

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Eric Schwartz to Timothy Atkin, et al., re: WOMEN'S CONFERENCE - COMMENTS ASAP (10 pages)	03/22/1995	P1/b(1)
002. email	Eric Schwartz to Eileen Claussen, re: WOMEN'S CONFERENCE - COMMENTS ASAP (10 pages)	03/22/1995	P1/b(1)
003. email	Robert Bell to Eric Schwartz, re: WOMEN'S CONFERENCE - COMMENTS ASAP (10 pages)	03/22/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail - Record (Sept 94 - Sept 97) ([AIDS and Global...])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/23/1994 - 04/13/1995]

2007-1550-F

ke2056

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 23 October 94 14:49
FROM Bradley, Amelia J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Population Paper [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Claussen, Eileen B.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY
Attached is a draft of a paper on population for the Fauver exercise.
[[G7SUMMIT.DOC : 3624 in G7SUMMIT.DOC]]
**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 23 October 94 14:44
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** G7SUMMIT.DOC

GLOBAL POPULATION GROWTH

Problem

Rapid global population growth is an urgent and substantial threat to international stability and sustainable development. The United Nations estimates that the world's population in 2050 is likely to be between 7.8 and 12.5 billion people, compared with today's 5.5 billion, with ninety percent of this growth occurring in developing nations. High rates of growth in these nations are expected to exacerbate existing dilemmas of unemployment, stagnant economic development, depressed wages, declining per capita availability of cropland, food scarcity, rapid urbanization, a depleted natural resource base and environmental degradation. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization estimates that by the year 2000, 31 low-income countries will be unable to feed their projected populations using their own land, resulting in: distorted migration flows; an increasing burden on local ecosystems and the global environment; and threats to local and regional political stability.

Solutions

-- Implement the comprehensive Program of Action adopted at

the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo in September 1994, which defines a global approach to stabilizing the world's population -- encompassing increased availability of family planning, sustainable economic development, the empowerment of women to include enhanced educational opportunities, and a reduction in infant and child mortality.

-- Promote targeted assistance to developing countries through both bilateral and multilateral channels. Seek to ensure that development assistance is devoted to critical objectives in the ICPD Program of Action: programs for reproductive health, maternal health and nutrition, prevention of AIDS and sexually transmitted diseases; other population and health programs, including child survival; programs for education of women and girls.

-- Demonstrate leadership by example in the United States.

Institutional Implications

-- Adequate resources must be directed to such multilateral programs as the United Nations Population Fund and the World Health Organization Human Reproductive Research Program, as well as appropriate private voluntary and non-governmental organizations.

-- In addition, the profile of assistance by other bilateral donors and multilateral organizations in the population and human resource sectors should be reviewed in order to develop a strategy for coordinating these modes of assistance, avoiding duplication, and increasing participation.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 26 October 94 15:45
FROM Claussen, Eileen B.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: FW: Population piece for G7 [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Bradley, Amelia J.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

From: Claussen, Eileen B.
To: Fauver, Robert C.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: Population piece for G7
Date: Monday, October 24, 1994 03:10 PM

GLOBAL POPULATION GROWTH

Problem

Rapid global population growth is an urgent and substantial threat to international stability and sustainable development.

The United Nations estimates that the world's population in 2050 is likely to be between 7.8 and 12.5 billion people, compared with today's 5.5 billion, with ninety percent of this growth occurring in developing nations.

High rates of growth in these nations are expected to exacerbate existing dilemmas of unemployment, stagnant economic development, depressed wages, declining per capita availability of cropland, food scarcity, rapid urbanization, a depleted natural resource base and environmental degradation. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization estimates that by the year 2000, 31 low-income countries will be unable to feed their projected populations using their own land, resulting in: distorted migration flows; an increasing burden on local ecosystems and the global environment; and threats to local and regional political stability.

Solutions

-- Implement the comprehensive Program of Action adopted at the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo in September 1994, which defines a global approach to stabilizing the world's

population -- encompassing increased availability of family planning, sustainable economic development, the empowerment of women, enhanced educational opportunities for women, a reduction in infant and child mortality, and the provision of reproductive health services for women and adolescents. This is a major shift away from most current programs that focus only on family planning services.

-- Promote targeted assistance to developing countries through both bilateral and multilateral channels. Seek to ensure that development assistance is devoted to critical objectives in the ICPD Program of Action: programs for reproductive health, maternal health and nutrition, prevention of AIDS and sexually transmitted diseases; other population and health programs, including child survival; programs for education of women and girls.

-- Demonstrate leadership by example in the United States.

Institutional Implications

-- Those institutions that provide assistance must redesign their efforts so that integrated programs, as specified in the Cairo Program of Action, are implemented. This includes the organizations of the United Nations, the World Bank and the regional banks, and bilateral assistance efforts.

-- Adequate resources must be directed to such multilateral programs as the United Nations Population Fund and the World Health Organization Human Reproductive Research Program, as well as appropriate private voluntary and non-governmental organizations.

-- In addition, the profile of assistance by other bilateral donors and multilateral organizations in the population and human resource sectors should be reviewed in order to develop a strategy for coordinating these modes of assistance, avoiding duplication, and increasing participation.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 08 November 94 11:02
FROM Rossin, Larry
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: RE: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Baker, James E.
Halperin, Morton H.
Longoria, Michael A.
Malley, Robert
Schwartz, Eric P.
CARBON_COPY Kreczko, Alan J.
Wolin, Neal S.

TEXT_BODY

Regarding the second issue Jamie raises, in discussion with Justice lawyers (Filppu) preparing a USG response last week, ay my suggestion they used language drawn from the report to Congress concerning the security situation in Haiti, i.e., that "a secure and stable environment is taking root" and that the "situation in Haiti is becoming generally secure and stable for Haitians rregardless of their political affiliation or viewpoint." They seemed to think this would be plenty adequate to draw the Cuba-Haiti distinction.

From: Baker, James E.
To: Halperin, Morton H.; Longoria, Michael A.; Malley, Robert; Rossin, Larry; Schwartz, Eric P.
CC: /R, Record at A1; Kreczko, Alan J.; Wolin, Neal S.
Subject: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 1994 10:25 AM

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED

Justice has identified a number of issues that could arise in the context of the Cuba/Hatian litigation this week that raise serious policy considerations. In order for litigators to best represent the government's legal view and preserve its policy options it is important that we provide guidance on the questions presented below as soon as possible. A follow-on lawyers meeting is scheduled for Wednesday.

1. Parole: The Haitian plaintiffs will likely ask for an order granting Haitians parity with Cuban migrants on parole decisions, i.e., parole for children, the elderly and medical hardships. This argument would likely be cast as an equal protection, due process, abuse of discretion claim.

NOTE: DOJ is not aware that the Administration has ever been asked, or considered parole concessions for Haitians. As a matter of law, parity is not required, although it is not clear how a five member CA panel would come out on this issue. Further, the scenarios are factually different -- Haiti is a democracy, Cuba is not, etc.

2. Voluntary Repatriation: Haitian plaintiffs will likely ask for an order similar to that issued by the Court of Appeals regarding Cuban migrants: no repatriation unless a migrant signs a form that such repatriation is voluntary.

NOTE: If policy-makers are considering, or are going to take, a different view, i.e., involuntary repatriation of Haitians, it would be useful for litigators to know now, so that they can prepare to distinguish the two groups and factual scenarios before the courts and be careful to preserve options if asked on the record, e.g., the Haitian case is distinguishable for among other reasons because we were offering safe haven from a regime whose days were numbered and therefore repatriation requires different analysis. As a matter of law, Justice believes involuntary repatriation is legally available and that we will ultimately win on the law if enjoined. It is also the lawyers' view that so long as this lawsuit is pending, more Haitians will not volunteer to return.

In the event, we were to get an injunction against involuntarily repatriating Haitians beyond the 14 Haitians already covered are we prepared to say to the court(s) that Haiti is in fact stable and safe in an effort to oppose? Are we considering moving to a policy of involuntary return? When? Are we prepared to repatriate before UNMIH. At what point will the sewage situation at GTMO dictate policy?

3. Request for a permanent injunction granting parole to all pregnant women.

4. Cuban plaintiffs may request an order permitting Cubans at GTMO with visas to come directly to the U.S. from GTMO.

5. Due Process and other Constitutional Rights: While litigators think the law is clear, if not necessarily the results, on the issues above, the question of migrant due process rights to a particular standard of conditions at GTMO is a tougher question. For example, do migrants have a DP right to a particular standard of medical care, or safety. That we are providing safe haven to migrants and are not holding them against their will, does not end the discussion as there is a body of law, which courts may choose to apply to GTMO, involving the conditions of persons who voluntarily put themselves in state custody. Further, some groups of migrants, such as children and unborn babies, are not in a position to exercise the types of choices that makes one's presence in GTMO voluntary. Bottom line: it is not likely at all that we will get the votes in the Court of Appeals or S.Ct. that the only rights that apply to migrants at

GTMO are non-enforceable standards under international law. Indeed, it is not clear this is a position Justice litigators are prepared to take as a matter of law. Clearly, there are remedies available other than brining migrants to the U.S., but planners should consider and anticipate a requirement to provide additional doctors, or facilities to improve conditions at GTMO.

6. 22 HIV Haitians. We understand that there remain 22 screened in HIV Haitians at GTMO. Lawyers consider it a matter of time, and short time given the availability of additional attorney access to GTMO, before these 22 sue for admission. Do we have plans to admit them?

As noted above, your feedback on these matters is greatly appreciated.

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 08 November 94 11:51
FROM Halperin, Morton H.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: RE: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Baker, James E.
Schwartz, Eric P.
CARBON_COPY Campbell, Kurt M.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Halperin, Morton H.
Longoria, Michael A.
Malley, Robert

TEXT_BODY

Re pregnant women. We think there are appropriate facilities in the camp now and we can improve them. I would not want to send a message to every women in the camp that this is the way to get to the US>

From: Schwartz, Eric P.
To: Baker, James E.
CC: /R, Record at A1; @DEMOCRACY - Democracy Affairs
Subject: FW: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 1994 11:00 AM

JAMIE: NOTE MY RESPONSES, THEN GIVE ME A CALL TO DISCUSS..

I THINK I NEED TO BE AT THE WEDNESDAY MEETING.

ERIC

From: Halperin, Morton H.
To: Schwartz, Eric P.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: FW: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 1994 10:45 AM

I assume that this are your issues and you will get back to the lawyers. If I were you I would insist on being at the meeting on Wednesday.

From: Baker, James E.
To: Halperin, Morton H.; Longoria, Michael A.; Malley, Robert; Rossin, Larry; Schwartz, Eric P.
CC: /R, Record at A1; Kreczko, Alan J.; Wolin, Neal S.

Subject: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]

Date: Tuesday, November 08, 1994 10:25 AM

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED

Justice has identified a number of issues that could arise in the context of the Cuba/Haitian litigation this week that raise serious policy considerations. In order for litigators to best represent the government's legal view and preserve its policy options it is important that we provide guidance on the questions presented below as soon as possible. A follow-on lawyers meeting is scheduled for Wednesday.

1. Parole: The Haitian plaintiffs will likely ask for an order granting Haitians parity with Cuban migrants on parole decisions, i.e., parole for children, the elderly and medical hardships. This argument would likely be cast as an equal protection, due process, abuse of discretion claim.

NOTE: DOJ is not aware that the Administration has ever been asked, or considered parole concessions for Haitians. As a matter of law, parity is not required, although it is not clear how a five member CA panel would come out on this issue. Further, the scenarios are factually different -- Haiti is a democracy, Cuba is not, etc.

Jamie: I think we do want to make a distinction here. With the Haitians, we believe that a durable solution is in sight. This justifies a different way of treating them. They have a democracy to return to. We do medevac some Haitians, but that is a different issue involving acute situations.

2. Voluntary Repatriation: Haitian plaintiffs will likely ask for an order similar to that issued by the Court of Appeals regarding Cuban migrants: no repatriation unless a migrant signs a form that such repatriation is voluntary.

NOTE: If policy-makers are considering, or are going to take, a different view, i.e., involuntary repatriation of Haitians, it would be useful for litigators to know now, so that they can prepare to distinguish the two groups and factual scenarios before the courts and be careful to preserve options if asked on the record, e.g., the Haitian case is distinguishable for among other reasons because we were offering safe haven from a regime whose days were numbered and therefore repatriation requires different analysis. As a matter of law, Justice believes involuntary repatriation is legally available and that we will ultimately win on the law if enjoined. It is also the lawyers' view that so long as this lawsuit is pending, more Haitians will not volunteer to return.

In the event, we were to get an injunction against involuntarily repatriating Haitians beyond the 14 Haitians already covered are we prepared to say to the court(s) that Haiti is in fact stable and safe in an effort to

oppose? Are we considering moving to a policy of involuntary return? When? Are we prepared to repatriate before UNMIH. At what point will the sewage situation at GTMO dictate policy?

Jamie: This is tricky. I would think, as a legal matter, we would want to preserve the government's option to not only involuntarily return, but to do so summarily -- without screening -- though as a matter policy I would urge against any practice that creates the possibility of return of bonafide refugees.

We have not yet confronted the policy issue of involuntary return with prior screening. As a matter of law and of policy, I think we should argue that involuntary return is justified. We can distinguish with the Cuba case by arguing that nothing prevents us from either being more generous than the law requires, or from making a generalized judgment about non-return to avoid the burden of individualized adjudications.

I think there is an important policy/legal issue here, however, and we may need to seek higher level guidance on it -- whether we want to take a position on the legality of direct return (i.e., return without screening) from Guantanamo.

3. Request for a permanent injunction granting parole to all pregnant women.

For Haitians? I say not necessarily. For Cubans? Speak to Mort.

4. Cuban plaintiffs may request an order permitting Cubans at GTMO with visas to come directly to the U.S. from GTMO.

Check with Mort.

5. Due Process and other Constitutional Rights: While litigators think the law is clear, if not necessarily the results, on the issues above, the question of migrant due process rights to a particular standard of conditions at GTMO is a tougher question. For example, do migrants have a DP right to a particular standard of medical care, or safety. That we are providing safe haven to migrants and are not holding them against their will, does not end the discussion as there is a body of law, which courts may choose to apply to GTMO, involving the conditions of persons who voluntarily put themselves in state custody. Further, some groups of migrants, such as children and unborn babies, are not in a position to exercise the types of choices that makes one's presence in GTMO voluntary. Bottom line: it is not likely at all that we will get the votes in the Court of Appeals or S.Ct. that the only rights that apply to migrants at GTMO are non-enforceable standards under international law. Indeed, it is not clear this is a position Justice litigators are prepared to take as a matter of law. Clearly, there are remedies available other than brining migrants to the U.S., but planners should consider and anticipate a

requirement to provide additional doctors, or facilities to improve conditions at GTMO.

Jamie: Need to explore this in greater detail.

6. 22 HIV Haitians. We understand that there remain 22 screened in HIV Haitians at GTMO. Lawyers consider it a matter of time, and short time given the availability of additional attorney access to GTMO, before these 22 sue for admission. Do we have plans to admit them?

Jamie: Awaiting a policy decision.

As noted above, your feedback on these matters is greatly appreciated.

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 08 November 94 13:14
FROM Baker, James E.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: RE: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Schwartz, Eric P.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

Eric,

I guess I need to be more direct. I am aware that all these issues raise legal and policy questions. The litigators are asking among other things whether policy makers have affirmatively considered these issues, and if not, whether and when you intend to do so. In the absence of affirmative decisions, the courts may dictate our policy to us, or more accurately, minimize our policy options. What is the policy timetable, for example, for deciding whether we are going to repatriate Haitians involuntarily? With or without screening?

It would be helpful to the Government's argument to be able to advise the court(s) that we intend to screen Haitians; or will not repatriate involuntarily; etc. To the extent such policy determinations alleviate the court's concern about how we are handling migrants at GTMO we may avoid broad sweeping TROs that prevent options. We may also avoid having to wait extended periods of time to win on the law, for as explained in the earlier E-mail, on all but the DP issue, we are confident that we will prevail on the law, but as a matter of policy we may not have the time or inclination to wait that long.

Why don't we meet to discuss. Can you suggest a time this late afternoon or evening? Thanks.

From: Schwartz, Eric P.
To: Baker, James E.
CC: /R, Record at A1; @DEMOCRACY - Democracy Affairs
Subject: FW: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 1994 11:00 AM

JAMIE: NOTE MY RESPONSES, THEN GIVE ME A CALL TO DISCUSS..

I THINK I NEED TO BE AT THE WEDNESDAY MEETING.

ERIC

From: Halperin, Morton H.
To: Schwartz, Eric P.
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: FW: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 1994 10:45 AM

I assume that this are your issues and you will get back to the lawyers. If I were you I would insist on being at the meeting on Wednesday.

From: Baker, James E.
To: Halperin, Morton H.; Longoria, Michael A.; Malley, Robert; Rossin, Larry; Schwartz, Eric P.
CC: /R, Record at A1; Kreczko, Alan J.; Wolin, Neal S.
Subject: GTMO Litigation: Issues [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 1994 10:25 AM

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED

Justice has identified a number of issues that could arise in the context of the Cuba/Haitian litigation this week that raise serious policy considerations. In order for litigators to best represent the government's legal view and preserve its policy options it is important that we provide guidance on the questions presented below as soon as possible. A follow-on lawyers meeting is scheduled for Wednesday.

1. Parole: The Haitian plaintiffs will likely ask for an order granting Haitians parity with Cuban migrants on parole decisions, i.e., parole for children, the elderly and medical hardships. This argument would likely be cast as an equal protection, due process, abuse of discretion claim.

NOTE: DOJ is not aware that the Administration has ever been asked, or considered parole concessions for Haitians. As a matter of law, parity is not required, although it is not clear how a five member CA panel would come out on this issue. Further, the scenarios are factually different -- Haiti is a democracy, Cuba is not, etc.

Jamie: I think we do want to make a distinction here. With the Haitians, we believe that a durable solution is in sight. This justifies a different way of treating them. They have a democracy to return to. We do medevac some Haitians, but that is a different issue involving acute situations.

2. Voluntary Repatriation: Haitian plaintiffs will likely ask for an order similar to that issued by the Court of Appeals regarding Cuban migrants: no repatriation unless a migrant signs a form that such repatriation is voluntary.

NOTE: If policy-makers are considering, or are going to take, a different view, i.e., involuntary repatriation of Haitians, it would be useful for litigators to know now, so that they can prepare to distinguish the two groups and factual scenarios before the courts and be careful to preserve options if asked on the record, e.g., the Haitian case is distinguishable for among other reasons because we were offering safe haven from a regime whose days were numbered and therefore repatriation requires different analysis. As a matter of law, Justice believes involuntary repatriation is legally available and that we will ultimately win on the law if enjoined. It is also the lawyers' view that so long as this lawsuit is pending, more Haitians will not volunteer to return.

In the event, we were to get an injunction against involuntarily repatriating Haitians beyond the 14 Haitians already covered are we prepared to say to the court(s) that Haiti is in fact stable and safe in an effort to oppose? Are we considering moving to a policy of involuntary return? When? Are we prepared to repatriate before UNMIH. At what point will the sewage situation at GTMO dictate policy?

Jamie: This is tricky. I would think, as a legal matter, we would want to preserve the government's option to not only involuntarily return, but to do so summarily -- without screening -- though as a matter policy I would urge against any practice that creates the possibility of return of bonafide refugees.

We have not yet confronted the policy issue of involuntary return with prior screening. As a matter of law and of policy, I think we should argue that involuntary return is justified. We can distinguish with the Cuba case by arguing that nothing prevents us from either being more generous than the law requires, or from making a generalized judgment about non-return to avoid the burden of individualized adjudications.

I think there is an important policy/legal issue here, however, and we may need to seek higher level guidance on it -- whether we want to take a position on the legality of direct return (i.e., return without screening) from Guantanamo.

3. Request for a permanent injunction granting parole to all pregnant women.

For Haitians? I say not necessarily. For Cubans? Speak to Mort.

4. Cuban plaintiffs may request an order permitting Cubans at GTMO with visas to come directly to the U.S. from GTMO.

Check with Mort.

5. Due Process and other Constitutional Rights: While litigators think the

law is clear, if not necessarily the results, on the issues above, the question of migrant due process rights to a particular standard of conditions at GTMO is a tougher question. For example, do migrants have a DP right to a particular standard of medical care, or safety. That we are providing safe haven to migrants and are not holding them against their will, does not end the discussion as there is a body of law, which courts may choose to apply to GTMO, involving the conditions of persons who voluntarily put themselves in state custody. Further, some groups of migrants, such as children and unborn babies, are not in a position to exercise the types of choices that makes one's presence in GTMO voluntary. Bottom line: it is not likely at all that we will get the votes in the Court of Appeals or S.Ct. that the only rights that apply to migrants at GTMO are non-enforceable standards under international law. Indeed, it is not clear this is a position Justice litigators are prepared to take as a matter of law. Clearly, there are remedies available other than brining migrants to the U.S., but planners should consider and anticipate a requirement to provide additional doctors, or facilities to improve conditions at GTMO.

Jamie: Need to explore this in greater detail.

6. 22 HIV Haitians. We understand that there remain 22 screened in HIV Haitians at GTMO. Lawyers consider it a matter of time, and short time given the availability of additional attorney access to GTMO, before these 22 sue for admission. Do we have plans to admit them?

Jamie: Awaiting a policy decision.

As noted above, your feedback on these matters is greatly appreciated.

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 10 November 94 14:26
FROM Sherman, David J.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT "Buck Slip" [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Mathiowetz, Nancy
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

[[BUCKNEW.DOC : 3657 in BUCKNEW.DOC]]

For your records so that you can have a copy of the memo format in your computer files.

Another task: please make one copy of the smaller set of Treasury papers ("A Fresh Start for the Poorest Countries"). Then do a cover memo (using the above as a model) to Sandy Berger from Bob Fauver.

Subject: Additional Institutions Review Papers.

Text: Attached are three papers on issues for the international economic institutions review that were passed out by Treasury at the Deputies meeting on Tuesday. Additional papers from Treasury were provided to you previously, as were copies of ones that we have done "in house." A complete listing of papers that have been drafted to date will accompany the agenda for our next meeting.

Have Bob initial; then take memo and copies of papers to Berger. Isn't this fun!
dave

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 10 November 94 14:12
**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** BUCKNEW.DOC

November 10, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO LAURA TYSON
SANDY BERGER
LEON FUERTH
JEFF GARTEN
KATY MCGINTY

JOAN SPERO
LARRY SUMMERS
RUFUS YERXA

FROM BOB FAUVER

SUBJECT INSTITUTIONS REVIEW -- PAPER ASSIGNMENTS

The following list of drafting assignments was agreed to at Tuesday morning's Deputy meeting on the review of the international institutions. These new papers should be approximately 5 -10 pages in length, and include: (1) a detailed statement of the problem being addressed; (2) the solution or solutions offered; and (3) the potential implications for the international institutions. The next Deputies meeting will be scheduled for the week following Thanksgiving. Papers should be circulated by Wednesday, November 23 if possible so that deputies can read them over the holiday. Please note that the lead drafter is responsible for coordinating with the reviewing agencies listed.

Each lead drafter is responsible for coordinating with the reviewing agencies listed below.

Paper Lead Drafter Reviewers

1. Post Chaos Fund Treasury
2. Education Treasury State/AID
3. Financial Markets Treasury NEC
4. New G-7 Financial Council NEC
5. Development Institutions Treasury NEC/State/AID
6. Environment OVP State
7. WTO USTR NEC
8. Labor State
9. AIDS State CEA
10. Technology CEA
11. Development -- health, hunger, (To be determined) infrastructure, etc.

cc: Bo Cutter

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 14 November 94 13:37
FROM Rossin, Larry
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: RE: [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Schwartz, Eric P.
CARBON_COPY Atkin, Timothy J.
Beers, Rand R.
Brown, Dallas
Campbell, Kurt M.
Clarke, Richard A.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Darragh, Sean J.
Halperin, Morton H.
Lindsey, Wanda
Longoria, Michael A.
Malley, Robert
Norman, Marcia G.
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Rossin, Larry
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Simon, Steven N.

TEXT_BODY

I concur. By the way, Nancy called me Saturday saying Tony was asking after the HIV memo. Did she ever reach you?

From: Schwartz, Eric P.
To: @GLOBAL - Global Affairs; @DEMOCRACY - Democracy Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: [UNCLASSIFIED]GTMO litigation
Date: Monday, November 14, 1994 12:52 PM

<<Attached File: HAITI78.DOC>>

TONY ASKED, IN A NOTE, TO OBTAIN INTERAGENCY CONCURRENCE PRIOR TO SENDING A MESSAGE TO POTUS ON THIS ISSUE. I DON'T KNOW IF POTUS NEEDS TO GET A MESSAGE ON THIS, BUT I HAVE SENT THE ATTACHED TO MIKE MYERS TO GET DOD CONCURRENCE.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 14 December 94 09:50
FROM Rossin, Larry
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: RE: HIV memo[UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Atkin, Timothy J.
Baker, James E.
Beers, Rand R.
Brown, Dallas
Campbell, Kurt M.
Clarke, Richard A.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Darragh, Sean J.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Halperin, Morton H.
Kreczko, Alan J.
Lennon, John E
Lindsey, Wanda
Longoria, Michael A.
Malley, Robert
Norman, Marcia G.
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Rossin, Larry
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Simon, Steven N.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

I also concur but I agree with Mort, since you are not seeking to use the Haitian case as a vehicle to gain the general policy shift set out in option 1, you might wait for the NGO sponsorship possibility to play out.

You might redo the para starting "Under this scenario..." (second para discussing option 2) slightly to make it clear to POTUS that you are talking about a general authority to make exceptions going beyond the Haiti case. I see this, but in the hurly-burly it might not be instantly apparent to POTUS. The recommendation could also so state -- "worldwide" or some such.

Finally, there is also a missing word in the first line of that paragraph -- "...you could also permit THE Attorney General..."

From: Halperin, Morton H.

To: Baker, James E.; Feinberg, Richard E.; Kreczko, Alan J.; Rossin, Larry;
Schwartz, Eric P.; @DEMOCRACY - Democracy Affairs; @GLOBAL - Global
Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: RE: [UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: Wednesday, December 14, 1994 09:34 AM

I concur. There is a "because" missing which I think I have added in all caps. One question, if we think we are going to get the sponsors, would it make sense to continue to delay this memo until we see and can tell the President how many, if any, need to be brought in under the waiver. In other words, we may not have to go to the President at all. Having waited so long, why not wait a bit longer and avoid making the President deal with the issue.

From: Schwartz, Eric P.
To: Baker, James E.; Feinberg, Richard E.; Kreczko, Alan J.; Rossin, Larry;
@DEMOCRACY - Democracy Affairs; @GLOBAL - Global Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: [UNCLASSIFIED]HIV MEMO: ANOTHER TRY
Date: Wednesday, December 14, 1994 09:09 AM

<<Attached File: HIVMEM.DOC>>

Apparently, there was some difficulty in transmitting the memo I sent you on this issue. Here is another try.

Please, your comments/concurrence asap -- Jamie, in particular.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 15 December 94 12:22

FROM Schwartz, Eric P.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT [UNCLASSIFIED]ABSOLUTELY LAST VERSION OF HIV MEMO

TO Atkin, Timothy J.
Baker, James E.
Beers, Rand R.
Brown, Dallas
Campbell, Kurt M.
Clarke, Richard A.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Darragh, Sean J.
Halperin, Morton H.
Kreczko, Alan J.
Lennon, John E
Lindsey, Wanda
Longoria, Michael A.
Malley, Robert
Norman, Marcia G.
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Rossin, Larry
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Simon, Steven N.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY

Here is the absolutely last version, I hope. I need concurrences/clearances from baker. I will send it through Dick Clarke.

Jamie:

Is what I've done, as an info memo, consistent with the Panetta meeting? I think it is, but the issue of the Haitians meeting the existing policy directive's public charge requirement was not discussed at that meeting, as it only came up recently when Justice told me that they think the GTMO Haitians (and maybe some in Haiti) could get sponsors.

[[HIVMEM.DOC : 3075 in HIVMEM.DOC]]

ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE

15 December 94 12:18

ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME

HIVMEM.DOC

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Haitian Refugee Processing: Endgame Issues and
HIV-Positive Refugees

Termination of In-country Refugee Processing in Haiti

At the time of the intervention, we stopped accepting applications for the in-country refugee processing program. However, we permitted U.S. resettlement for the some 1500 Haitians who were approved for refugee status during the period of military rule but who could not leave Haiti prior to the intervention. We took this action primarily because these Haitians had already been informed that they would be admitted to the United States and many took measures -- e.g., selling their belongings, quitting their jobs -- in reliance of our promise of U.S. resettlement.

HIV-positive Haitian Refugees and the Medical Exclusion

This decision still leaves 26 HIV-positive Haitians on Guantanamo Naval Base who were approved for refugee status at our processing ship in Jamaica last spring and summer but were not permitted entry when other Jamaica-approved refugees were accepted for admission. In addition, there remain in Haiti about 85 HIV-positive Haitians who were approved for refugee status in the in-country program prior to the intervention. These two groups of HIV-positive Haitians have been barred due to a medical exclusion in the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Waiver of the Exclusion

This exclusion may be waived for humanitarian, public interest or family unification reasons. However, a 1988 INS policy directive requires HIV-positive applicants to establish further that 1) the danger to the public health created by admission is minimal, 2) the possibility of the spread of the infection is minimal, and 3) there will be no cost incurred by any level of Government agency of the U.S. without prior consent of that Agency as a result of entry. The third prong of this test -- and the need to find sponsorship -- has prevented most HIV-positive refugees (including the Haitians) from gaining entry.

INS Proposal to Alter the Public Charge Requirement

The INS policy directive's sponsorship requirement is

discriminatory, as refugees, by virtue of their status, are by legislation exempt from public charge requirements. This includes refugees with diseases more costly than HIV. For this reason, INS -- with support from State, HHS and the National Office of AIDS Policy -- proposed earlier this year to modify its policy directive worldwide to eliminate the public charge requirement for HIV-positive refugees. INS estimates that this change would result worldwide in entry of less than 100 HIV-positive refugees each year (out of more than 100,000).

While the logic of the INS proposal is sound, implementing such a policy change in the present political climate could spur a backlash that might result in restrictive legislation, including legislation to impose public charge requirements on all refugees.

Alternatives to a Change in the Policy Directive

We have thus suggested that Justice/INS defer considering a change in its policy directive. Justice understands our position and does

not disagree. At the same time, however, the Attorney General intends to take action -- without changing the existing policy directive or its sponsorship requirement -- that will result in entry of the 26 Haitians on Guantanamo and could result in the entry of some number of other HIV-positive refugees in Haiti and elsewhere around the world.

In particular, Justice has now obtained guarantees of private sponsorship for each of the 26 Haitians, thus bringing them into conformity with the requirements of the policy directive. In addition, INS will be informing the 85 others in Haiti -- who have not been able to obtain private sponsorships -- that they will be given a limited time to file or perfect their waiver applications (after which they will cease to be valid).

Finally, in the absence of a change in the policy directive, the Attorney General is prepared to provide globally, and in exceptional circumstances, an exemption from the public charge requirement for approved HIV-positive refugees. Such a circumstance might include a refugee applicant in one of our in-country programs who would be at grave risk if forced to remain in his country of origin after being approved by INS.

Discussion

We have concurred with the Justice Department's course of action for several reasons.

The Guantanamo Haitians have been outside their country of origin for between five and seven months and were formally deemed to have

well-founded fears of persecution. Seeking to return a group of already-approved asylum-seekers would break new ground and would be quite controversial. To ensure basic fairness to these Haitians, the UNHCR would rightly press us to re-evaluate their cases prior to return. Such re-evaluation, as well as any attempt to return some or all of the Haitians, would come under a court challenge similar to that which we faced last year (and which result in the compelled admission of some 200 HIV-positive refugees).

An attempt to return the Guantanamo Haitians would also focus attention on the discriminatory aspect of the INS policy directive's public charge requirement. And a blanket decision to bar entry of HIV-positive Haitians who meet the existing waiver requirements would conflict with the decision to permit entry of the other Haitians approved for refugee status prior to the intervention.

Finally, we support the Attorney General's judicious use of discretion to provide an exemption to the public charge requirement in exceptional circumstances involving approved refugees. In the absence of a change in the policy directive, we believe that the Attorney General should nonetheless ensure that an applicant whom we have determined to be a refugee is not subjected to grave risks due to our unwillingness to consider entry.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 15 December 94 15:59
FROM Halperin, Morton H.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT Subject: RE: [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO Atkin, Timothy J.
Baker, James E.
Beers, Rand R.
Brown, Dallas
Campbell, Kurt M.
Clarke, Richard A.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Darragh, Sean J.
Halperin, Morton H.
Kreczko, Alan J.
Lennon, John E
Lindsey, Wanda
Longoria, Michael A.
Malley, Robert
Norman, Marcia G.
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Rossin, Larry
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Simon, Steven N.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

I think the memo is fine.

From: Schwartz, Eric P.
To: Baker, James E.; Kreczko, Alan J.; @DEMOCRACY - Democracy Affairs;
@GLOBAL - Global Affairs
CC: /R, Record at A1
Subject: [UNCLASSIFIED]ABSOLUTELY LAST VERSION OF HIV MEMO
Date: Thursday, December 15, 1994 12:22 PM

<<Attached File: HIVMEM.DOC>>

Here is the absolutely last version, I hope. I need concurrences/clearances from baker. I will send it through Dick Clarke.

Jamie:

Is what I've done, as an info memo, consistent with the Panetta meeting? I think it is, but the issue of the Haitians meeting the existing policy directive's public charge requirement was not discussed at that meeting, as it only came up recently when Justice told me that they think the GTMO Haitians (and maybe some in Haiti) could get sponsors.

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 20 December 94 15:01
FROM Chyba, Christopher F.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT [UNCLASSIFIED] language you requested
TO Spalter, Jonathan H.
CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE
TEXT_BODY

Jonathan,

The attached memo is in reply to your request for some language on the connection between foreign assistance and national security. We have not cleared this with anyone, so if you do use it, you should first check it with the appropriate NSC offices. I hope that it will be of some use to you.

Sorry this took as long as it did,

Chris

[[SPALTER.DOC : 3860 in SPALTER.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 20 December 94 14:55

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** SPALTER.DOC

Foreign Assistance and National Security

Foreign assistance contributes to the national security of the United States in both short- and long-term ways. The long-term ways are the harder to appreciate, because wars that don't break out are little noticed, and revolutions that don't occur don't get reported.

So let's talk first about the short-term contributions. Ukraine, for example, is shipping to Russia the nuclear warheads left behind on its soil when the Soviet Union collapsed, under a trilateral agreement between Ukraine, Russia, and the U.S. The Clinton Administration's ability to broker this deal relied in part on America's ability to help Ukraine through the difficult economic times it is facing after the breakup of the Soviet Union. Foreign

assistance is a crucial part of our relationship.

There are many examples like this. In the recent "Sapphire" operation, the United States bought half a ton of highly enriched uranium, put it into secure containers, and flew it out of Kazakhstan. In the wrong hands, that uranium could have been used to make atomic bombs. But now it is no longer at risk. That uranium will not be stolen by criminals, it won't be sold on the black market, and it won't be smuggled to backlash states whose governments would like to use it for terror or blackmail. Sapphire was possible because the United States had cultivated a diplomatic relationship with Kazakhstan, and because the United States spent the funds needed both to build that relationship and to make the operation happen. What's more, because the highly enriched uranium from Kazakhstan can be blended down into reactor fuel, the U.S. should recoup much of the cost of the uranium purchase.

The President has put into place a comprehensive strategy for improving the security of nuclear-weapons material worldwide. The Administration is working with Russia to bolster the security of weapons-usable material at a number of facilities. No one who saw the news stories last summer about plutonium smuggling could doubt the importance of these initiatives. The people of the United States are safer in a world with fewer nuclear states, with better security for nuclear storage sites, and--if it even needs to be said--without nuclear smuggling. Foreign assistance money is indispensable if we are to protect the American people against these threats.

Now let's go back to thinking about the longer-term. There are clear threats down the road for the people of the United States that foreign assistance spending is crucial to warding off. To cite just two specific examples, consider the threat of pandemic disease, or the potential loss to U.S. biotechnology posed by biodiversity loss. As the disease of AIDS illustrates, the United States is hardly immune to worldwide epidemics. Similarly, U.S. biotechnology, increasingly important to American food and health, will be hampered by biodiversity loss, which could cost us future drugs we can't yet even foresee. Our ability to address successfully these and similar long-term issues is strongly dependent on our modest levels of foreign assistance.

CFCHYBA/DRAFT/12.20.94

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 14 March 95 17:08
FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
SUBJECT March 13 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]
TO

Andreasen, Steven P.
Andricos, George M.
Aoki, Steven N.
Appel, Edward J.
Argarin, Jocelyn D.
Arnold, Gary W.
Atkin, Timothy J.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Benjamin, Daniel
Beyrle, John R.
Bieda, James M.
Blacker, Coit D.
Blakeman, Earle C.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boorstin, Robert O.
Boright, John
Bradley, Amelia J.
Branscum, Larry
Breeland, Jocelyn G
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Buzalko, Russ
Carter, Michael E.
Chyba, Christopher F.
Cicio, Kristen K.

Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.
Claussen, Eileen B.
Clements, William L.
Cleveland, Carolyn E.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Crispell, Thomas G.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darby, Melanie B.
Darnes, Victoria J.
Darragh, Sean J.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Edwards, Joan
Emery, Mary C.
Evans, Paul A.
Fauver, Robert E.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Daniel
Fried, Daniel
Froman, Michael B.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Funches, Christina L.
Gardner, Anthony
Gates, Brian K.
Genton, Regina A.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Grant, Kathleen M.
Gray, Wendy
Guekel, Kathi A.
Hahn, Keith D.
Hale, John E.
Hall, Wilma G.
Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Hammond, Cathy J.
Hammonds, Lisa W.
Harris, Elisa D.
Hawes, David J.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Herrington, David E.
Heslin, Sheila N.
Hilliard, Brenda I.

Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Hofmann, Stephen D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Indyk, Martin S.
Itoh, William H.
Jensen-Moran, Jeri L.
Jones, Steven R.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Koff, Alexander
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Laipson, Ellen B.
Leary, William H.
Lennon, John E
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Longoria, Michael A.
Lowry, Jay E.
Mack, Kathryn S.
Malley, Robert
Marmol, Madelyn P.
Marshall, Betty A.
Marshall, Dana M.
Martinez, Alejandro
Martin, Roger L.
Mathiowetz, Nancy
Stefan T. Mauzy
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Mislock, Raymond A.
Mitchell, Calvin A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Neil, M. Elise
Niemerski, Stephen
Niemerski, Matthew B.
Norman, Marcia G.
O'Loughlin, Katherine
Owen, Elisa J.

Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pease, Bruce E.
Peggins, John W.
Pifer, Steven K.
Pitman, James
Poneman, Daniel B.
Poppiti, Victoria L.
Porter, Gidell
Punke, Michael W.
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Realuyo, Celina B.
Jim Reed
Reed, George
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Rocha, Victor M.
Rose, Gideon G.
Ross, Thomas B.
Roth, Stanley O.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salveti, Lisa M.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, Sandra E.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Seeley, Charlotte P.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sherman, David J.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Spalter, Jonathan H.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Stephens, Kathleen D.
Stern, Jessica E.
Suettinger, Robert L.
Sullivan, Kathryn
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarantino, Frederick A.

Tenet, George J.
Marcel T. Thomas
Turner, Joe T.
Unrue, Michael M.
VanDam, Stacy L.
Van DeCar, Karen J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Wales, Jane
Wallack, Matthew D.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Wise, Jeffrey B.
Wise, William M.
Witkowski, Anne A.
Wolin, Neal S.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[313MCBRF.DOC : 4392 in 313MCBRF.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 14 March 95 17:7

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 313MCBRF.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release March 13, 1995

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

F01

The Briefing Room

12:35 P.M. EST

MR. MCCURRY: Okay. Happy Monday to you all, and welcome to the White House daily briefing.

Your first question, please, whoever would like to pose one.

Q Salinas. Where is he?

MR. MCCURRY: Where is Salinas. To quote the President, he's probably hanging out with Carmen San Diego at the moment. (Laughter.) The answer is, we don't know. President Salinas has traveled since he's been President of Mexico to the United States on three separate occasions. He has a valid general visitor's visa, which would allow him to travel as a private citizen. We don't have any record yet of him having entered the country. We have not had a report back to us from INS that he's been processed at any port of entry. Obviously, we're inquiring as to his whereabouts. To our knowledge, he has not contacted us regarding any intentions that he might have to remain in the United States, so we'll have to establish some contact with him, or at least INS will, to determine what his intentions are beyond the six-month period that he would be allowed to stay on the visa that he's currently traveling on.

Q Does his entire family --

Q Does the administration have an opinion if former President Salinas should choose to live in the United States for a period of time?

MR. MCCURRY: We'd have to have a discussion with him, as we normally would with any individual who would like to stay beyond the period in which he's allowed to stay on under the terms of the visa that he's traveling on.

Q Do his wife and children have valid visas for six months?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't have any information on family members that may or may not be with him.

Q Has the White House contacted the Mexican

governments for some clarification on this report that Zedillo and Salinas reached this agreement?

MR. MCCURRY: We have had some contact with the embassy here, and as we learn more details, I'll try to pass them on. But I don't have any readout.

Q If he does get in, is there any thought that he might be the new Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: I believe his interest is in pursuing an academic career. I'm not sure --

Q Isn't that job traditionally reserved for an academic?

MR. MCCURRY: It is, indeed. I'll determine whether his economic background might put him in the pool of candidates available. I doubt it. We do cast, as you know, though, consistent with our views on diversity, a very wide net.

Q Can I follow up? You said there has been contact between the U.S. and the Mexican government. What did they tell you?

MR. MCCURRY: I frankly, interrupted a call that an NSC staffer was just having with the embassy, so I don't have a full readout on that yet. But if we have any more details -- these are the details that I've got at this point. If we get anything more, we'll pass it on.

Q Mike, can we get an update in progress here?

Q Has he definitely left Mexico?

MR. MCCURRY: Calvin Mitchell just indicated that he's more than happy to continue to pursue this matter while we are on brief.

Q If the former president is in this country --haven't been told about it, how would that be?

MR. MCCURRY: As a private citizen, he's entitled to travel here on the visa that he has. He has a multiple entry visa. And as I say, he's been here three times that we're aware of since he served as President of Mexico. So that's -- the fact that he would be in the United States is not unusual and is -- wouldn't be inconsistent with the type of visa he has.

Q But you have no record of him.

MR. MCCURRY: We don't have a record. He has not -- the INS has not reported back to us yet, based on our inquiries, any indication of what his port of entry was or where he might be at this moment.

Q Mike, today is the deadline for the Justice Department to say whether they're going to appoint an independent counsel for Henry Cisneros. Have you received any word on that?

MR. MCCURRY: That's at 12:30 p.m. now.

Q And has the President decided whether or not he believes that Cisneros should stay on if the counsel --

MR. MCCURRY: As the Chief of Staff got that same question yesterday, I'll give the same answer the Chief of Staff did. We don't want to comment on this while it's under review by the Attorney General. That would be, in some sense, prejudicial.

Q We ran out of time, so I wasn't able to ask a follow-up. But it seems pretty straightforward. It's not the kind of thing that you have to wait and see whether there's a referral. You have in your mind -- you know one way or the other what your decision will be.

MR. MCCURRY: I don't think that's an accurate characterization. It depends on what manner is referred and what, if in fact, something is referred. We'll just have to wait and see what the Attorney General recommends.

Q Mike, the British government says that John Major has written a letter to President Clinton asking that he twist Gerry Adams's arm on the issue of decommissioning IRA weapons. Has the President received such a letter? What can you tell us about it?

MR. MCCURRY: The President has received a letter from the Prime Minister dated March 10th. We will be developing a response to the Prime Minister. The tone of the letter is fully consistent with our sense that there exists between the United States and the U.K. a warm and special relationship. It does refer to the issue of Gerry Adams's visit to the United States and it does reflect our determination, as well as the U.K.'s determination that there be forward movement in the peace process and that the issue of discussing decommissioning actually be translated into real actions and words. That would represent a step for in the peace process.

Q The United states favors, or wants to see the IRA take that step?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we are, as you know, we were satisfied that raising the issue of decommissioning within the talks was a step forward. And of course, we do want -- our concerns about disarmament are well known. That could contribute to deepening a furtherance of the peace process.

Q So Major is preaching to the choir in asking that the President twist Adams's arm on --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, there are -- I don't want to confirm -- it really would not be up to us to confirm the substance or tone of the letter beyond what I just described. I think I would leave that to the British.

Q Well that was the purpose of the letter, was it not?

MR. MCCURRY: The purpose of the letter, generally, I'd describe just reviewing the peace process and where things stand and how we can further and deepen the peace process that the United States clearly supports.

Q Who is Adams going to see when he comes here? Is he -- you said that, or we've been told that there's -- he's not going to have substantive meetings with President Clinton, that's it's basically a handshake. But who will he have meetings with in the administration?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll check on that. I'm not entirely certain that there have been any scheduled. He's been invited to be a guest at the reception for Prime Minister John Bruton. In that sense, he'll be a social guest of the President at the St. Patrick's Day reception Friday. Beyond that, I'm not aware at the moment of any planned meetings, but he has had contact in the past, I believe with the National Security Advisor, as well as other NSC staff members, and I'll see whether they plan any type of contact of that nature.

Q Mike, is the President happy with the way the Pentagon's gays in the military policy has been implemented over the past year?

MR. MCCURRY: He is. He knows that the Department of Defense believes the policy is working well. The Department has no intent of changing it. Both Secretary of Defense Perry and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Shalikashvili report

that military commanders in the field are satisfied with it, and the number of expulsions clearly is declining. So, based on that report from the Pentagon, we're satisfied that the policy is working well and we ought to proceed with it.

Q Does the President think that more military personnel should be punished for violating the ban, as there is clear evidence --

MR. MCCURRY: We believe that the Pentagon should

effectively implement the policy as it was designed, and they are clearly doing so.

Q Has the President telephoned, or tried to telephone John Major today or over the weekend?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll have to check and see. I know that beyond the letter that I've just described, there have been some attempts to have contact at the highest level, but I'll have to check and see if there was any effort over the weekend to have contact.

Q Mike, what's the latest on Dr. Foster's nomination? You had a meeting today with how Patsy Fleming, the AIDS Czar, with various groups in the Roosevelt Room to talk about Foster, but what's -- do you have any idea when he's going to actually get his hearings, and can you give us a status report?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't believe that there have been any hearings scheduled yet by the Senate, but we certainly hope that they will be scheduled as soon as possible. And Dr. Foster continues to meet with various groups that are supportive of his nomination. We continue to make the case for his nomination on the Hill, and it is a strong and persuasive one, and we're satisfied that as the Senate exercises its advice and consent role, they'll see the merit of the appointment, see his extraordinary record in its full context, and they will proceed to confirmation.

Q The reaction to Phil Gramm saying that he will do his most, including filibuster, to kill this nomination?

MR. MCCURRY: His remarks are unfortunate, because they indicate that, based at least on the issue of choice, he is willing to use that rather extreme view as a way of blocking a nomination that could do so much to end teenage pregnancy, a subject to which Dr. Foster has devoted most of his professional career. So it would be unfortunate if extremists in the Senate took a view on choice, made it a litmus test and prevented the nomination from going forward on that basis.

Q Senator Gramm said that his opposition was based on the issue of Dr. Foster's credibility, not choice.

MR. MCCURRY: I've read the transcript very carefully, what he said, and his opposition was based in part on the fact, simply that Dr. Foster had performed abortions, and I suggest you check the transcript.

Q Mike, The Post yesterday had a major story of possible connections between high government officials in Mexico and drug-trafficking, and that the U.S. has told the Mexican government. Can you confirm that?

MR. MCCURRY: I'll have to check into that. I saw the

story, and I think there have been some contacts related to former President Salinas, but I'll have to check and see what contacts we've had on that subject.

Q It wasn't clear to me this morning whether Mr. Deutch will have to go through any kind of additional vetting process, or does his nomination get sent up right away?

MR. MCCURRY: We are checking on that now. He's been through a confirmation process twice during the course of the current administration, most recently when he was confirmed as Deputy Secretary of Defense last year, so most of the material and background work on him is relatively current, and was in the hands of the Senate fairly recently. But whatever additional information is necessary, we will gather prior to sending the nomination to the Hill, but we believe we can do that rather quickly.

Q Why did the President decide to make the CIA Director Cabinet level?

MR. MCCURRY: The President believes that elevating the position of Director of Central Intelligence to Cabinet rank will help bring the intelligence-gathering function to the table as foreign policy is discussed within the White House and within the administration broadly. It is a reflection of the President's view that in the new world that we live in, the information that we need to make the right decisions become very, very important. And Dr. Deutch, as someone who will be the chief analyst of that intelligence information, will be able to contribute that perspective to the discussions underway. Even though he will not play a policy-making role as a member of the national security team, he will be at the table as someone who has got the best available facts and the best available analysis, which will be critical as the administration addresses the challenges America

faces in this new world.

Q Who convinced the President of this, and when did he change his mind?

MR. MCCURRY: The President -- the question of what role information-gathering can play in foreign policy discussions has been a subject of not only debate in foreign policy circles, but has certainly been a point of discussion within the administration. And the President does feel that the Cabinet rank can attach significance to the intelligence function within foreign policy deliberations. The exact point at which I believe the President indicated his willingness to elevate the DCI to Cabinet rank was Saturday as the announcement was made.

Q As a condition of Deutch taking the job?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not aware -- I'm not 100 percent confident that this question actually arose in the President's conversation with Dr. Deutch. I think it was raised during the day on Saturday.

Q Does this change his salary in any way by being a Cabinet rank office?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know the answer to that. I'll have to check on that.

Q The President has been criticized for not seeing the CIA Director in the morning, regularly, on any basis during the week and so forth. He has no regular meetings with him.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, the President gets a daily briefing from his National Security Advisor, which is consistent with past practices here at the White House. I suspect, given the President's relationship with Dr. Deutch, that he will see the Director of Central Intelligence, once confirmed, on a fairly regular basis.

Q It wasn't clear from what you said about efforts to reach John Major. Are you trying to reach him by phone or have you been unable to, or is he not taking the call?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, I'll check on that. As I say, we've had correspondence with him, and I'm not certain whether or not they've had trouble connecting. I do know that the President looks forward to the Prime Minister's upcoming visit. We expect him here in early April for what will be good discussions on a range of matters.

Q What was the reason Mr. Deutch gave in the first place for turning down the job?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't want to get into that. If he feels like he would like to address it, it would be appropriate to address that question to him.

Q Mr. Mitchell has returned. Did he bring Mr. Salinas with him?

MR. MCCURRY: What news, Calvin?

Q The President's plane --

Q The baseball strike is over.

MR. MCCURRY: Struck out, huh?

Q April fools.

MR. MCCURRY: -- 0 for 3 -- says we're -- mostly we'll have to get more information as we come along. We don't have any readout on the conversations we've had so far.

Q Is there any concern that he could be missing; that his plane went down somewhere? I mean, what's -- (laughter) --

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't heard any concerns of that nature expressed.

Q Then somebody --

Q Is it realistic to assume, though, that the former President of Mexico would come to the United States without informing anyone in the United States government of his travel plans?

MR. MCCURRY: I think that is realistic to assume, because I believe that happened at least on one occasion prior.

Q Depends on the level of haste, you think? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: I don't want to speculate.

Q Time is -- since time was of the essence here?

MR. MCCURRY: I've --

Q Is he wanted in Mexico?

MR. MCCURRY: Not that I'm aware of, no.

Q Is he wanted here?

MR. MCCURRY: Not that I'm aware of.

Any other questions? We're sort of petering out.

Q What's the significance of that green M&M on the edge of the podium?

MR. MCCURRY: The significance -- it's the one little bit of bait that's put out there to see if I will tempt myself with a chocolate.

Q What was the prior occasion?

MR. MCCURRY: Prior occasions that he's been here? I'd have to check. He gave a lecture in Texas at one point. I'm doing that from memory, Gene, but I'd have to go and check the other times he's been here.

Q He has a general visitor's visa. And we were unaware of his presence here?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes. At least that one other occasion.

All right, thank you everybody.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 12:50 P.M.

EST

#30-03/13

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Eric Schwartz to Timothy Atkin, et al., re: WOMEN'S CONFERENCE - COMMENTS ASAP (10 pages)	03/22/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail - Record (Sept 94 - Sept 97) ([AIDS and Global...])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/23/1994 - 04/13/1995]

2007-1550-F
ke2056

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Eric Schwartz to Eileen Claussen, re: WOMEN'S CONFERENCE - COMMENTS ASAP (10 pages)	03/22/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail - Record (Sept 94 - Sept 97) ([AIDS and Global...])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/23/1994 - 04/13/1995]

2007-1550-F
ke2056

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Robert Bell to Eric Schwartz, re: WOMEN'S CONFERENCE - COMMENTS ASAP (10 pages)	03/22/1995	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail - Record (Sept 94 - Sept 97) ([AIDS and Global...])
OA/Box Number: 590000

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/23/1994 - 04/13/1995]

2007-1550-F
ke2056

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

M S M a i l

DATE-TIME 13 April 95 16:13

FROM Wozniak, Natalie S.

CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT April 13 McCurry Press Briefing [UNCLASSIFIED]

TO

Andreasen, Steven P.
Andricos, George M.
Aoki, Steven N.
Appel, Edward J.
Argarin, Jocelyn D.
Arnold, Gary W.
Atkin, Timothy J.
Atlas, Edwin L.
Baker, Jane E.
Baker, James E.
Bakke, Kyle D.
Baldwin, Kenneth
Battenfield, Pat
Beardsley, Tyler S.
Beers, Rand R.
Bellamy, Ralph C.
Bell, Robert G.
Benjamin, Daniel
Beyrle, John R.
Bieda, James M.
Blacker, Coit D.
Blakeman, Earle C.
Blieberger, Marion H.
Blinken, Antony J.
Bolinski, Charlene C.
Boorstin, Robert O.
Boright, John
Bradley, Amelia J.
Branscum, Larry
Breeland, Jocelyn G
Bresnahan, Gary E.
Broadway, Jamuna
Brown, Dallas
Bruton, Robert G.
Bryan, Lloyd D.
Buzalko, Russ
Carter, Michael E.
Chyba, Christopher F.
Cicio, Kristen K.

Clark, Bronya
Clarke, Richard A.
Claussen, Eileen B.
Cleveland, Carolyn E.
Cooper, Kathleen H.
Cressey, Roger W.
Crispell, Thomas G.
Daniel, Patty A.
Danvers, William C.
Darby, Melanie B.
Darnes, Victoria J.
David Myles M.
Deshazer, Macarthur X.
Dimel, Marsha L.
Dohse, Fred J.
Dragone, Karen D.
Dupuy, Shawn L.
Edwards, Joan
Emery, Mary C.
Evans, Paul A.
Fauver, Robert E.
Feinberg, Richard E.
Ficklin, John W.
Flessas, Daniel
Fried, Daniel
Froman, Michael B.
Fuerth, Leon S.
Funches, Christina L.
Gardner, Anthony
Gates, Brian K.
Genton, Regina A.
George, Christopher
Gerstner, Christina L.
Gorsuch, Robert P.
Grant, Kathleen M.
Gray, Wendy
Guekel, Kathi A.
Hahn, Keith D.
Hale, John E.
Hall, Wilma G.
Halperin, Morton H.
Hamilton, Roy A.
Hammond, Cathy J.
Hammonds, Lisa W.
Harmon, Joyce A.
Harris, Elisa D.
Hawes, David J.
Hawkins, Ardenia R.
Herrington, David E.
Heslin, Sheila N.

Hilliard, Brenda I.
Hill, Roseanne M.
Hilty, JoAnne M.
Hofmann, Stephen D.
Houck, Baerbel K.
Hunerwadel, Joan S.
Indyk, Martin S.
Itoh, William H.
Jensen-Moran, Jeri L.
Jones, Steven R.
Joshi, M. Kay
Kelly, Sandra L.
Kerr, Andrew S.
Kerrick, Donald L.
Koff, Alexander
Kreczko, Alan J.
Kyle, Robert D.
Laipson, Ellen B.
Leary, William H.
Lennon, John E
Lindsey, Wanda
Litwak, Robert C.
Longoria, Michael A.
Lowry, Jay E.
Mack, Kathryn S.
Malley, Robert
Marmol, Madelyn P.
Marshall, Betty A.
Marshall, Dana M.
Martinez, Alejandro
Martin, Roger L.
Mathiowetz, Nancy
Stefan T. Mauzy
Maxfield, Nancy H.
Mazzuchi, Anthony D.
McIntyre, Stuart H.
Merchant, Brian
Miller, Matthew E.
Millison, Cathy L.
Mislock, Raymond A.
Mitchell, Calvin A.
Mitsler, Elaine M.
Miyaoka, Lester H.
Moody, Angelyn D.
Moore, Lori A.
Neil, M. Elise
Niemerski, Stephen
Niemerski, Matthew B.
Norman, Marcia G.
O'Loughlin, Katherine

Owen, Elisa J.
Parco, Jim E.
Gwyn M. Parker
Parramore, Carl W.
Parris, Mark R.
Pease, Bruce E.
Peggins, John W.
Pifer, Steven K.
Pitman, James
Poneman, Daniel B.
Poppiti, Victoria L.
Porter, Gidell
Punke, Michael W.
Quinn, Mary E.
Ramsay, Martha S.
Realuyo, Celina B.
Jim Reed
Reed, George
Rice, Susan E.
Richardson, Craig
Rocha, Victor M.
Rose, Gideon G.
Ross, Thomas B.
Roth, Stanley O.
Roundtree, Beverly J.
Salvetti, Lisa M.
Sanborn, Daniel R. K.
Satterfield, David M.
Saunders, John W.
Saunders, Richard M.
Schifter, Richard
Schmidt, John R.
Schmidt, Sandra E.
Schwartz, Eric P.
Sculimbrene, Thomas A.
Seaton, James B.
Seeley, Charlotte P.
Sens, Andrew D.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sevigny, Theodore T.
Sherman, David J.
Sigler, Ralph
Simon, Steven N.
Simons, James R.
Spalter, Jonathan H.
Stauffer, Helen L.
Stephens, Kathleen D.
Stern, Jessica E.
Sterns, Crayton L.
Suettinger, Robert L.

Sullivan, Kathryn
Sulser, Jack A.
Tarantino, Frederick A.
Tarullo, Daniel K.
Tenet, George J.
Marcel T. Thomas
Turner, Joe T.
Unrue, Michael M.
Van DeCar, Karen J.
Van Tassel, David S.
Veit, Katherine M.
Vershbow, Alexander R.
Wadsworth, Valon J.
Wales, Jane
Wallack, Matthew D.
Walsh, Helen C.
Ward, JoAnn X.
Weber, Paul A.
Wilhelm, Richard J.
Wilson, Marilyn E.
Wise, William M.
Witkowsky, Anne A.
Wolin, Neal S.
Woolston, Ann E.
Wooton, Kevin B.
Wozniak, Natalie S.
Wright, Allison M.

CARBON_COPY NO CC's on THIS MESSAGE

TEXT_BODY [[4-13MCBF.DOC : 4169 in 4-13MCBF.DOC]]

**ATTACHMENT
FILE DATE** 13 April 95 16:11

**ATTACHMENT
FILE NAME** 4-13MCBF.DOC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

Immediate Release April 13, 1995

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MIKE MCCURRY

F01

The Briefing Room

1:25 P.M. EDT

MR. MCCURRY: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the White House, and this is the daily briefing. And having no initial pronouncements, I will entertain your questions.

Q What did the President say today? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: On which subject? He's been quite voluble today, so far.

Q Oh, politics.

MR. MCCURRY: Politics. He didn't say anything about -- he said there will be plenty of time for politics in 1996. You might -- the way it works here in the United States of America, Terry, we have -- every four years, we have presidential elections. And according to the calendar I keep on my desk, 1996 will be the presidential election year. That would be next year.

Q So no thinking about politics now?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we think about it, but we don't do a lot about it. (Laughter.)

Q What do you do --

Q Do you want to revise that?

MR. MCCURRY: All right, let's try another one. That was a dry hole. (Laughter.)

Q Would you like to revise and extend?

Q If there are no politics in this interview, why are they showing a big chunk of it on "Inside Politics"?

MR. MCCURRY: You'll have to ask CNN. We just sit there and answer the best -- questions the best we can.

Q Mike, didn't the President address --

MR. MCCURRY: And then they decide what's news.

Q -- didn't the President address the tax pledge issue?

MR. MCCURRY: He was asked about that, yes. I'm not going to scoop CNN, but his answer was one that you might well imagine he'd give.

Q Mike, are we threatening new tariffs against Japan on trade?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we've been in discussion for over 18 months with Japan on the subject of imbalances in trade. We've made progress on some issues, but we're very concerned about some of their practices in the auto sector. And we believe that they keep competitive foreign products out of the Japanese market. And we continue to raise that issue with them. We've been negotiating intensely with the Japanese. We will continue to do so. We believe that resolving these imbalances through negotiation is the best route to go. But if that fails, we will have to consider other options, and other options are available.

Q But is this something new? I mean, you've been negotiating for sometime, but are you actually setting some sort of -- I don't want to use the word "ultimatum" -- something along the lines of a demand for specific performance by a certain time?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we have to -- as I say, we have to consider other options that would be available, failing a resolution of these matters through negotiation. And you can well expect that the President's economic advisors, looking ahead, do have to begin thinking of other options.

Q Well, have they specifically recommended or come up with a list of options?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, they have been thinking about options, and those who have been working on this both at USTR, Commerce, Treasury, other economic offices, as well as the NEC here, can tell you more about it. But they are not -- not unpredictable. You're very familiar with the way our trade laws function and what would be required, absent a negotiated agreement.

Q What about a date?

MR. MCCURRY: A date?

Q A date at which -- a point those options would be considered or imposed.

MR. MCCURRY: The deadlines and the schedule for negotiations in the five baskets of the framework I think are fairly well-known.

Q Reports coming out of Russia indicate that the Russians are beginning to conduct what they hope will be a fast and apparently a quite brutal mopping-up operation in Chechnya, an effort to try to get the hostilities over with or died down by the time of the big multi-power visit there in May. Is the administration concerned about this, and is the President giving any thought to withholding his attendance as a result of this campaign?

MR. MCCURRY: The administration is quite concerned about this, and it was raised by the Deputy Secretary of State on his most recent visit to Moscow. You can check in with them. They gave a fairly full report on our expressions of concern and the President's concern about the operations in Chechnya.

Q Does it raise the possibility that it might reach a point where the President would find it intolerable to go and stand shoulder to shoulder with Mr. Yeltsin celebrating an Allied victory over brutality if it there had just been a horrible chapter of it nearby?

MR. MCCURRY: The President is going to Russia with other Western leaders who participated on the coalition that defeated Nazism in World War II and to commemorate the sacrifice of many Russians in World War II.

Q Be a little ironic --

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not aware of any change in his plans at the moment.

Q And you'd be one of the first to know.

Q Mike, since the situation on auto and auto parts with the Japanese has been so in terms of -- (inaudible) -- does the President believe that the possibility of -- (inaudible) -- would help our relationship to break through, help U.S. interests, or is he concerned about the harm to the relationship?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we have a broadbased relationship with Japan that deals not only on economic issues and issues important to international commerce, but also reflects our cooperation on security issues, our cooperation on global issues, such as U.N. peacekeeping, environmental protection, the work we do together to support the Middle East peace process. We have a broad agenda with

Japan, but it is clear that to enjoy the full benefits of that relationship, there must be progress in the economic sphere, and that's what the trade talks have been aimed to achieve.

Q Mike, what's the President's position on taking away benefits to legal immigrants?

MR. MCCURRY: That's what -- we're looking at various proposals that come through the Congress for welfare reform. There's a discussion of some proposed or suggested modifications in the House-passed bill today that represent some steps in the right direction. But we'll have to see a lot more. They've made a lot of progress. If you think that they started with the idea of putting poor children in orphanages, they've been moving in the right direction as they consider and deliberate on the bill, but we'll have to see what type of legislation actually emerges in the Senate. There's been no measure introduced yet in the Senate. There have been some suggestions from Republican governors, and we are quite anxious to see what type of measure they fashion.

Q Mike, back on Chechnya for a moment. What does the President think about officials of the -- (inaudible) -- government using his name to justify the -- (inaudible) -- of their attacks on the Chechens?

MR. MCCURRY: There's nothing that he has said nor has the administration said that would justify the taking of innocent life or the destruction of private property. We've made very clear our concerns about the operation in Chechnya and have suggested that it would be very wise for the Russians to try to work with the people of Chechnya to build a spirit of reconciliation that can bring this damaging conflict to a conclusion as well.

Q Has he asked or the United States asked that they stop using his name to justify --

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not certain that -- I'm not certain that they have done that. We've made our views to them quite clear. And they know of our concern and know how deeply troubling aspects of this conflict have been, not only to the United States but to other Western governments as well.

Q Mike, has the President spoken to Yeltsin on the telephone recently or has he sent any written communication to Yeltsin on this subject?

MR. MCCURRY: He has not, as far as I'm aware, spoken to him by telephone. I have to check on written communications. We've had a series of high-level exchanges with the Russian

Federation in preparation for the summit. I believe that's been the venue for our communication with the Russian government, but maybe someone at the NSC can check a little further on whether there's been any correspondence.

Q I'd like to go back to the Japan question for just a second. It was suggested in the stories about it this morning that the U.S. might be using the threat of sanctions as a bluffing tool, an effort to force concessions. Is the President, just for the record, willing to impose sanctions upon Japan if a satisfactory agreement is not reached?

MR. MCCURRY: The President is willing to proceed as

required by law and suggested by law to consider other options if there is a failure in negotiation as I indicated earlier.

Q Is he willing to carry out those options?

MR. MCCURRY: Oh, he's willing to proceed to consideration of other options, and failing a negotiated solution to our concerns and to what must be done to address trade imbalances, he is prepared to act if necessary.

Q Mike, you mentioned the other -- you often talk about the -- of the relationship with Japan, and particularly in this 50th anniversary year there have been all these sensitivities. Has there been any thought given to the fact that this trade dispute, now that you're going to get tough, is going to spill over into some of the other relationships, especially considering it's such a sensitive year?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe I answered earlier by indicating that the full benefits of an expanded portfolio of cooperation with Japan can't be fully appreciated by either government and the peoples of Japan or the United States if there is not progress in those economic issues that remain unresolved.

Q Mike, has there been any change in the situation with the Russians building the two reactors for Iran? Is there any movement on that at all or is that still -- they're going to go ahead with that?

MR. MCCURRY: There continues to be a lot of discussion about that, but I'm not aware of any change in the posture of the Russian Federation on that question.

Q Speaking of Iran, how close are you to announcing any new sanctions on Iran?

MR. MCCURRY: I haven't checked on that in the last several days, so I'm not aware of any movement in the last several days. The matter is left where I think we told you it was before --some options were being considered for review by the President. I'm not aware of him having reviewed those yet, but --

Q Is that a backburner issue, I mean, or is that --

MR. MCCURRY: That is not a backburner issue. Our concern about the behavior of the Iranian government and its activities is a source of deep concern to us and one that prompts us to employ the strategy of containment, which you're familiar with.

Q Mike, a question on AIDS policy. Why did AIDS Czar Fleming stop mandatory AIDS education in the government? And do you have any reaction to the group, ACT-UP, today calling on her resignation for that change?

MR. MCCURRY: No, I don't have any reaction. And you'll have to check with them on why they changed the policy.

Q Mike, do you have anything to say about The Washington Post story that Secretary of Commerce Brown is both a slum lord and may have misstated the location of his holdings in the --

MR. MCCURRY: A curious question, because I believe they were mining territory that The Los Angeles Times had looked at.

Q I'm trying to share the credit --

MR. MCCURRY: The Secretary of Commerce has addressed that question in a statement.

Q Mike, there is a report today that Roberta Achtenberg is going to be leaving the administration to run for Mayor of San Francisco. Do you have anything on that?

MR. MCCURRY: I have just seen some material that her office has developed, so you might want to check with her office.

Q Mike, on the women going to Iraq to seek the release of their husbands, do you have any indication that their appeal will be more positively responded to than the efforts by the United States?

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we continue to hope for the prompt

release on humanitarian grounds of two innocent Americans who are in Iraq now through no fault of their own. We believe they should be released promptly through executive clemency, and we hope that will happen as promptly as possible.

Q Would you urge third parties, NGOs and such to provide humanitarian assistance to Iraq in exchange for their release?

MR. MCCURRY: I believe a number of governments and others have spoken out in hopes that these two innocent Americans might soon be released.

Q Mindful of the answer you gave to Mr. Hunt's question at the top of the briefing, have you any comment on the latest entrant into the presidential race on the Republican side?

MR. MCCURRY: No.

Q Well, you do, obviously --

MR. MCCURRY: There's so many of them now I can't keep them all straight.

Q Could we tick them off for you? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: No.

Q Let's play a word association game.

MR. MCCURRY: Nineteen ninety-six. Come back next year.

We'll have plenty of time for that.

Q Anything on the security resolutions that you got -
- recommendations --

MR. MCCURRY: Nothing new. I believe it's still where we left it earlier in the week.

Q Do you have anything? (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: Look at this. There is so much paper and so few answers, you know? Look at that. (Laughter.)

Q How about this one -- this morning we asked about if the administration has a position on the legislation or the lawsuits being filed on transracial adoption.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, we do. Accelerating adoption has been

a very real source of interest for this President. He believes that that's important to do. And he believes that the guidelines necessary to implement the legislation passed last year should be brought to him promptly, as I believe they are in the process of doing. And those should be complete by the end of the month. And we believe that consistent with the best interests of the child, they ought to proceed with implementing the legislation as passed.

Q Does the White House worry about the possibility of a new mass exodus from Cuba if relations deteriorate?

MR. MCCURRY: No, we're satisfied that the Cuban migration agreement, which we've reached with the government of Cuba, provides a satisfactory avenue for addressing questions of migration.

Q What's the President doing all day, Mike?

MR. MCCURRY: He's mostly been talking to CNN, I think. No, he's been --

Q Well, let's go back --

MR. MCCURRY: -- he worked with his foreign policy advisors earlier in the day on Russia and other subjects, spent some time with his economic staff. He's having lunch with the Vice President. He has an active day in anticipation of a holiday weekend.

Q He has an active day --

Q When is he leaving tomorrow?

MR. MCCURRY: Early, we hope.

Q Could we ask that you put out a list now of his guests at Camp David this weekend -- save us a whole lot of work?

MR. MCCURRY: Consistent with my practice, we don't do lists of the Clinton's social guests.

Q Are they having guests?

MR. MCCURRY: I don't know.

Q There's a growing number of flat tax proposals out there, many by presidential contenders. What is the White House view on having just a simple flat tax?

MR. MCCURRY: The concept of a flat tax initially sounds pretty attractive. It sounds like it would be simpler; it would be easier for Americans to understand. The problem is, as you begin to do the math on flat tax proposals, you very quickly see that in order to make them revenue neutral, which most proponents call for, you have to do it in a way that could result in substantial, if not massive, tax increases for the middle income and those at the lower end of the economic scale, and massive, and in some senses, unconscionable, tax cuts for the very wealthiest. So we would want to look very, very carefully at any proposal of that nature and see what type of measure is actually advanced.

Q Can I ask a question? Why -- I can understand why --

MR. MCCURRY: Can you? Sure. (Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: Will I give you a straightforward answer? (Laughter.)

Q I understand why you would say that a tax raise would be a hardship on people who didn't make a lot of money. But why would it be unconscionable to give money back to people -- money that they themselves earned?

MR. MCCURRY: Because during the 1980s, as we struggled with the limited resources available to government, huge tax cuts were given to the wealthiest in our society, while the rest of us got left out; and to move first in the process of reforming tax, making it simpler, or trying to provide tax relief through some mechanism to providing it to the wealthiest, who already enjoyed enormous tax relief in the 1980s, is unconscionable. How about some tax relief for the middle income? That's what the President wants. He wants to cut taxes for those who are working hard, who are already struggling to make ends meet. And we'd prefer to do that first. It seems more conscionable to do that first, and then to take care of the rich later on.

Q Mike, isn't it the case though that the reason why these tax cuts seem to affect the rich so much is that the rich's taxes are so much higher --

MR. MCCURRY: They are.

Q -- that you can't give large tax cuts to people who are not paying large taxes.

MR. MCCURRY: That's correct, because we have in our country something called progressive taxation, which is still

--represents, in some measure, the majority thinking about the way taxation ought to be done.

Q Well doesn't it also mean though when you talk about giving large tax breaks to the rich, that it's a bit of a illogical problem because it's hard to give large tax breaks to people who don't pay large taxes?

MR. MCCURRY: It is true that the wealthiest pay more in taxes because they earn more, and thus, pay more in taxes. The question is, at what type of rates are you talking about and whether or not those tax cuts or taxation itself is progressive or regressive.

Q And also, how does it get to be that you talk about giving when you speak of tax cuts --

Q Is this a theoretical debate?

Q -- as a matter of giving -- the government giving something -- when people keep their own money, they're not being given anything -- (laughter) --

Q I want to come back to the original question, which is --

Q I'm not rich. (Laughter.)

Q I want to come back to the original question, which is why is it that somehow it is -- it becomes unconscionable? Are you saying it in the context of taking away more money from poor people --

MR. MCCURRY: No, in the context of massive budget --

Q -- or are you just saying just the basic idea of giving back money, the people who make it?

MR. MCCURRY: In the context of massive budget deficits -- let's remember that -- we're dealing with, as much as we have done to try to reduce deficits, we are still dealing in an environment in which the government is taking in less than the government is spending. And so to try to provide tax relief to those who already enjoyed enormous sums in tax relief seems less fair than to concentrate on providing within the context of budget deficit reduction tax relief to middle income families who are already facing tough times. That's what the President thinks is fair. That's what the philosophy is that lies behind the Middle Class Bill of Rights. We want Congress to go back to that concept first rather than dreaming up new schemes to cut taxes for the

wealthiest in our society.

Q I'd like to go to a less taxing issue. Ann Compton has a presentation to make.

MS. COMPTON: We have brought you a present from Mrs. Clinton's --

MR. MCCURRY: Uh oh!

MS. COMPTON: -- excellent adventure in Asia. This is a sutkeri samagri. We wanted -- on behalf of those who -- of your flock who went -- Gene and Nancy, Todd, Claire and Win -- we wanted you to know that it wasn't all just riding elephants and dancing camels, that we thought of you and Debra all through our trip. And we're hoping that you would not have baby number three while we were gone.

Now, we saw lots of babies. We went to Mother Teresa's orphanages. And we went to the diarrhea hospital in Bangladesh. (Laughter.) And every step of the way we thought of you, especially when we got to Katmandu, where almost all babies are born at home. Now we know that you don't have a lot of time to get away from here. We thought we would bring for you one of these little home delivery kits, home birthing kits from Bangladesh. What this has in it is --

MR. MCCURRY: Whatever this has got in it, it ain't enough. (Laughter.) That much I know already. (Laughter.)

MS. COMPTON: The problem in many of these countries is that they don't have sanitary conditions for birthing the baby at home. And a Nepalese custom is that the --

MR. MCCURRY: Let the record who that Ms. Santos is getting quite nervous down here in the front of the room. (Laughter.)

MS. COMPTON: We brought you one, too. The umbilical cord is cut for good luck up against a coin, which is not clean, and a lot of babies die from tetanus. So this includes -- Mrs. Clinton gave us this -- it includes a mat to put out, soap to wash your hands, and a little plastic button against which you will cut the umbilical cord. And full instructions -- they are all in Nepalese. (Laughter.)

But we missed you, and we're glad you waited for us to come home.

MR. MCCURRY: Thank you. Thank you.

Q That's in lieu of universal health care.
(Laughter.)

MR. MCCURRY: Why does this look so -- this looks very dangerous. I don't think -- if that's all it takes to delivery a baby, there's a lot more health care reform that's occurred than President Clinton realizes, that's for sure.

Q Boil water, Mike. Just remember, boil water.

MR. MCCURRY: Well, thank you very much. I appreciate that. And I know that those of you who accompanied the First Lady had a marvelous time, because I've heard about it from several of you.

Q Mike, when are you due?

MR. MCCURRY: Probably at the end of next week. Thank you one and all. Have a happy Easter. We'll see you tomorrow. We've got --

Q Are you briefing tomorrow?

Q Why?

MR. MCCURRY: We do -- well, we've got -- well, we've got, among other things, as I think -- as I said -- indicated earlier, we'll be providing the President's tax returns --

Q You said there is a briefing?

MR. MCCURRY: Yes, I will. I'll do one -- I'll try to do it a 1:00 P.M. and try to make sure that's the last thing of the day that has any news in it.

Okay. Thanks.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

1:45 P.M. EST