling the longing of your ancestors. You are building a free, sovereign, and independent Ukraine.

I know you have faced disappointments, and your dream is not complete. You have your vote, but you may ask, will it lead to have a real, positive impact? You have your freedom, but you may ask, will it lead to a better future?

I ask you to look around you. From Lithuania to Poland to the Czech Republic, those who chose open societies and open markets like you started out with sacrifice, but they ended up with success. I have not lived what you have lived. I am an American, not an Ukrainian. I cannot tell you how to build your

future. But I do believe this: I believe Ukraine has the best opportunity in a thousand years to achieve both freedom and prosperity.

You are on your way. President Kuchma has helped to pass a strong budget. He has moved to give people their own land, to reform the old government bureaucracy, to privatize new businesses in accord with international standards, and he has appointed a strong Prime Minister. But my friends, you too must be strong leaders. You must encourage the government. You must exhort the Rada. You must build a free and prosperous Ukraine. Do not give up. Keep on fighting. *Boritesya poborete.*

There will be obstacles. I know some in Ukraine want to discourage foreign investment; they oppose free markets. But that thinking is lost in the past. But I ask you, look around the world today. The nations with the highest standards of living, the greatest security, the lowest poverty are free market democracies, people who trade and invest in one another.

Communism has lost in Ukraine, but a full commitment to free market democracy has not yet won. If your children are to live their dreams, it must win. So again I ask you, do not give up. Keep on fighting. *Boritesya poborete.*

America needs a strong, prosperous, and democratic Ukraine as a partner. Together we have made the whole world safer from the risk of nuclear war. Our soldiers are serving together with courage and pride in missions of peace. There is so much more we can do together. We can explore the frontiers of science and space, increase our efforts to protect the environment, fight disease, defeat terrorism, and promote democracy, prosperity, and peace. These are challenges all nations face, and no nation can meet alone. And so I say again, let us meet them together. We must not give up. We must keep on fighting. *Boritesya poborete.*

America believes Ukraine has a right to a place among the nations of Europe. No one must take that right away from you. We reject the idea that the eastern border of Europe is the western border of Ukraine. Of course, your future is your own choice. But we can, and we will, keep the door to the

transatlantic community of democracies open to Ukraine.

Ukraine has so much of what it takes to succeed in the global information age—strong universities, an educated society, and partners willing to stand with you. All you need now is to stay on course and pick up speed, open the economy, strengthen the rule of law, promote civil society, protect the free press, break the grip of corruption.

In Ukraine, I understand you have a saying, “He who is an hour late will spend a year catching up.” People of Ukraine, seize this moment now for your nation and your children. And so I say for the last time, *Boritesya poborete*.

In the cathedrals around me, I see Ukraine’s past. In the faces of all the young people before me, I see Ukraine’s future. It is a promising future. You have kept alive your language, your unity, your dream of independence for a thousand years. You have what it takes to build the future of your dreams. Your parents battled tyranny to help you win your freedom. Now, you must use your freedom to make sure you and your children prosper in peace. America is your friend and your partner.

Again, I thank you for coming to be with me today. Again I say, America will be with you all the way.

God bless you. *Slava Ukrainiy*.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:30 p.m. in St. Michael’s Square. In his remarks, he referred to students Natalia Voinorovska and Kateryna Yasko, who introduced the President; Deputy Head of Presidential Administration Vasyl Rohovyi, Minister of Foreign Affairs Borys Tarasyuk, Prime Minister Viktor Yushchenko, and President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine; Ukrainian Ambassador to the U.S. Konstantin Hryshchenko; Mayor Oleksandr Omelchenko of Kiev; U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine Steven K. Pifer; and Ukraine Orthodox Church-Kiev Patriarch Filaret. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With King Abdullah II of Jordan

June 6, 2000

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, are you encouraged that the talks will be moving back to Washington now, sir?

The President. Yes. And Secretary Albright, I think, has had a good trip out there. I mean, we’re working at it, and I’m encouraged. You know it’s not going to be easy, but I’m encouraged.

I would like to say a special word of thanks to His Majesty for the commitment he’s shown to peace and also to reform within his own country and rebuilding the economy of Jordan. I have enormous respect for his leadership and great gratitude for the strength of our partnership, which he has continued. So I am delighted that he is here. And he’s coming at a good time. We have a lot to discuss today.

Jordan-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

Q. Mr. President, will you announce a free trade agreement with Jordan or the beginning of negotiations towards that end?

The President. I think we’ll have a good announcement on the trade issue, and I think it’s important. I’m excited about—we have to discuss it, and we want to make sure that we’re clear and in agreement on all the essential points. I think we are, and I’m encouraged. I think it’s a very good thing to do.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, what’s the outlook for a Camp David-style summit?

The President. Well, I want to wait until Secretary Albright gets back. As you know, I saw Prime Minister Barak when I was in Europe, and I’m going to see Mr. Arafat, Chairman Arafat—I think about a week from tomorrow, something like that—soon, anyway. And of course, His Majesty and I are

going to talk today. So after that, we'll make some decisions about what to do next.

But you know, we're down now to the difficult issues and to the difficult decisions. And those of us who are not charged with making them, but are charged with helping them get made, just have to try to create the best possible environment. I'll do whatever I can. I have for over 7 years, and I'll continue to do that.

Q. Your Majesty, do you foresee any possibility for resuming talks between Israel and Syria?

King Abdullah II. Well, we have a series of discussions about the peace process in the next half an hour, so we'll see what comes out of that.

Q. Your Majesty, would you say that both parties—both the Palestinians and the Israelis—need to maybe limit their expectations in these talks? There's a lot of talk now on the Palestinian side; people are recommending to the Palestinians to go for it all and get everything, 100 percent, the same way that Lebanon did.

King Abdullah II. There are healthy discussions between President Arafat and the Prime Minister, and we have to give them the benefit of the doubt and see what unfolds in the next week or so.

Q. But do you expect either side to get everything they want, or will—would you suggest that maybe the Palestinians will only get 90 percent, or 90-something percent, of the West Bank? Or do you expect them to get everything?

King Abdullah II. Well, I've been told by an old friend of mine that the best solution is one that both sides are a bit unhappy with, which means that both sides have had to give up something. And I think that when we look at final status, both sides have to be very openminded about the other people's positions.

Q. Mr. President, Jordan will face several challenges from final status peace talks, including refugees and water. Will the U.S. offer support—financial, moral support, et cetera—towards us?

The President. Well, I think to have any kind of complete agreement on this, there has to be a provision made for dealing with the refugee problems, including some sort

of fund, international fund, which would deal with the financial burdens of the displaced refugees everywhere, including Jordan. That's what I'm in favor of.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:40 a.m. in the Colonnade at the White House. In his remarks, the President referred to Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel; and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Remarks on Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Legislation and an Exchange With Reporters

June 6, 2000

The President. Today is the first full day back to work for Members of Congress since Memorial Day. Three weeks from now they leave again for the Fourth of July recess. Those 3 weeks provide a critical window of opportunity for Congress to make real progress on some of our Nation's most vital priorities. I urge congressional leaders to seize that opportunity.

They can get off to a strong start by passing without delay the emergency budget supplemental request I sent to Congress back in February. This is funding for pressing national needs, where delay means putting American families in hardship and our national interests at risk.

The legislation includes funding for crucial safety maintenance on the air traffic control system. Without this funding, we could see more flight delays as we enter the peak summer tourist season.

It includes housing assistance for victims of Hurricane Floyd, many of whom still are living in temporary shelters. These families will have to spend yet another winter there if they cannot begin rebuilding their homes during this summer's construction season.

It includes money to battle the record number of forest fires that have been burning across America last year, especially out West. Delaying this funding could erode our capacity to fight further blazes this summer.

It includes emergency assistance for families who have struggled all winter with high

heating oil costs and who now face a scorching summer. Without this assistance, these low income Americans, many of them elderly and infirm, may not be able to afford the fans and air conditioning that can literally save their lives.

It includes funding to keep illegal drugs out of our Nation by supporting the Colombian Government's courageous fight against drug traffickers. Delays in this funding come at a time when cocaine production is increasing in Colombia, where more than 80 percent of the cocaine on United States streets comes from. It also comes at a time when Colombia, Latin America's oldest democracy, is fighting to preserve its very system of government and way of life in the face of intense pressure.

It includes funding to lift crippling debt burdens from the world's poorest nations, funding for our troops in Kosovo and for building civilian institutions there. Delaying this funding may force the Army to put off regular maintenance of tanks and other weaponry or even to cancel combat exercises crucial to the readiness of our troops around the world. It will also delay the day when we can bring our troops home from Kosovo.

Each and every one of these investments is urgently needed, and the package as a whole enjoys strong bipartisan support. Leaders in the House clearly understand that. That's why they put the emergency spending bill on a fast track for passage. But in the Senate, instead of taking swift action, the emergency spending bill has been attached to next year's spending bills. The Senate weighed them down with further unrelated provisions, such as one that would block our efforts to get the tobacco companies to pay back the Government for health costs caused by tobacco products.

This process is not the right thing to do when the needs of the country covered by the bills are so urgent. The emergency spending bill should have been passed months ago. Let's do it now, so that we can move on to other pressing business that we can and should pass this summer.

That includes the Senate following quickly the House's example in providing normal trade relations with China. It also, I hope, will include raising the minimum wage by a dollar over 2 years; passing a strong, en-

forceable Patients' Bill of Rights; reforming Medicare and adding a voluntary prescription drug benefit; passing commonsense gun legislation to close the gun show loophole, require child safety locks, ban the importation of large capacity ammunition clips.

I hope it will include education reform, demanding more from our schools and investing more in them, including modernizing 6,000 of our schools that are now falling apart. I hope it will include strong, fair hate crimes legislation. And I hope it will include clean spending bills that I can sign, not those loaded down with anti-environmental riders, special interest provisions for the tobacco industry, and other add-ons I have vetoed in the past and would have no choice other than to veto in the future.

Now, we can do all of this in short order if congressional leaders will stop delaying and start voting. Almost every one of these issues has been thoroughly debated, and almost every one of them enjoys strong bipartisan support. We could pass them if they could just be brought up for a vote. It's time to put progress ahead of partisanship.

When Congress adjourns this summer, we ought to be able to look back and say we took real steps to make our country better. We ought to be able to say we made the most of this historic moment of unparalleled prosperity. That's what the American people sent us here to do, and they deserve no less. As I have said repeatedly, the fact that this is an election year should not have an impact on that. If we just pass the things that there is strong bipartisan majority support for, there will still be plenty of matters over which there are honest disagreements that can be presented to the American people to resolve. All I'm asking for is a vote on the things that are urgently needed in the national interest and those things that clearly the majority of Congress supports.

Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, could you explain a little more about the urgency for the Colombia funds? And why not ask for that money as part of a foreign ops bill?

The President. Well, we asked for it in an emergency supplemental bill. And that's where we think—we think it should be passed on an emergency basis because the

Colombian Government is under great stress now, and because they can't begin to deal with the challenges posed by the drug traffickers in Colombia without extra support—not only to build up their forces, their police forces in the country but also to give alternatives to those who are growing the plants, the coca plants, to find another way to make a living, and to do other things that will deal with some of the border problems we have in the countries that border Colombia.

But I think most of us have seen that democracy itself is under great stress throughout the Andean region, in no small measure because of the power of the drug traffickers. And I say again, Colombia is the oldest democracy in Latin America, and I believe their very way of life is under stress because of this. And I think that if we were to pass this quickly, and then send a clear signal to the Colombians that we support democracy and we support their efforts against the drug traffickers, you would see a big response from other countries of the world to help them. The world would rally behind them. It would, I believe, change the entire psychology of the drama that is unfolding down there.

And if it's a battle that we lose to the drug traffickers, the price would not only be more drugs on the streets of America but also potentially destabilizing the entire Andean region and the whole move we've seen these last 15 or 20 years toward democracy in South America and throughout Latin America. It's very troubling to me. And I think there are people in the Congress—I know there are, in both parties—who strongly agree.

We all know that the Senate operates differently, on different rules, than the House. We all know there are all kinds of problems and conflicting interests. But this is something we really ought to put beyond that. And I think that what happened is that this emergency supplemental got caught up in a whole lot of conflicting pressures in the Senate and the ability of those who disagree with one thing or another to use the rules to delay it. But somehow we've got to cut through all this. The national interest in Colombia and in the other things that I itemized just cries out for action. It's just imperative that we get it as quickly as possible.

Q. Mr. President, have you talked to Senator Lott directly about this, in trying to move some of these things? And what —

The President. I have, I have. I've talked to him on more than one occasion. I have not talked to him since I've been back, because I haven't had a chance to this morning; I've been working all day. But I will talk to him.

Q. What—what is his counterargument?

The President. I believe that on the merits, I think he wants to do it. And you know, it's a difficult situation. I think what is required is for everybody in the Senate to recognize that this is something we ought to just put beyond whatever the other squabbles are, and get it done and put it behind us. And so—I believe he wants to do that, and I hope we can find a way to do that.

Peruvian Elections

Q. Mr. President, would you like to see the U.S. take any action toward Peru—possible sanctions, or anything—regarding irregularities in their recent election?

The President. Well, we just got back from my trip. I think I ought to have a chance to talk about all that. I haven't—I don't feel—I may not know enough to answer that. I'm disappointed, obviously, that the election didn't unfold as we thought it would after the first round. And I have to figure out exactly what all the reasons are and get a briefing before I can make a comment beyond that.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:28 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

Statement on the Earthquake in Indonesia

June 6, 2000

I was saddened to learn of the earthquakes that shook the island of Sumatra and other parts of Indonesia. On behalf of the American people, I extend my deepest sympathies to all those who have suffered losses and injuries.

The United States is providing emergency assistance to support relief efforts and stands ready to provide further help to meet the needs of those affected by the earthquake.

Remarks on Departure for Tokyo, Japan, and an Exchange With Reporters

June 7, 2000

Clinical Trials/Patients' Bill of Rights

The President. Good morning everyone. We are here at this early hour to talk about a vitally important issue to the health of America's senior citizens—indeed, eventually, to the health of all of us.

We must help more seniors participate in clinical trials that test new therapies for illnesses, from cancer to heart disease to Alzheimers. These trials may prolong lives, and they are central to finding cures for deadly diseases.

Today, America's seniors are badly under-represented in clinical trials, yet they bear the heaviest share of illness. More than half of our cancer patients are over 65, but only a third of those in clinical trials are seniors. For breast cancer, the statistics are even worse.

Today, thousands of important clinical trials don't have enough patients because so few seniors are able to take part, and that means slower progress towards curing or treating illness. One major factor keeping seniors out of clinical trials is patients lack of certainty that their expenses will be covered by insurance. Because Medicare's policies on payment for clinical trials have been unclear, seniors cannot be sure of coverage if they volunteer for experimental care. Many assume they'll be saddled with thousands of dollars in routine medical costs if they participate, and they clearly cannot bear such a heavy burden.

For several years, Vice President Gore has led our efforts to clean up the confusion and help seniors and people with disabilities into clinical trials. We've had bipartisan support in Congress, led by Senators Rockefeller and Mack and Congresswoman Johnson and Congressman Bentsen and Congressman Cardin.

Today, after careful study, I am signing an executive memorandum directing Medicare to change its policy and remove a major barrier to seniors' participation in these trials. Within a week, Medicare will begin to cover

all the routine medical costs of participation in a clinical trial.

The Department of Health and Human Services and the Health Care Financing Administration will begin outreach programs so that patients, as well as doctors, researchers, and administrators, all are aware of the change. We'll ask for the help of advocates for patients and research who have done so much to publicize this issue. We believe that with good outreach, thousands of seniors could join trials this year and make a dramatic contribution to the progress of medicine, as well as to the health of older Americans.

I am also directing today the Department of Health and Human Services to report back to me on ways we can provide additional support to clinical trials that are especially relevant to senior citizens and am requesting that the National Institutes of Health look for ways we can encourage even more seniors to speed science's progress by participating in new clinical trials.

As America ages, we must provide all our seniors affordable, quality health care, and we should be using our cutting-edge science to meet that challenge. Simply put, the more seniors we enroll in trials, the faster we'll be able to use these advances to save American lives. We've done this successfully with cancer in children. For decades now, more than half of all the children with cancer have joined clinical trials, giving us a wealth of evidence about how the disease works and how best to fight it. Now we can cure three-quarters of childhood cancers. That could never have happened without the participation of children in these trials. We should be doing the same for Americans of every age.

Today I've authorized Medicare to help seniors participate. Private health care plans should be doing the same for their members. But it won't happen also unless Congress takes the next step and passes a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. Congress has had that on its agenda for 6 months now in the Norwood-Dingell bill, which includes a requirement that every private insurer cover the cost of participation in clinical trials.

This month, before the summer recess, Congress has a window of opportunity to take

another real step to make our country stronger and safer and healthier. I hope that window will be used, because we need this. If we do the Medicare participation in clinical trials and pass the Patients' Bill of Rights, then all our citizens will be able to participate in these trials, and that will hasten the day when all age groups will be more likely to recover from the most serious illnesses.

Thank you very much.

2000 Election

Q. Mr. President, could you disabuse us of the notion that this is an attempt by the Vice President to curry favor among a group of individuals which have been, in recent years, starting to move away from the Democratic Party during an election year?

The President. Well, I think the only way I can disabuse you of the notion is 7½ years of activity on this and the fact that it has been well known that I have been working on this issue, and so has he, for several months now, trying to work through all the legal and administrative issues necessary to get this done. It's not as if this is just an issue that popped up on the radar screen. We've been working this clinical trial issue alone for years, not only the seniors but with children. This is by no means the first action we've taken in this area.

And indeed, there has been a strong bipartisan interest in this with all the people involved. I mentioned Senator Connie Mack, Congresswoman Nancy Johnson; they are the two most visible Republicans who have been working on this. But we've been—all of us have been working on this for some time now trying to get this done. And if I could have gotten it done a month ago, 2 months ago, 6 months ago, I would have done that.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:09 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House.

Memorandum on Increasing Participation of Medicare Beneficiaries in Clinical Trials

June 7, 2000

Memorandum for the Secretary of Health and Human Services

Subject: Increasing Participation of Medicare Beneficiaries in Clinical Trials

Promoting biomedical research and ensuring that Medicare beneficiaries receive the highest quality care possible are longstanding priorities of my Administration. Over the past 3 years, with the invaluable assistance of the Vice President, my Administration has advocated and secured funding for a budget proposal that explicitly provides for Medicare coverage of services associated with cancer clinical trials, assuring that seniors and disabled persons with cancer have access to cutting-edge treatments and helping promote the research necessary to find new treatments and cures.

Research shows that only about 1 percent of American seniors participate in clinical trials, although the elderly bear the majority of the disease burden in the United States. For example, although 63 percent of cancer patients are over 65, these older cancer patients constitute only 33 percent of all those enrolled in clinical trials. The disparity is greater for breast cancer patients—elderly women comprise 44 percent of breast cancer patients, but only 1.6 percent of women over the age of 65 are in clinical trials for the disease. These low participation rates hinder efforts to develop new therapies, because they mean that scientists often need between 3 and 5 years to enroll enough participants in a clinical trial to generate scientifically valid and statistically meaningful results.

Experts believe that coverage of all clinical trials—not just those for cancer—can lead to breakthroughs in diagnostics, treatments, and cures for many of the most devastating diseases afflicting millions of Americans of all ages. For example, we have made striking

progress in treating and curing pediatric cancers, largely because of widespread participation in clinical trials. For decades now, well over 50 percent of pediatric cancer patients were enrolled in clinical trials, and today, 75 percent of cancers in children are curable.

One factor contributing to seniors' low participation rate in clinical trials is the Medicare program's failure to guarantee Medicare payment for the care associated with participation. This uncertainty regarding reimbursement often deters patients from participating in these trials, and deters physicians and other clinicians from recruiting patients, contributing to low participation rates and slowing the development of new medical treatments and diagnostic tests that could benefit the entire Medicare population.

Last December, the Institute of Medicine (IOM) issued a report entitled "Extending Medicare Reimbursement in Clinical Trials," which recommended that Medicare explicitly cover routine patient care costs for participants in clinical trials. This and other recommendations by IOM, combined with your ongoing efforts to modernize Medicare's process to ensure coverage of new technology, prompted a review of Medicare's administrative flexibility to independently remove barriers to participation in clinical trials. Following this review, you concluded that Medicare could exercise its administrative authority to provide reimbursement for routine patient care costs associated with clinical trials.

Based on the results of your Department's review and your recommendations, as well as our shared commitment to promoting critical biomedical research and to assuring that older Americans and millions of people with disabilities have access to cutting edge medical treatments, I hereby direct the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to:

- **Revise Medicare program guidance to explicitly authorize payment for routine patient care costs associated with clinical trials.** The HCFA should inform all claims-processing contractors that Medicare will immediately begin to reimburse routine patient care costs and costs due to medical complications asso-

ciated with participation in clinical trials.

- **Launch activities to increase beneficiary awareness of the new coverage option.** The HHS should educate beneficiaries and providers about this policy change, including developing an easy-to-read brochure, adding information on clinical trial coverage to future Medicare handbooks, and posting information on the HHS website.
- **Establish a tracking system for Medicare payments.** The HCFA should implement a system to track clinical trial spending to which Medicare contributes financial support.
- **Ensure that the information gained from important clinical trials is used to inform Medicare coverage decisions.** The HCFA and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) should work with researchers prior to clinical trials designed to test the efficacy of devices or therapies that have significant implications for the Medicare program to structure those trials to produce information to inform subsequent Medicare coverage decisions.
- **Review and report back to me within 90 days on the feasibility and advisability of additional actions to promote research on issues of importance to the Medicare population, including:**
 - as recommended by IOM, supporting certain clinical trials of particular importance to the Medicare population, including certain health care interventions unique to the Medicare population and clinical trials that could lead to more effective and/or less costly treatments. HHS should review IOM's recommendation to provide additional financial support for monitoring and evaluation, device implantation, and other non-covered costs for trials researching methods of care of particular importance to Medicare beneficiaries;
 - increasing the participation of seniors in clinical trials. Specifically, the NIH should evaluate additional action to

- increase seniors' participation in clinical trials to ensure that researchers can determine the best therapies for older as well as younger patients; and
- developing a registry of all ongoing clinical trials receiving Medicare reimbursement, using the information contained in current NIH and FDA clinical trial registries. This new registry would provide a comprehensive picture of ongoing trials, participation rates, and ways patients can access the trials and facilitate the HCFA's ongoing review and oversight activities to ensure that only covered services are billed and reimbursed.

William J. Clinton

Remarks Following a Memorial Service for Keizo Obuchi in Tokyo

June 8, 2000

I would like to begin by thanking Ambassador and Mrs. Foley for welcoming me back to the American Embassy and the Ambassador's residence, along with our American party.

I came here today to pay my respects to a friend. And on behalf of the American people, I want to extend our deepest condolences to the Prime Minister's family, especially to his wife and his three children, as well as to the people of Japan.

Two years ago Prime Minister Obuchi took office in a difficult time for Japan and the world. There were many who wondered if any person could meet the tremendous challenges brought on by the global economic crisis we faced. I think history will record that Keizo Obuchi rose to the challenge with courage and confidence.

Thirty-seven years ago he was the youngest person ever elected to the Japanese Parliament. Over time, it's clear that he learned a profoundly important lesson, how to reach out to all sides and bring people together. As Prime Minister, he became known for imitating the art and skill of an orchestra conductor, in finding harmony among people of different views.

From his first days in office, he took swift steps to put Japan on firmer economic

ground, and he gave strong support to the cause of peace, from East Timor to Kosovo. He worked to strengthen our alliance and to place it on a solid foundation for the 21st century. He believed in a U.S.-Japanese partnership built upon mutual respect and shared values of democracy and human rights, economic freedom and security, and that this partnership must remain the cornerstone of stability in East Asia.

Prime Minister Obuchi touched hearts around the world in simple, human ways. His telephone calls are legendary. I remember his human touch when he came to America last spring, when he threw out an unhittable pitch to the Chicago slugger, Sammy Sosa; when he told us the honor he felt in meeting Robert Kennedy as a young man; and how much he appreciated the dinner we hosted in his honor when he shared a table with Mrs. Robert Kennedy.

Early in his career, Prime Minister Obuchi competed for votes in the same district as two former Prime Ministers. He used to describe himself as a "noodle shop sandwiched between two skyscrapers." As usual, he was being modest. Prime Minister Obuchi represented to the whole world the Japanese virtues of honor and loyalty, vision and determination, love for and commitment to ordinary people. Our world is a better place thanks to the life that he lived and the work that he did.

On his last day in Washington, Prime Minister Obuchi gave me a beautiful painting of Mount Fuji. I will cherish it always. And whenever I look at it, it will always remind me of him. I hope very much that, in his memory, Japan and the United States can work together as partners and friends to lift humanity to a new mountaintop in the 21st century.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 4:05 p.m. at the U.S. Ambassador's residence. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador Thomas S. Foley, and his wife, Heather; Prime Minister Obuchi's widow, Chizuko, his son, Go, and his daughters, Yuko and Akiko; and Ethel Kennedy, widow of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the Entertainment and Media Industry's Parental Media Guide Website

June 8, 2000

I applaud the media and the entertainment industry for announcing that they have answered our call to action to develop a one-stop website for parents to learn more about how to monitor and understand their children's interaction with the media. This website is a positive step, but not the only one we need to take, to give parents the tools they urgently need to help them choose what media is appropriate for their children. The First Lady challenged the industry to develop this website, as part of the White House Conference on Teenagers, to give parents more and better information about how to use the current media rating systems and parent advisory guidelines voluntarily put in place by the movie, television, music, and computer/video game industries. Hillary and I will continue to call on the industry to take the next step of voluntarily creating a uniform rating system that would apply to movies, television, music, and video games.

The parental media guide can be found at www.parentalguide.org. This website was jointly developed and produced by the Motion Picture Association of America, the National Cable Television Association, the National Association of Broadcasters, the Recording Industry Association of America, and the Interactive Digital Software Association.

Statement on the Senate Vote on the Patients' Bill of Rights

June 8, 2000

I am disappointed that today's vote in the Senate means that the American people will continue to wait for the long overdue patient protections that they deserve. However, we continue to enjoy overwhelming bipartisan support in the House of Representatives and are now within a single vote of a bipartisan majority in the Senate. I am encouraged by this progress and urge the supporters of a real Patients' Bill of Rights to redouble their

efforts to pass this critically important legislation.

Statement on Congressional Action on the "Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act"

June 8, 2000

I am pleased that House and Senate conferees have reached bipartisan agreement on important electronic commerce legislation, the "Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act." This legislation will remove legal barriers to doing business on-line while preserving consumer protections. Congress should quickly send the bill to my desk.

E-commerce offers substantial benefits for businesses and consumers in terms of efficiency, convenience, and lower costs and is a vital source of dynamism for the American economy. If we are to achieve the full potential of electronic business-to-business and business-to-consumer commerce, however, some minimal ground rules are necessary. Business needs legal certainty that a contract formed and executed on-line will be no less valid than its pen and ink counterpart. Consumers need confidence that they are as safe doing business in the electronic world as they are on paper.

The bipartisan agreement reached by conferees is a responsible and balanced approach to accomplishing both of these goals. The legislation would remove barriers to E-commerce by establishing technology-neutral legal standards for electronic contracts and signatures. It would ensure that consumer protections on-line will be equivalent to those in the paper world.

I applaud the leadership of Chairmen Bliley and McCain who reached across party lines and built a bipartisan consensus. I am also grateful to the Democrats who worked so constructively to reach bipartisan agreement in conference, including Senators Hollings, Leahy, Sarbanes, and Wyden and Congressmen Dingell and Markey.

**Message to the Congress
Transmitting a Report of the
National Science Board**

June 8, 2000

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by 42 U.S.C. 1863(j)(1), I am pleased to submit to the Congress a report of the National Science Board entitled, "Science and Engineering Indicators—2000." This report represents the fourteenth in a series examining key aspects of the status of American science and engineering in a global environment.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 8, 2000.

**Letter to the Senate Democratic
Leader on the Patients' Bill of Rights**

June 8, 2000

Dear Mr. Leader:

I am writing to express my strong support for your effort to give the Senate its first opportunity to vote for the bipartisan Norwood-Dingell Patients' Bill of Rights. It is long past time that the Congress acted to deliver real patient protections for all Americans in all health plans.

It is my understanding that the members of the Senate/House Conference who support a strong, enforceable, Patients' Bill of Rights have reluctantly concluded that the likelihood of an acceptable bill emerging from the conference is remote. After 8 months of inaction since the House passed the Norwood-Dingell Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act, and with very few scheduled legislative days remaining, it is time for the Congress to act to pass this legislation and give Americans the patient protections they deserve.

Congress has failed to pass this measure for years, and this delay has real consequences. According to a recent study, each day without a strong Patients' Bill of Rights results in harm to thousands of patients because insurance companies refused a patient a diagnostic test, a necessary procedure, or a referral to a specialist.

It is my hope that the Senate will approve this legislation today and take the next important step toward the enactment of a strong, enforceable Patients' Bill of Rights. I urge the Senate to put the interests of patients before those of the special interests and replicate last fall's bipartisan achievement by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this letter.

**Letter to the Speaker of the House
of Representatives on Estate Tax
Legislation**

June 8, 2000

Dear Mr. Speaker:

I recognize that some small businesses and family farms struggle with the estate tax and am committed to working with you to relieve this burden. I am supportive of targeted, fiscally responsible legislation to make the estate tax fairer, simpler, and more efficient. I believe the alternative proposed by Representatives Rangel, Cardin, and Stenholm, which would exempt most small businesses and family farms from the estate tax entirely, promotes these objectives in a fiscally responsible manner.

We should not, however, turn our backs on fiscal discipline by passing a regressive, poorly targeted, and expensive repeal of the estate tax. If you send me a bill to completely repeal the estate tax, I will veto it rather than risk the fiscal progress that has contributed to the longest economic expansion in history.

The cost of the estate tax repeal would explode just as the baby boom generation begins to retire, putting at risk our ability to extend the life of Medicare and Social Security, pay down the debt, and meet other important national priorities. The full cost of this legislation is hidden because the repeal is phased in over ten years. Although it would cost about \$100 billion from 2001–10, the drain on the surplus would increase sevenfold to over \$750 billion over the following ten years.

Repealing the estate tax would undermine the progressivity, fairness, and integrity of the tax system. In 2010, the repeal of the estate and gift taxes would provide a \$50 billion tax break. But this estate tax repeal would benefit only 54,000 estates—about 2 percent of decedents—providing an average tax cut of \$800,000. Small businesses and family farms would receive a tiny fraction of the benefits of this proposal, while the largest estates would enjoy enormous windfalls. In addition, studies indicate that, without the estate tax, charitable donations and bequests would fall by \$5 billion to \$6 billion per year.

I would like to work with the bipartisan Congressional leadership to enact legislation to reduce the burden of the estate tax on small businesses and family farms, provided it is done in an overall framework of fiscal discipline that strengthens Social Security and Medicare, invests in key priorities, and pays down the debt by 2013. I look forward to working with you to accomplish this goal.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Ernesto Zedillo of Mexico

June 9, 2000

Mexican Economy

Q. President Clinton, do you want to say something about the Mexican economy? How do you see the development of the last 5½ years under President Zedillo?

President Clinton. I think President Zedillo has done a truly remarkable job. Mexico has had 5 years of growth, in excess of 5 percent a year, after the very difficult financial crisis in '94. And I think it's a real tribute to him and to the people he put on his team, as well as to the hard work and industry of the people of Mexico.

But I hope the partnership that we have enjoyed together after NAFTA and through

the crisis has played some role. But I think the great credit goes to the President and his team and the people of Mexico.

Mexican Election

Q. What do you think about the Mexican election?

President Clinton. I think the Mexican people will vote and make their own decision. It's interesting to observe. It's just like this election. I'm just an observer now. I'm not running for anything.

[At this point, a question was asked and answered in Spanish, and no translation was provided.]

Organization of American States

Q. *[Inaudible]*—just failed to get the support of the Latin American countries to get the OAS as a mediator in Peru. What do you think could be the role of the OAS supervising elections in Latin America without the support of key countries like Mexico?

President Clinton. Well, I think the real question that we all have to come to terms with is, what is the right thing to do now? And that's what we've been discussing. But over the long run, I think that the OAS still has a good future and a critical future. And I don't think there's any difference between the United States and Mexico in our determination to do whatever we can to keep democracy strong throughout the region.

And so we talked about it today, and it's a difficult problem. But I think the trend is good. You can't look back on the last 20 years and not believe that. And so we'll need some mechanism to monitor these elections and to be involved in an ongoing basis, and I think the OAS still has a pretty good future.

Thank you.

NOTE: The exchange began at 2:45 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

**Proclamation 7317—Establishment
of the Canyons of the Ancients
National Monument**

June 9, 2000

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

Containing the highest known density of archaeological sites in the Nation, the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument holds evidence of cultures and traditions spanning thousands of years. This area, with its intertwined natural and cultural resources, is a rugged landscape, a quality that greatly contributes to the protection of its scientific and historic objects. The monument offers an unparalleled opportunity to observe, study, and experience how cultures lived and adapted over time in the American Southwest.

The complex landscape and remarkable cultural resources of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument have been a focal point for archaeological interest for over 125 years. Archaeological and historic objects such as cliff dwellings, villages, great kivas, shrines, sacred springs, agricultural fields, check dams, reservoirs, rock art sites, and sweat lodges are spread across the landscape. More than five thousand of these archaeologically important sites have been recorded, and thousands more await documentation and study. The Mockingbird Mesa area has over forty sites per square mile, and several canyons in that area hold more than three hundred sites per square mile.

People have lived and labored to survive among these canyons and mesas for thousands of years, from the earliest known hunters crossing the area 10,000 years ago or more, through Ancestral Puebloan farmers, to the Ute, Navajo, and European settlers whose descendants still call this area home. There is scattered evidence that Paleo-Indians used the region on a sporadic basis for hunting and gathering until around 7500 B.C. During the Archaic period, generally covering the next six thousand years, occupation of the Four Corners area was dominated by hunters and gatherers.

By about 1500 B.C., the more sedentary Basketmakers spread over the landscape. As Ancestral Northern Puebloan people occupied the area around 750 A.D., farming began to blossom, and continued through about 1300 A.D., as the area became part of a much larger prehistoric cultural region that included Mesa Verde to the southeast. Year-round villages were established, originally consisting of pit house dwellings, and later evolving to well-recognized cliff-dwellings. Many archaeologists now believe that throughout this time span, the Ancestral Northern Puebloan people periodically aggregated into larger communities and dispersed into smaller community units. Specifically, during Pueblo I (about 700–900 A.D.) the occupation and site density in the monument area increased. Dwellings tended to be small, with three or four rooms. Then, during Pueblo II (about 900–1150 A.D.), settlements were diminished and highly dispersed. Late in Pueblo II and in early Pueblo III, around 1150 A.D., the size and number of settlements again increased and residential clustering began. Later pueblos were larger multi-storied masonry dwellings with forty to fifty rooms. For the remainder of Pueblo III (1150–1300 A.D.), major aggregation occurred in the monument, typically at large sites at the heads of canyons. One of these sites includes remains of about 420 rooms, 90 kivas, a great kiva, and a plaza, covering more than ten acres in all. These villages were wrapped around the upper reaches of canyons and spread down onto talus slopes, enclosed year-round springs and reservoirs, and included low, defensive walls. The changes in architecture and site planning reflected a shift from independent households to a more communal lifestyle.

Farming during the Puebloan period was affected by population growth and changing climate and precipitation patterns. As the population grew, the Ancestral Pueblos expanded into increasingly marginal areas. Natural resources were compromised and poor soil and growing conditions made survival increasingly difficult. When dry conditions persisted, Pueblo communities moved to the south, southwest, and southeast, where descendants of these Ancestral Puebloan peoples live today.

Soon after the Ancestral Puebloans left the monument area, the nomadic Ute and Navajo took advantage of the natural diversity found in the variable topography by moving to lower areas, including the monument's mesas and canyons, during the cooler seasons. A small number of forked stick hogans, brush shelters, and wickiups are the most obvious remnants of this period of occupation.

The natural resources and spectacular land forms of the monument help explain why past and present cultures have chosen to live in the area. The geology of the monument evokes the very essence of the American Southwest. Structurally part of the Paradox Basin, from a distance the landscape looks deceptively benign. From the McElmo Dome in the southern part of the monument, the land slopes gently to the north, giving no indication of its true character. Once inside the area, however, the geology becomes more rugged and dissected. Rising sharply to the north of McElmo Creek, the McElmo Dome itself is buttressed by sheer sandstone cliffs, with mesa tops rimmed by caprock, and deeply incised canyons.

The monument is home to a wide variety of wildlife species, including unique herpetological resources. Crucial habitat for the Mesa Verde nightsnake, long-nosed leopard lizard, and twin-spotted spiny lizard can be found within the monument in the area north of Yellow Jacket Canyon. Peregrine falcons have been observed in the area, as have golden eagles, American kestrels, red-tailed hawks, and northern harriers. Game birds like Gambel's quail and mourning dove are found throughout the monument both in dry, upland habitats, and in lush riparian habitat along the canyon bottoms.

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

proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

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

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by section 2 of the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S.C. 431), do proclaim that there are hereby set apart and reserved as the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument, for the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, all lands and interests in lands owned or controlled by the United States within the boundaries of the area described on the map entitled "Canyons of the Ancients National Monument" attached to and forming a part of this proclamation. The Federal land and interests in land reserved consist of approximately 164,000 acres, which is the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

All Federal lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of this monument are hereby appropriated and withdrawn from all forms of entry, location, selection, sale, or other disposition under the public land laws, including but not limited to withdrawal from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and from disposition under all laws relating to mineral leasing, other than by exchange that furthers the protective purposes of the monument, and except for oil and gas leasing as prescribed herein.

For the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, the Secretary of the Interior shall prohibit all motorized and mechanized vehicle use off road, except for emergency or authorized administrative purposes.

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

Because most of the Federal lands have already been leased for oil and gas, which includes carbon dioxide, and development is already occurring, the monument shall remain open to oil and gas leasing and development; provided, the Secretary of the Interior

shall manage the development, subject to valid existing rights, so as not to create any new impacts that interfere with the proper care and management of the objects protected by this proclamation; and provided further, the Secretary may issue new leases only for the purpose of promoting conservation of oil and gas resources in any common reservoir now being produced under existing leases, or to protect against drainage.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to affect the management of Hovenweep National Monument by the National Park Service (Proclamation 1654 of March 2, 1923, Proclamation 2924 of May 1, 1951, and Proclamation 2998 of November 26, 1952).

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

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

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:47 a.m., June 12, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on June 13.

Proclamation 7318—Establishment of the Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument

June 9, 2000

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

With towering fir forests, sunlit oak groves, wildflower-strewn meadows, and steep canyons, the Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument is an ecological wonder, with biological diversity unmatched in the Cascade Range. This rich enclave of natural resources is a biological crossroads—the interface of the Cascade, Klamath, and Siskiyou ecoregions, in an area of unique geology, biology, climate, and topography.

The monument is home to a spectacular variety of rare and beautiful species of plants and animals, whose survival in this region depends upon its continued ecological integrity. Plant communities present a rich mosaic of grass and shrublands, Garry and California black oak woodlands, juniper scablands, mixed conifer and white fir forests, and wet meadows. Stream bottoms support broad-leaf deciduous riparian trees and shrubs. Special plant communities include rosaceous

chaparral and oak-juniper woodlands. The monument also contains many rare and endemic plants, such as Greene's Mariposa lily, Gentner's fritillary, and Bellinger's meadowfoam.

The monument supports an exceptional range of fauna, including one of the highest diversities of butterfly species in the United States. The Jenny Creek portion of the monument is a significant center of fresh water snail diversity, and is home to three endemic fish species, including a long-isolated stock of redband trout. The monument contains important populations of small mammals, reptile and amphibian species, and ungulates, including important winter habitat for deer. It also contains old growth habitat crucial to the threatened Northern spotted owl and numerous other bird species such as the western bluebird, the western meadowlark, the pileated woodpecker, the flammulated owl, and the pygmy nuthatch.

The monument's geology contributes substantially to its spectacular biological diversity. The majority of the monument is within the Cascade Mountain Range. The western edge of the monument lies within the older Klamath Mountain geologic province. The dynamic plate tectonics of the area, and the mixing of igneous, metamorphic, and sedimentary geological formations, have resulted in diverse lithologies and soils. Along with periods of geological isolation and a range of environmental conditions, the complex geologic history of the area has been instrumental in producing the diverse vegetative and biological richness seen today.

One of the most striking features of the Western Cascades in this area is Pilot Rock, located near the southern boundary of the monument. The rock is a volcanic plug, a remnant of a feeder vent left after a volcano eroded away, leaving an outstanding example of the inside of a volcano. Pilot Rock has sheer, vertical basalt faces up to 400 feet above the talus slope at its base, with classic columnar jointing created by the cooling of its andesite composition.

The Siskiyou Pass in the southwest corner of the monument contains portions of the Oregon/California Trail, the region's main north/south travel route first established by Native Americans in prehistoric times, and

used by Peter Skene Ogden in his 1827 exploration for the Hudson's Bay Company.

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

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

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by section 2 of the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S.C. 431), do proclaim that there are hereby set apart and reserved as the Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument, for the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, all lands and interests in lands owned or controlled by the United States within the boundaries of the area described on the map entitled "Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument" attached to and forming a part of this proclamation. The Federal land and interests in land reserved consist of approximately 52,000 acres, which is the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

All Federal lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of this monument are hereby appropriated and withdrawn from all forms of entry, location, selection, sale, or leasing or other disposition under the public land laws, including but not limited to withdrawal from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and from disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing, other than by exchange that furthers the protective purposes of the monument.

There is hereby reserved, as of the date of this proclamation and subject to valid existing rights, a quantity of water sufficient to fulfill the purposes for which this monument

is established. Nothing in this reservation shall be construed as a relinquishment or reduction of any water use or rights reserved or appropriated by the United States on or before the date of this proclamation.

The commercial harvest of timber or other vegetative material is prohibited, except when part of an authorized science-based ecological restoration project aimed at meeting protection and old growth enhancement objectives. Any such project must be consistent with the purposes of this proclamation. No portion of the monument shall be considered to be suited for timber production, and no part of the monument shall be used in a calculation or provision of a sustained yield of timber. Removal of trees from within the monument area may take place only if clearly needed for ecological restoration and maintenance or public safety.

For the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, the Secretary of the Interior shall prohibit all motorized and mechanized vehicle use off road and shall close the Schoheim Road, except for emergency or authorized administrative purposes.

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

The Secretary of the Interior shall manage the monument through the Bureau of Land Management, pursuant to applicable legal authorities (including, where applicable, the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1181a–1181j)), to implement the purposes of this proclamation.

The Secretary of the Interior shall prepare, within 3 years of this date, a management plan for this monument, and shall promulgate such regulations for its management as he deems appropriate. The management plan shall include appropriate transportation planning that addresses the actions, including road closures or travel restrictions, necessary to protect the objects identified in this proclamation.

The Secretary of the Interior shall study the impacts of livestock grazing on the objects of biological interest in the monument with specific attention to sustaining the natural ecosystem dynamics. Existing authorized permits or leases may continue with appropriate terms and conditions under existing laws and regulations. Should grazing be found incompatible with protecting the objects of biological interest, the Secretary shall retire the grazing allotments pursuant to the processes of applicable law. Should grazing permits or leases be relinquished by existing holders, the Secretary shall not reallocate the forage available under such permits or for livestock grazing purposes unless the Secretary specifically finds, pending the outcome of the study, that such reallocation will advance the purposes of the proclamation.

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

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

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

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

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:47 a.m., June 12, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on June 13.

Proclamation 7319—Establishment of the Hanford Reach National Monument*June 9, 2000**By the President of the United States of America***A Proclamation**

The Hanford Reach National Monument is a unique and biologically diverse landscape, encompassing an array of scientific and historic objects. This magnificent area contains an irreplaceable natural and historic legacy, preserved by unusual circumstances. Maintained as a buffer area in a Federal reservation conducting nuclear weapons development and, more recently, environmental cleanup activities, with limits on development and human use for the past 50 years, the monument is now a haven for important and increasingly scarce objects of scientific and historic interest. Bisected by the stunning Hanford Reach of the Columbia River, the monument contains the largest remnant of the shrub-steppe ecosystem that once blanketed the Columbia River Basin. The monument is also one of the few remaining archaeologically rich areas in the western Columbia Plateau, containing well-preserved remnants of human history spanning more than 10,000 years. The monument is equally rich in geologic history, with dramatic landscapes that reveal the creative forces of tectonic, volcanic, and erosive power.

The monument is a biological treasure, embracing important riparian, aquatic, and upland shrub-steppe habitats that are rare or in decline in other areas. Within its mosaic of habitats, the monument supports a wealth of increasingly uncommon native plant and animal species, the size and diversity of which is unmatched in the Columbia Basin. Migrating salmon, birds, and hundreds of other native plant and animal species rely on its natural ecosystems.

The monument includes the 51-mile long "Hanford Reach," the last free-flowing, nontidal stretch of the Columbia River. The Reach contains islands, riffles, gravel bars, oxbow ponds, and backwater sloughs that support some of the most productive spawning areas in the Northwest, where approxi-

mately 80 percent of the upper Columbia Basin's fall chinook salmon spawn. It also supports healthy runs of naturally-spawning sturgeon and other highly-valued fish species. The loss of other spawning grounds on the Columbia and its tributaries has increased the importance of the Hanford Reach for fisheries.

The monument contains one of the last remaining large blocks of shrub-steppe ecosystems in the Columbia River Basin, supporting an unusually high diversity of native plant and animal species. A large number of rare and sensitive plant species are found dispersed throughout the monument. A recent inventory resulted in the discovery of two plant species new to science, the Umtanum desert buckwheat and the White Bluffs bladderpod. Fragile microbiotic crusts, themselves of biological interest, are well developed in the monument and play an important role in stabilizing soils and providing nutrients to plants.

The monument contains significant breeding populations of nearly all steppe and shrub-steppe dependent birds, including the loggerhead shrike, the sage sparrow, the sage thrasher, and the ferruginous hawk. The Hanford Reach and surrounding wetlands provide important stop-over habitat for migratory birds, as well as habitat for many resident species. The area is important wintering habitat for bald eagles, white pelicans, and many species of waterfowl such as mallards, green-winged teal, pintails, goldeneye, gadwall, and buffleheads. The monument's bluff habitats provide valuable nesting sites for several bird species, including prairie falcons, and important perch sites for raptors such as peregrine falcons.

Many species of mammals are also found within the monument, including elk, beaver, badgers, and bobcats. Insect populations, though less conspicuous, include species that have been lost elsewhere due to habitat conversion, fragmentation, and application of pesticides. A recent biological inventory uncovered 41 species and 2 subspecies of insects new to science and many species not before identified in the State of Washington. Such rich and diverse insect populations are important to supporting the fauna in the monument.

In addition to its vital biological resources, the monument contains significant geological and paleontological objects. The late-Miocene to late-Pliocene Ringold Formation, known as the White Bluffs, was formed from river and lake sediments deposited by the ancestral Columbia River and its tributaries. These striking cliffs form the eastern bank of the Columbia for nearly half of the length of the Reach, and are significant for the mammalian fossils that they contain. Fossil remains from rhinoceros, camel, and mastodon, among others, have been found within these bluffs.

The Hanford Dune Field, located on the western shore of the Columbia in the southeastern part of the monument, is also of geologic significance. This active area of migrating barchan dunes and partially stabilized transverse dunes rises 10 to 16 feet above the ground, creating sandy habitats ranging from 2 to several hundred acres in size.

The monument also contains important archaeological and historic information. More than 10,000 years of human activity in this largely arid environment have left extensive archaeological deposits. Areas upland from the river show evidence of concentrated human activity, and recent surveys indicate extensive use of arid lowlands for hunting. Hundreds of prehistoric archaeological sites have been recorded, including the remains of pithouses, graves, spirit quest monuments, hunting camps, game drive complexes, quarries, and hunting and kill sites. A number of Native American groups still have cultural ties to the monument. The monument also contains some historic structures and other remains from more recent human activities, including homesteads from small towns established along the riverbanks in the early 20th century.

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

to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

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

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by section 2 of the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S.C. 431), do proclaim that there are hereby set apart and reserved as the Hanford Reach National Monument, for the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, all lands and interests in lands owned or controlled by the United States within the boundaries of the area described on the map entitled "Hanford Reach National Monument" attached to and forming a part of this proclamation. The Federal land and interests in land reserved consist of approximately 195,000 acres, which is the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

All Federal lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of this monument are hereby appropriated and withdrawn from all forms of entry, location, selection, sale, or leasing or other disposition under the public land laws, including but not limited to withdrawal from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and from disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing, other than by exchange that furthers the protective purposes of the monument.

For the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Energy shall prohibit all motorized and mechanized vehicle use off road, except for emergency or other federally authorized purposes, including remediation purposes. There is hereby reserved, as of the date of this proclamation and subject to valid existing rights, a quantity of water in the Columbia River sufficient to fulfill the purposes for which this monument is established. Nothing in this reservation shall be construed as a relinquishment or reduction of any water use or rights reserved or appropriated by the United States on or before the date of this proclamation.

For the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, the Secretary of the Interior shall prohibit livestock grazing.

The monument shall be managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under existing agreements with the Department of Energy, except that the Department of Energy shall manage the lands within the monument that are not subject to management agreements with the Service, and in developing any management plans and rules and regulations governing the portions of the monument for which the Department of Energy has management responsibility, the Secretary of Energy shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior.

As the Department of Energy and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service determine that lands within the monument managed by the Department of Energy become suitable for management by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will assume management by agreement with the Department of Energy. All agreements between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Energy shall be consistent with the provisions of this proclamation.

Nothing in this proclamation shall affect the responsibility of the Department of Energy under environmental laws, including the remediation of hazardous substances or the restoration of natural resources at the Hanford facility; nor affect the Department of Energy's statutory authority to control public access or statutory responsibility to take other measures for environmental remediation, monitoring, security, safety, or emergency preparedness purposes; nor affect any Department of Energy activities on lands not included within the monument.

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

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

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

Nothing in this proclamation shall interfere with the operation and maintenance of existing facilities of the Columbia Basin Reclamation Project, the Federal Columbia

River Transmission System, or other existing utility services that are located within the monument. Existing Federal Columbia River Transmission System facilities located within the monument may be replaced, modified and expanded, and new facilities constructed within the monument, as authorized by other applicable law. Such replacement, modification, expansion, or construction of new facilities shall be carried out in a manner consistent with proper care and management of the objects of this proclamation, to be determined in accordance with the management arrangements previously set out in this proclamation.

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

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

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:47 a.m., June 12, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on June 13.

Memorandum on the Hanford Reach National Monument

June 9, 2000

Memorandum for the Secretary of Energy

Subject: Hanford Reach National Monument

The area being designated as the Hanford Reach National Monument forms an arc surrounding much of what is known as the central Hanford area. While a portion of the central area is needed for Department of Energy missions, much of the area contains the same shrub-steppe habitat and other objects of scientific and historic interest that I am today

permanently protecting in the monument. Therefore, I am directing you to manage the central area to protect these important values where practical. I further direct you to consult with the Secretary of the Interior on how best to permanently protect these objects, including the possibility of adding lands to the monument as they are remediated.

William J. Clinton

**Proclamation 7320—Establishment
of the Ironwood Forest National
Monument**

June 9, 2000

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

The landscape of the Ironwood Forest National Monument is swathed with the rich, drought-adapted vegetation of the Sonoran Desert. The monument contains objects of scientific interest throughout its desert environment. Stands of ironwood, palo verde, and saguaro blanket the monument floor beneath the rugged mountain ranges, including the Silver Bell Mountains. Ragged Top Mountain is a biological and geological crown jewel amid the depositional plains in the monument.

The monument presents a quintessential view of the Sonoran Desert with ancient legume and cactus forests. The geologic and topographic variability of the monument contributes to the area's high biological diversity. Ironwoods, which can live in excess of 800 years, generate a chain of influences on associated understory plants, affecting their dispersal, germination, establishment, and rates of growth. Ironwood is the dominant nurse plant in this region, and the Silver Bell Mountains support the highest density of ironwood trees recorded in the Sonoran Desert. Ironwood trees provide, among other things, roosting sites for hawks and owls, forage for desert bighorn sheep, protection for saguaro against freezing, burrows for tortoises, flowers for native bees, dense canopy for nesting of white-winged doves and other birds, and protection against sunburn for night blooming cereus.

The ironwood-bursage habitat in the Silver Bell Mountains is associated with more than 674 species, including 64 mammalian and 57 bird species. Within the Sonoran Desert, Ragged Top Mountain contains the greatest richness of species. The monument is home to species federally listed as threatened or endangered, including the Nichols turk's head cactus and the lesser long-nosed bat, and contains historic and potential habitat for the cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl. The desert bighorn sheep in the monument may be the last viable population indigenous to the Tucson basin.

In addition to the biological and geological resources, the area holds abundant rock art sites and other archeological objects of scientific interest. Humans have inhabited the area for more than 5,000 years. More than 200 sites from the prehistoric Hohokam period (600 A.D. to 1450 A.D.) have been recorded in the area. Two areas within the monument have been listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the Los Robles Archeological District and the Cocoraque Butte Archeological District. The archeological artifacts include rhyolite and brown chert chipped stone, plain and decorated ceramics, and worked shell from the Gulf of California. The area also contains the remnants of the Mission Santa Ana, the last mission constructed in Pimeria Alta.

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

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

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by section 2

of the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S.C. 431), do proclaim that there are hereby set apart and reserved as the Ironwood Forest National Monument, for the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, all lands and interests in lands owned or controlled by the United States within the boundaries of the area described on the map entitled "Ironwood Forest National Monument" attached to and forming a part of this proclamation. The Federal land and interests in land reserved consist of approximately 128,917 acres, which is the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

All Federal lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of this monument are hereby appropriated and withdrawn from all forms of entry, location, selection, sale, or leasing or other disposition under the public land laws, including but not limited to withdrawal from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and from disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing, other than by exchange that furthers the protective purposes of the monument.

For the purpose of protecting the objects identified above, the Secretary of the Interior shall prohibit all motorized and mechanized vehicle use off road, except for emergency or authorized administrative purposes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:47 a.m., June 12, 2000]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on June 13.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

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

June 3

In the afternoon, the President met briefly with Prime Minister Goran Persson of Sweden following the Conference on Progressive Governance in the Chancellery in Berlin, Germany. Later, he traveled to Moscow, Russia, arriving in the evening.

Later in the evening, the President attended a working dinner hosted by President Vladimir Putin of Russia in Residence Building One at the Kremlin.

June 4

In the afternoon, the President had several meetings with President Putin in the Grand Kremlin Palace.

June 5

In the morning, the President met with President Putin in the Ceremonial Office at the Kremlin. In the afternoon, he met with former President Boris Yeltsin of Russia in the Sitting Room at Gorky 9.

Later, the President traveled to Kiev, Ukraine, where he had meetings with President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine in the Blue Room and Green Room of Mariinskiy Palace.

In the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to appoint Billy Blanks and Lauren Gregg as members of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports.

The President announced his intention to appoint Phillip A. Sharp as Chair of the National Cancer Advisory Board.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following persons as members of the Advisory Committee on Expanding Training Opportunities: Christine Hemrick; Hilary C. Pennington; Clarence E. Anthony; J. Paul Carey; Anthony P. Carnevale; Jerry J. Jasinowski; Lawrence F. Katz; Greta Kotler; Belkis Leong-Hong; Lisa M. Lynch; Elliott Masie; Stephen J. Rohleder; Doug Ross; and Jerry Sue Thornton.

June 6

The President announced his intention to nominate Holly J. Burkhalter to be a member of the U.S. Institute of Peace.

The President announced his intention to appoint George Chao-Chi Chu as a member

of the Advisory Committee on Trade Policy Negotiations.

June 7

In the morning, the President traveled to Tokyo, Japan, arriving the following morning.

The President announced his intention to nominate Richard A. Boucher to be Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs for the Department of State.

The President announced his intention to nominate Allan I. Mendelowitz to be a member of the Board of Directors for the Federal Housing Finance Board.

The President announced his intention to appoint Simon Shaheen to the President's Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

June 8

In the morning, the President met with Prime Minister Yoshiro Mori of Japan in the Asahi-No-Ma Room at the Akasaka State Guest House.

In the afternoon, the President met with President Kim Dae-jung of South Korea in the Presidential Suite at the Okura Hotel.

In the evening, the President attended a reception hosted by Prime Minister Mori in the Hagoroma Room at the Akasaka State Guest House. Later, he returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to nominate James Charles Riley to be a Commissioner of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.

The President announced his intention to nominate James A. Daley to be Ambassador to Barbados, Saint Lucia, and Saint Kitts and Nevis.

The President announced his intention to nominate Francisco J. Sanchez to be Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs at the Department of Transportation.

June 9

In the evening, the President traveled to Minneapolis/St. Paul, MN.

The President announced his intention to nominate Marti Thomas to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Legislative Affairs and Public Liaison.

The President announced his intention to appoint Maria Lombardo as a member of the

Board of Trustees of the Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation.

The President announced his intention to reappoint Marc D. Guthrie and Kenneth M. Schoonover as members of the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.

The White House announced that the President will meet with President Robert Kocharian of Armenia at the White House on June 27.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted June 6

Lisa Gayle Ross,
of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, vice Nancy Killefer, resigned.

Lisa Gayle Ross,
of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Treasury, vice Nancy Killefer, resigned.

K. Gary Sebelius,
of Kansas, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Kansas, vice G. Thomas Van Bebber, retiring.

Kenneth O. Simon,
of Alabama, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, vice Sam C. Pointer, Jr., retired.

John E. Steele,
of Florida, to be U.S. District Judge for the Middle District of Florida (new position).

Withdrawn June 6

James M. Lyons,
of Colorado, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, vice John P. Moore, retired,

which was sent to the Senate on September 22, 1999.

Submitted June 8

Holly J. Burkhalter,
of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2001, vice W. Scott Thompson, term expired.

John Train,
of New York, to be a member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring October 11, 2003, vice Scott B. Lukins, term expired.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released June 3

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Released June 4

Transcript of a press briefing by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott on the President's meetings with President Vladimir Putin of Russia

Transcript of a press briefing by National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling on the President's meetings with President Vladimir Putin of Russia

Fact sheet: United States-Russian Federation Plutonium Disposition Agreement

Fact sheet: Protecting the Environment and Combating Global Warming

Fact sheet: Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative

Fact sheet: U.S.-Russia Joint Steel Dialogue

Fact sheet: Agreement on the Establishment of a Joint Warning Center for the Exchange

of Information on Missile Launches and Early Warning

Fact sheet: People to People Cooperation

Announcement: Official Delegation Accompanying the President to Russia

Released June 5

Fact sheet: Nuclear Safety Assistance Increased

Fact sheet: Combating Trafficking in Human Beings

Fact sheet: Chornobyl Closure

Fact sheet: U.S. Assists Ukraine in Small and Medium Enterprise Development

Announcement: Official Delegation Accompanying the President to Ukraine

Released June 7

Statement by the Press Secretary: Terrorist Bombing in Sri Lanka

Announcement of nominations for U.S. District Judges for the District of Kansas, the Northern District of Alabama, and the Middle District of Florida

Released June 8

Transcript of a readout to the pool by NSC Senior Director for Asian Affairs Kenneth G. Lieberthal on the President's meetings with Prime Minister Yoshiro Mori of Japan

Transcript of readout to the pool by Assistant Press Secretary for Foreign Affairs P.J.

Crowley on the President's meetings with President Kim Dae-jung of South Korea

Announcement of nominations for U.S. District Judges for the District of Hawaii and the Middle District of Florida

Released June 9

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Joe Lockhart

Statement by the Press Secretary announcing the visit of President Robert Kocharian of Armenia on June 27

Transcript of a press briefing by NSC Senior Director for Inter-American Affairs Arturo Valenzuela on the President's meeting with President Ernesto Zedillo of Mexico

Transcript of a press briefing by Acting Council on Environmental Quality Chair George Frampton and Department of the Interior Solicitor John Leshy on the proclamations establishing national monuments

Announcement: Deputy National Security Adviser James B. Steinberg To Depart the White House

**Acts Approved
by the President**

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.